

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 8 November 1983

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

DEATH OF Mr H. O'NEILL

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

That this House expresses its regret at the recent death of Mr H. O'Neill, former member of the House, and places on record its appreciation of his meritorious services; and that as a mark of respect to his memory the sitting of the House be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

On Wednesday 11 August 1982 my predecessor as Premier moved a motion expressing the regret of the House at the untimely resignation on account of ill health of Mr Howard O'Neill as member for Florey, and conveyed to him and his family the best wishes of the House for his speedy recovery. This was supported by a number of members at that time. Unfortunately, in the period since that motion was moved, from August 1982 until 30 October 1983, Mr O'Neill, though battling hard against the illness that afflicted him, was unable to enjoy any form of major respite from his illness or take part in either public affairs or other activities. His long and courageous battle finally was over on 30 October.

Unfortunately, only a little over 12 months later I find myself moving this motion of regret. Many things that were said on that occasion were very apposite and I think all members will recall the warmth of the sentiments that were expressed. Now that Mr O'Neill is no longer with us, I still think it is worth recounting briefly his career and saying one or two things about it. He was born on 12 October 1928 in Port Pirie and his primary schooling took place in that regional city. For secondary schooling he went to Woodville High School and then took up an apprenticeship in boilermaking with the South Australian Railways in 1945.

Following the completion of his indenture he went to the Broken Hill North Mine for a period of three years, returning to Adelaide, and then going to country areas, including Mount Gambier, and in June 1966 he was elected Assistant Secretary of the Boilermakers and Blacksmiths Society. Prior to his becoming a full-time union official, Mr O'Neill had obviously become very familiar with a number of areas of this State and had developed his particular skills in his trade and established his reputation there. During that period he was also quite active in political and community activities, and this marked his whole life. His career in the trade union movement as an elected full-time official was very successful and it led to his becoming State organiser of his union.

Then in March 1974 he became the State organiser of the Australian Labor Party. He served as Secretary of that Party prior to entering this House as a result of the 1979 elections. Throughout his career Mr O'Neill never stopped working with those people in society with whom he had been brought up and with whom he particularly identified—what might be called, in an old-fashioned term, but one I do not think that Mr O'Neill would back away from at all—those members of the working class of our community.

He was, as I have already said, active in political, trade union and community activities throughout the period of his life. The tragedy for Mr O'Neill, and I suggest a great loss to the State itself, was that having entered this place and eventually finding his way, with the support of his colleagues, into the shadow Cabinet, he was not able to serve a term as a Minister of the Crown. I believe that the reputation and development that he displayed was such that

he would have made a very major contribution in that role. One of my great regrets is that I have not been able to have his advice and counsel within my Government.

I think all it leaves to say is to place on record how important a role Howard O'Neill played in the lives of those who were fairly close to him, and how significant that role was in the broader community, and how respected he was. He was not a man to forgive easily; he was a man who held to his principles strongly. However, as we saw in the course of the far too short time he was in Parliament, he was a man who responded with humanity and emotion to those around him.

On behalf of the Government and members of my Party in this place, I extend condolences to his wife, Pat, and members of his family over the loss we all feel so deeply.

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): I would certainly like to join the Premier in supporting the condolence motion before the Chair for Howard O'Neill, whose untimely death occurred on 30 October after a lengthy and serious illness. As the Premier has indicated, Howard O'Neill was State Secretary of the South Australian Branch of the Labor Party between 1976 and 1979, and he was in fact a tireless worker for that Party to which he belonged. He believed in the principles of the Labor movement and certainly such devotion to a cause, as indeed Howard O'Neill had, deserves recognition and commendation. Whether one as an individual believes in the cause or not, the fact is that he held those principles and held them strongly, and worked for them, and therefore they deserve, as I said, recognition.

He certainly had an active career in the Labor movement in South Australia, to the extent of representing his State at the Federal executive level of the Labor movement, as I recall, between 1972 and 1974. As the representative for Florey, it was indeed unfortunate that he was unable to complete his full term as a representative for that electorate. All members will recall the tragedy his family suffered in the loss of his son whilst participating in a sporting event at Port Pirie during that period of time. The Premier referred to the compassion and humility of the man, and I believe that shone through following that very tragic event in his life, and I believe that brought Howard O'Neill closer to a number of members of this House, when due recognition was given to the man, the principles by which he stood, and the compassion within the man himself.

One would have to acknowledge that those ingredients in any individual are ingredients that each and every one of us would wish to aspire to. During his working career he held very important positions within the Labor movement, both State and federally, and his active work, as indeed the Premier has pointed out to the House, saw him hold executive and senior positions in those bodies. I have already said that Howard O'Neill never lost sight of that cause and, although I come from the other side of the House and support a different philosophy, I enjoyed and respected the fact that he had a vision for his Party and his State and, as the Premier has said, it is indeed unfortunate that the man was not able to serve as a Minister of the Crown. He served for a period as a shadow Minister in this House and, as political events turned out in this State, had ill health not struck him he would have no doubt been a Minister of the Government today.

I suppose that his devotion to the cause of his Party was the deciding factor in his decision to retire in August last year, and I think that the words used to describe him in a press article on his retirement as a worthy fighter are very apt indeed of Howard O'Neill. I believe that it was a measure of the man that, when he did retire, he apologised to his constituents of Florey for not being able to serve out a full term as their member. I support the motion before the

House and ask that condolences be passed on to the family of Howard O'Neill.

Mr WHITTEN (Price): It is with a great deal of regret that I speak on the motion moved by the Premier. Howard and I were very, very close. I first met him when he started to serve his apprenticeship at the South Australian Railways in 1945. We have continued to be close all the way through those years. The Labor movement and the world at large have lost a lot through the loss of Howard O'Neill. Whether it was in the industrial movement or the political movement, Howard O'Neill was always sincere, dinkum and a mate for those persons who wanted some sort of assistance. Howard and I perhaps had the same interests for most of his working life. Howard was so interested in the industrial movement and the Labor movement that, as an apprentice, he joined the old union (the old Boilermakers Society).

We were both executive members of the same union for many years. Even when, as the Premier said, he went to the country areas in the South-East, he quickly identified himself with the Labor movement. He was Secretary of the Mount Gambier sub-branch of our Party. When he returned to Adelaide, he still kept his association with the Labor movement, both politically and industrially, and became the State Organiser and Assistant Secretary of the Boilermakers and Blacksmiths Society. We both took part in the amalgamation of the boilermakers and blacksmiths, and later in the amalgamation of the Amalgamated Engineering Union, the sheetmetal workers, and boilermakers and blacksmiths. I went into the political sphere as an organiser for the Labor Party. However, when the opportunity came for me to select an organiser to follow me in 1973 (I think), Howard became my organiser in the Labor Party. We worked very, very closely together.

When I entered this House in 1975, Howard followed me as State Secretary of our Party. I welcomed him here as a great representative of the Labor movement when he was elected member for Florey in 1979. It is with a lot of regret that I stand here today and voice my thoughts about Howard, because we were not only friends but great mates, and in the Labor movement being a mate is something better than being a friend. Howard had a great deal of distinction. Not many members of our Party have been President of our Party twice, and that is what Howard O'Neill was. He also served on the Federal Executive and I had the honour to serve with him on the Federal Executive of the Labor Party.

The Labor movement industrially and politically is sad at the loss of Howard O'Neill. As the Leader has said, he was a man of great compassion. He was able to forgive, although he would never forget, which I think is a great attribute. When I look at other members in this House who have known Howard (perhaps for not as long as I have), I recall that one never heard anyone speak ill of him. He had a great wife and family. The Leader referred to the sudden passing of his son, Brian, and I agree that the sudden passing of his son greatly affected Howard's life. I would like to join with the Premier and the Leader in expressing my condolences and regrets to his wife Pat and their family.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I want to add my words of respect to the memory of our late Parliamentary colleague. My respect for Howard O'Neill grew quite considerably when, as Speaker, I enjoyed his very close confidence during the period leading to his unfortunate early retirement. His fortitude at that time under trying conditions was an inspiration to behold. I am pleased that the appropriate humanising of the Parliamentary system permitted Howard and his family to enjoy a period of borrowed time under less tense circumstances and with a sense of dignity. Howard's leaving the Parliamentary scene was a great loss to the

people of South Australia, and his passing is a loss to the community.

Mr GREGORY (Florey): I support the Premier's motion. Howard O'Neill served an apprenticeship with the railways as a boilermaker, a place where I also served an apprenticeship as a fitter and turner, in a workshop in which many working men worked as tradesmen and which apparently has moulded a lot of people who worked there in the traditions of the working people of Australia. It has produced many leading trade union officials and members of Parliament at both State and Federal levels. Howard was one of those who worked at the State level and at the Federal level of the Labor Party, and also at the national level of his union.

He had a long period as union organiser and union activist at Broken Hill, Mount Gambier and in Adelaide. He and I worked together over a long period of time in the metal unions, first in separate unions and later in an amalgamated union. I always appreciated his advice, his dedication, resolution, and resolute approach to resolving problems, and his unflinching assistance when we were in trouble.

Howard worked within the Labor Party with the same dedication and zeal as when he worked in the union movement. He suffered a long illness and coped with it with the steadfastness with which he approached problems he had experienced during his life in advancing the cause of the working people of South Australia. His courage never failed him and it will always be remembered by all those people of South Australia whom he helped. I hope that these few words will assist his family in the bereavement that they have suffered.

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): I can only support the comments made by previous speakers. As mentioned by the Premier, in some ways Howard was unforgiving, and I remember that when I first came to this Chamber he and I had some problems, but as time passed we got to know each other a little better, and I can state here that I found Howard to be a man of deep principle and of dedication to his tasks here and in the Labor movement generally. This was reflected throughout the path of his career, which has been referred to by previous speakers. As was mentioned by another speaker, I think his courage and character were reflected in the way in which he faced his illness. I do not think I know of anyone else who has faced up to such an illness so courageously in attempting to do what he could while he was as ill as he was. I can only express my deep personal sadness, because I did like the man for his principles. I express my deep sympathy to his family in their loss.

The SPEAKER: I join with the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition and other speakers in conveying my condolences to the O'Neill family. Howard O'Neill was a person whom I knew to be of great integrity, honesty and intense loyalty, and, notwithstanding his long illness, the announcement of his death came as a great blow. His courage in that illness was an inspiration to anybody associated with him. I shall arrange for a copy of this resolution, and the remarks that have been attracted by it, to be sent to the O'Neill family. I ask all honourable members to rise in their places to carry the motion in silence.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

[Sitting suspended from 2.22 to 2.30 p.m.]

PETITION: AURORA HOTEL

A petition signed by 3 277 residents of and visitors to South Australia praying that the House urge the Government

to prevent the demolition of the Aurora Hotel, take full responsibility for all heritage legislation in this State and for the maintenance and management of the historic character of the city of Adelaide, ensuring public participation in any decision that affects that character was presented by the Hon. J. D. Wright.

Petition received.

PETITION: MARIHUANA

A petition signed by 10 residents of South Australia praying that the House reject any legislation that would legalise or decriminalise the use of marihuana was presented by Mr Olsen.

Petition received.

PETITION: PATAWALONGA CHANNEL

A petition signed by 1 215 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to make an urgent commitment to dredging the Patawalonga channel, providing a safe all-weather passage for marine craft, and announcing planned commencement dates was presented by Mr Oswald.

Petition received.

PETITION: SCHOOL PARENT CLUB ACCOUNTS

A petition signed by 36 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to grant exemptions from debit tax charged on school parent club accounts was presented by Mr Rodda.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that answers to questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the following schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: questions on the Notice Paper Nos 64, 66, 77, 91, 99, 124, 126, 132, 152, 162 to 165, 169, 170, 175, 176, 187, 190, 193, 195, 197 to 199, 201, 210, 214, 215 to 220, 225 to 227, 229, 230 and 233; and I direct that the following answers to questions without notice and questions asked during the Estimates Committees be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

TELEPHONE TAPPING

In reply to **Mr BECKER** (11 August).

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Telephone (Interception) Act 1979 (Federal) precludes the South Australian Police Department from utilising any telephone tapping facility or seeking any type of approval under the authority of the Act to investigate any criminal matter, irrespective of the seriousness to the community.

EXPORT ABATTOIRS

In reply to **Mr BLACKER** (1 September).

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: On 1 September last, the member for Flinders asked me a question concerning the recent increase in export meat inspection fees. In fact, the increases were imposed by the last Federal Budget on all livestock slaughtered in an export abattoir only, with the

result that export abattoirs processing stock for the local market are relatively disadvantaged. Representations have been made to the Federal Government for a re-examination of the fees.

HERBICIDES

In reply to **Mr FERGUSON** (21 September).

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I can assure the honourable member that Department of Agriculture officers do not 'instruct' farmers to use herbicides against their better judgment. When requested by farmers, or others, officers of the Department of Agriculture do provide advice on the use of herbicides for particular situations, and I am assured that they stress that the user carefully read the product label and fully follow directions for use and all safety requirements. Similarly, authorised officers employed by local government, whether with pest plant control boards or district councils, do not recommend the use of herbicides which are not recommended by the Department of Agriculture or the Pest Plants Commission or which are not registered for use in South Australia. Should a landholder not wish to use a certain herbicide, then an alternative herbicide or method of control is suggested. In making recommendations to landholders regarding use of herbicides for weed control these officers, being trained and skilled in the use of such herbicides, take into account all necessary safety aspects and stress that usage be strictly in accordance with the product label.

RESEARCH AND BEQUEST FARM

In reply to **Mr BLACKER** (14 September).

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Before the working party conducting the review of research centres committed itself to the recommendation that the balance of Sims farm at Cleve be sold, it had to satisfy itself that the recommended action would not infringe the terms of the bequest. Legal opinion from the Crown Solicitor confirmed the validity of the proposal.

CASINO LICENCE

In reply to **Hon. MICHAEL WILSON** (27 October).

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In relation to the honourable member's question concerning the location of the casino licence, I have been advised that the Director of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet wrote to Mr Ron Tremaine, of Ayers House Restaurants, on 20 October after Mr Tremaine had asked for an indication of the Government's attitude to the proposal that Ayers House become the location of the proposed casino. The Director explained that the Government was willing to consider modifications to the existing arrangements for the use of Ayers House, bearing in mind that there were other interests involved in the site. He also informed Mr Tremaine that the Government would be making a submission to the authority which would canvass the general economic, financial, and other benefits which need to be obtained for the establishment of a casino. The letter did not reveal the contents of the Government's submission, but did point out that it was likely to favour location of the casino in a different part of the city where it would relate more closely to other entertainment, tourist, recreational and cultural facilities.

CONVENTION CENTRE

In reply to **Hon. D.C. BROWN** (27 October).

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In relation to the rental the Government will pay for the sublease of the convention centre and car park, the agreement provides that the Government shall sublease for a period of 40 years from a date to be agreed that part of the development comprising the convention centre and car park. The Government shall pay rental in respect of such leases. The initial rental shall be 6¼ per cent of the capitalised cost of the construction of the convention centre and car park. Thereafter the rental shall be adjusted for c.p.i. increases.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. State Government Insurance Commission—Auditor-General's Report on, 1982-83.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. The Technology Park Adelaide Corporation—Report, 1982-83.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. State Opera of South Australia—Report, 1982-83.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

- Planning Act, 1982—Crown Development Reports by South Australian Planning Commission on—
 - i. Division of land at St. Peters.
 - ii. Expansion of the existing 33/11 kv substation at Nuriootpa.
 - iii. Erection of classroom—Springton Rural School.

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. R.K. Abbott)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Road Traffic Act, 1961—Regulations—Traffic Prohibition—Enfield.

By the Minister of Marine (Hon. R.K. Abbott)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Marine and Harbors, Department of—Report, 1982-83.

By the Minister of Education (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Poultry Farmer Licensing Committee—Report, 1983.
- ii. University of Adelaide—Report and Legislation, 1982.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Alcohol and Drug Addicts Treatment Board—Report, 1981-82.
- ii. South Australian Health Commission—Report, 1981-82.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Children's Court Advisory Committee—Report, 1982-83.
- ii. Community Welfare, Department for—Report, 1982-83.
- iii. Legal Services Commission—Report, 1982-83.
- iv. Consumer Affairs, Commissioner for—Report, 1982-83.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Greyhound Racing Control Board—Report, 1982-83.
- ii. Trotting Control Board—Report, 1982-83.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. District Council of Strathalbyn—By-law No. 20—Motor Vehicles Plying, Kept or Let for Hire.
- ii. District Council of Tanunda—By-law No. 31—Metric Conversion.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: AURORA HOTEL

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister for Environment and Planning): I seek leave to make a statement.
Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: In light of public concern at the proposed demolition of the Aurora Hotel, this morning I convened a meeting of the interested parties. At the meeting were representatives of the Save the Aurora group, the developers, Baulderstones, the Adelaide City Council and the Building Trades Federation. It was a round-table conference to explore the stalemate and discuss any possible avenues for compromise. At the outset I made it clear to the participants, that the Government had no legal (perhaps it is better to say 'statutory') role to play in the matter. It is clear that Baulderstones has acted within the law. The Company has complied with all the legal processes. It has approval from the City Council to proceed with the demolition. Understandably, it is concerned with delays to the project.

The Adelaide City Council City Planning Committee has taken the view that, having granted approval for demolition of the Aurora Hotel, it has exhausted its legal obligations. The possibility of a land swap with other City Council land in the area was raised at the meeting, along with a further suggestion that the Government acquire the building for an alternative use such as low-cost boarding accommodation. I made the point at the meeting that acquisition by the Government was only a remote possibility. The Government has since rejected this as a viable option. The cost of acquiring the Aurora Hotel would be well in excess of \$1 million, and the Government is not in a position to outlay such a large sum of money for this particular building. This would amount to more than twice the funds available in the State Heritage Fund for this fiscal year. The building union will be meeting tonight to consider its position.

In view of the fact that the Aurora is not on the State Heritage List nor on the City of Adelaide proposed list, and that neither the City Council nor the State Government has any legal power to intervene, Baulderstones is entitled to proceed with its development project. However, the Aurora dispute has highlighted the general concern in the community for preserving our heritage and for shortcomings in the Adelaide City heritage protection measures. Clearly, there needs to be more public input into the heritage listing process and more opportunity for the public to comment before development proposals are settled.

As Minister responsible, I will be pressing the Adelaide City Council to exhibit its proposed City Heritage List for public comment as soon as possible. I will also be examining ways in which State and city heritage measures might be strengthened. Shortly, I will be inviting interested individuals, including those involved in the efforts to save the Aurora, to discuss with me steps that can be taken to overcome any perceived shortcomings.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: AUSTRALIAN U.L.C. HUMANITARIAN ORGANISATION

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Chief Secretary): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: An interstate organisation known as the Australian U.L.C. Humanitarian Organisation has again been collecting funds from the South Australian public. This organisation is not registered in South Australia as a charity, and persons soliciting donations are in breach of the provisions of the Collections for Charitable Purposes Act, 1939-1982. In June of this year a warning was issued to the public about this organisation, which claims to be collecting for the handicapped and disabled persons. This organisation has been active in Adelaide and in some country centres but is not registered as a charity in South Australia, nor is it registered as a company, an association or a business name.

It is understood that this organisation may be operating under various other non-registered names. The organisation caused some concern in 1981 when complaints reached Government from legitimate South Australian charities. Investigations into the activities of U.L.C. have been carried out by the South Australian Police which resulted in two persons being convicted under the Collections for Charitable Purposes Act in the Port Lincoln Magistrates Court. Principals behind the U.L.C. are understood to be residents of Victoria.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

QUESTION TIME

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Deputy Premier): I move:
That Question Time be extended to 3.45 p.m.
Motion carried.

ELECTRICITY CHARGES

Mr OLSEN: Does the Premier agree that the Government's decision to charge the Electricity Trust a higher rate of interest on loans outstanding to the Government was a significant factor in the recent increase in electricity tariffs and, if so, will he review that decision? In last weekend's *Sunday Mail* the Premier was quoted as saying that rises in gas prices were mostly to blame for the 12 per cent increase in power tariffs from 1 November, the second such rise since the last election.

However, the facts show that this statement was misleading, if not completely wrong. The Government's decision to increase the rate of interest that the Trust must pay for the outstanding loans will cost the Trust an extra \$12.3 million this financial year. As each \$1 million in extra costs necessitates the Trust's lifting tariffs by one-quarter of 1 per cent, these higher interest charges mean that during the rest of the current financial year tariffs will have to rise by about 6 per cent in order to recover costs.

The cost to the Electricity Trust of higher natural gas prices will be about \$14.8 million, based on the amount of gas purchased by the Trust last financial year. This will necessitate a rise of 3.7 per cent spread over 12 months. These figures show that the increased gas prices account for just over a quarter of the most recent 12 per cent tariff increase, whereas the Government's decision to charge the Trust a higher interest rate will have a much more significant short-term effect.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Certainly, that decision had an influence on the level of Trust tariff increases. The way

in which the Trust chose to treat that over the period of time it sought recovery was, of course, a matter for its own consideration. I find it very odd that the Leader keeps drawing attention to this particularly vexed question of electricity tariffs. During the three years before the Government of which he was a member came into office there were three increases in tariffs on an annual basis, give or take a few months. Tariffs had been increasing and adjusted, as must occur due to rising costs.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In those three years the increases were each 10 per cent. In July 1980 the previous Liberal Government—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Why don't you answer the question?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Members opposite do not like this; one can hear them starting to chiac already. In July 1980 the former Government approved an increase in Trust tariffs of 12.5 per cent. In July 1981 there was an increase of 19.8 per cent, the highest increase on record; certainly, the highest increase for the past 10 years or so. Then, in May of the following year, less than 12 months later, there was a further increase, this time of 16 per cent. So, there were increases of 19.8 per cent and 16 per cent on top of the increase of 12.5 per cent. When the Labor Government assumed office in November of 1982 a further 12 per cent increase was in place to operate from the beginning of December. That increase was due almost entirely to the gas price agreement that had been negotiated by the previous Government. I want to set on record very clearly the fact that there were those three 10 per cent increases followed by increases of 12.5 per cent, 19.8 per cent, 16 per cent, and 12 per cent—that is, four increases in three years.

There are various complex reasons for the situation. It is not a simple problem. Now, in November, we have a further 12 per cent increase, due to a number of factors, not the least of which is the gas price increase, which ensures that over and above the general level of costs there will be increases in future years. Of course, the Government is concerned about it and we are making an effort to try to ensure that in the future electricity tariffs will be contained. But this cannot be done in the short term. My colleague the Minister of Mines and Energy—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON:—has commissioned the wide-ranging Stewart Inquiry to look into the whole question of electricity generation. One of its terms of reference will be to have regard to minimising the cost of electricity to South Australian users. We can do a number of things in terms of subsidising concessions in terms of the concession scheme. It should be borne in mind that the present Government is the first Government in the history of South Australia to introduce a scheme which is far more comprehensive and valuable than are the schemes that operate in other States of Australia. When talking about increases in tariffs, it should be borne in mind that previously tariffs were increased by 19.8 per cent and 16 per cent in less than 12 months: where was the concession scheme then? We are sick and tired of the crocodile tears and exploitation of this issue by the Opposition. The Government is concerned and will take the appropriate action to try to contain and minimise the price of electricity over future years.

FLINDERS RANGES NATIONAL PARK

Mr WHITTEN: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy provide the House with a further progress report on the

geophysical and geological work being undertaken by his Department inside the western edge of the Flinders Ranges National Park?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I am happy to give all honourable members an update on this exploration programme which, as members will recall, is designed to assist B.H.P. Company Limited's search for new sources of lead and zinc for the Port Pirie smelters. I would have thought that the member for Glenelg would have had some interest in the successful search in the interests of South Australia. The situation is that all of the stage I geological field trips have now been completed, with the fourth and final trip being completed on 4 November. Mapping has been completed to a point 2.5 kilometres north of Brachina Gorge and a grand total of 766 stream sediment, rock chip, soil and petrographic samples have been gathered for analysis by Amdel and B.H.P.

Stage II of the programme—the geophysical survey—is now scheduled to start on 21 November following completion of tests outside the park to finalise methods which will be effective, but will have minimal impact on the environment. As I have reported previously to the House, the induced polarisation method has been chosen, using electrode pits only one metre by half a metre in area and 10 centimetres deep. Steel stakes will be driven into the base of the pits and water will be applied daily while the electrodes are in use.

On completion of the survey, the stakes will be removed and the pits filled in with their original soil, including their seed load. Using this method, it is expected that all trace of the pits will have disappeared in a year or less. During the survey, lines will be traversed within the survey area at 200 metre intervals. Electrode pits will be dug at intervals along these lines. The distance between the pits will depend on test results within the park but, in any case, will be no shorter than 50 metres and may, in fact, be considerably greater. The geophysical survey is expected to take from three to four weeks to complete.

ROXBY DOWNS

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I direct my question to the Deputy Premier. In view of the fact that this Parliament has obliged the Roxby Downs joint venturers to complete their feasibility study by the end of 1984, will the Minister make immediate and strong representations to the A.C.T.U. and the South Australian Trades and Labor Council following threats of black bans and other industrial action to impede the progress of the Roxby Downs project? The Premier has committed the Government to full support for the terms and conditions of the Roxby Downs indenture.

Amongst other things, the indenture requires the joint venturers to complete their feasibility study by the end of next year. However, the threat of union bans and other industrial action could prevent the companies from keeping to this timetable. On the Jeremy Cordeaux show yesterday, the President of the A.C.T.U., Mr C. Dolan, said:

We will seek by any means we can to stop these projects, particularly Roxby Downs, from going ahead.

Mr Dolan repeated that threat in the *Advertiser* this morning, saying unions would consider action to interfere with the supply of materials and machinery for the project, and a spokesman for the Trades and Labor Council has supported Mr Dolan's statements.

The spokesman was quoted on 5DN news this morning as saying the T.L.C. would follow A.C.T.U. policy. As a party to this indenture, the South Australian Government

has a responsibility to ensure that the joint venturers are not impeded in their work and the Minister of Labour ought to make immediate representations to the unions to point out this fact and urge them not to take any action against the project.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: First, I think the questioner is rather uninformed about the current situation. Quite simply, at the moment it is my understanding, and I think I am accurate, that all of the working personnel at Roxby Downs are unionists at this time. They must be unionists with the good grace of the Trades and Labor Council. If the Trades and Labor Council had any dispute with that area at the moment I do not see how the establishment could be serviced as a union site. I am confident that there are 100 per cent unionists there at the moment. In relation to the question of whether I will or will not do something, that is hypothetical at this stage because there is no need—

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: That is not in accord with news reports.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: If it is necessary to talk to the Trades and Labor Council about this matter I will certainly do so as I have done with respect to every other matter. Let us see how much industrial time was lost in South Australia last year. There was almost a record low in lost time in this State. That is just some evidence.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: No thanks to Mr Dolan for that.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Of course, it is clear that this Government has continual rapport and consultation with the Trades and Labor Council at the very highest level. In fact, I meet with that Council every fortnight. Disputes of this nature can only be solved if one has continual consultation. If the previous Minister had had the same consultations as I now have we would not have seen thousands of people marching on Parliament House every third or fourth week. They were the kinds of problems that occurred because there was lack of consultation at that time. If I deem it necessary, I will certainly talk to the Trades and Labor Council and I will be very welcome to discuss it with them.

AMOEBIC MENINGITIS

Mr GREGORY: Can the Minister of Water Resources inform the House what steps are being taken to control amoebic meningitis during the summer months?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: Starting on 14 November, most water supplies in South Australia will undergo an intensive monitoring programme to help control amoebic meningitis. The State-wide campaign will continue until at least 1 April next year. The programme will involve regular water sampling at 151 locations, 93 of which are on the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline. Weekly samplings will take place at a number of additional locations, and further samples will be tested in other areas on a less regular basis. Tank cleaning will be stepped up and chlorination levels will be increased in a number of country areas to help control *naegleria fowleri*, the agent that causes amoebic meningitis.

Chloramination, which combines chlorine and ammonia to provide a more stable disinfectant in long pipeline systems, has been introduced on a trial basis in Yorke Peninsula and will continue to be used in the Tailem Bend-Keith pipeline system. My colleague, the Minister of Health in another place, has informed me that the Health Commission will conduct a campaign to make the South Australian community aware of the dangers of amoebic meningitis. The Engineering and Water Supply Department will do everything possible to provide safe water supplies during the summer months ahead. However, I would like to stress that the

ultimate responsibility will rest with every South Australian to take all necessary precautions.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: That's not what you said three years ago.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The honourable member should listen to what I say now. He was the person who was making the comments then. However, I do stress that there is a responsibility to the community at large to take all the necessary precautions to ensure that amoebic meningitis cases do not occur. For instance, it is dangerous to swim in dirty water or when insufficient care is taken in keeping swimming pools clean. Above all, the campaign proposed by the Health Commission certainly will include the request that people take extreme caution, particularly when swimming, not to allow water to reach the upper part of the nose because it is believed that that is where the disease can be contracted.

AURORA HOTEL

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Does the Minister of Local Government now agree with the Premier that the Adelaide City Council cannot prevent the demolition of the Aurora Hotel because the developer's plan complies with planning regulations? In the *Advertiser* of 1 November the Premier was reported as saying that the Government was not in a position to save the Aurora Hotel. The report states:

Mr Bannon said all planning conditions for the redevelopment of the Aurora had been complied with and the building was not listed on any heritage lists.

What the Premier said contradicted and conterminded the earlier views of the Minister of Local Government as stated in the *Advertiser* of 26 October, when he was reported as saying that he did not accept the City Council's argument that it could not prevent demolition because the developer's plan complied with planning regulations. The Minister also said that he would ask the Minister for Environment and Planning for assistance.

That Minister earlier this afternoon, in a Ministerial statement, said quite categorically that it is clear that Baulderstones have acted within the law; that the company has complied with all the legal processes and has approval from the City Council to proceed with the demolition; and that understandably the company is concerned about delays to the project. It is on the basis of the open conflict between the Minister of Local Government and the Premier that I ask the question.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: In reply to the member for Light's question, 'Do I agree with the Premier?', the answer is, 'Yes'.

EXTERNAL ACCOUNTS AUDITS

Mr MAYES: Will the Minister of Community Welfare ask the Attorney-General to initiate urgently discussions with the Federal Attorney-General and State Attorneys-General to amend the Australian National Companies and Securities Act to provide regulations for an independent body to review all external accounts audits of private and public companies? The provisions that currently operate have been raised with me by many of my constituents who are chartered accountants and who are concerned with current practices which are developing within the audit industry. I refer particularly to an article which appeared in the financial pages of the *Advertiser* last week with the headline 'Accountant goes to shareholders over sacking', and which stated:

Accountants Arthur Young & Co. have appealed to shareholders of Abbott Holdings Ltd in a bid to avoid being sacked as the

company's auditor . . . but with the Abbott board controlling more than 50 per cent of the company's shares, and certain to vote in favor of its motion to dismiss Young at the forthcoming annual meeting, the accountant's cause seems a lost one. The removal of Young is part of a major cost rationalisation scheme undertaken by Abbott following its recent slump in profitability.

The article goes on to refer to a letter placed by Mr Hastwell before the board and the shareholders. The article continues:

In his letter, Mr Hastwell says his firm believes its proposed fee for the 1983-84 audit of \$31 800 is fair and reasonable and that 'fee cutting' can act only to the detriment of shareholders and the company in the longer term. 'Shareholders should consider this proposal very carefully and exercise their right to vote on it as we consider the proposed change in auditors is not in the best interests of your group of companies.'

He says Young declined to resign when requested as this would constitute a failure to fulfil its obligations to shareholders. The accounts of certain subsidiaries of Abbott were mildly qualified in the year ended 30 June, and Mr Hastwell says this makes the process of audit tendering 'particularly undesirable' as it puts undue pressure on the incumbent auditor.

I have had a number of discussions with people who are concerned about this practice and about cost cutting in the audit area and who view this as a dangerous precedent which might reflect on the overall well-being of companies and certainly not give shareholders proper protection.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTY: I thank the honourable member for his question. It is a matter of some importance in the community, and I shall refer it to my colleague the Attorney-General, the Minister responsible for the registration of company auditors.

ROXBY DOWNS

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Will the Premier now give an unequivocal assurance to the House and to the people of South Australia that no further impediment will be placed in the path of the Roxby Downs development by the Federal and State conferences of the A.L.P. or the trade union wing of the Australian Labor Party?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: All I can say in answer to that is that I would have thought the events of the past few days and the debate that has taken place would have shown precisely where I stand and precisely the South Australian Government's attitude in relation to this project. I would have thought rather than carping doubt and criticisms being thrown on what has happened—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: If members opposite could contain their disappointment and just try to get on to a little more constructive vein it would be useful. This sort of pursuit is rather like the treatment meted out a little while ago to my colleague the Deputy Premier (although he brushed it off) in which apparently, if he does not meet with the Trades and Labor Council he is neglecting his duties and ignoring his responsibilities, and, if he does, he is taking orders from it. This whole attitude of the Opposition is to try to find the worst possible interpretation. I would have thought that at least in view of the carry-on in the last week or so, particularly when we debated this matter in the House, we might have got some form of acknowledgement that the right result had come about. In my view that project is going ahead on schedule and we as a Government will do all that we are required to do in terms of our responsibility to ensure that that happens.

101 USES FOR THE UNEMPLOYED

Mrs APPLEBY: Has the attention of the Minister of Labour been drawn to the book released in the past few days entitled *101 Uses for the Unemployed?* I have received

many phone calls from persons who have seen this book and who are disturbed by the discrimination, sexism and blatant sick humour of such a publication. They have said that it is not only the title which concerns them but that the cartoons could just as easily apply to sex, racial and religious or other minority groups and are encouraging a degrading attitude towards human beings.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I was not aware of the book until the honourable member drew it to my attention a few moments ago; hence I did not see the press cutting in the *Advertiser* on 7 November to which she refers. I am not quite sure how I missed it. The article in the *Advertiser* is headed 'New book lampoons unemployed'.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I might have been down at Price getting the numbers. If so, I did a good job, and I would advise members opposite to be worried less about me than about the member for Fisher, who I notice has nominated for two seats.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We are debating not preselection but a book on the unemployed.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The book is published in London by Frederick Muller Limited, and it appears that the author has a very twisted sense of humour. It reminds me of some Liberals I know!

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: That is a bit of subtle wit!

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Nevertheless, it is true. What the author is trying to depict, in my view, is scurrilous, low, and of a very poor standard. If one looks at a couple of the cartoons featured in the *Advertiser*, one finds unemployed people being dragged behind a tractor and used as scarifiers. I do not think that anyone in South Australia ought to buy the book. In another cartoon, we see a lamp post, with people waiting to cross the street, and unemployed people have been laid out to make a platform for them. I do not know what makes a man sink to this sort of scurrilous attack on unemployed workers. Surely it is bad enough to be unemployed in our society today without someone trying to make money out of it, as this person is doing. If he has skill, if that is what it is—

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: You're assisting him with promotion.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I did not authorise this question. I was asked a question by an honourable member—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT:—who has the right to ask me a question and who is concerned about the unemployed. I want to try to influence people throughout South Australia not to purchase this book. I notice in the article that one bookshop in South Australia has refused to take it. I wish to place on record my appreciation and gratitude to those who have refused to take the book, and I urge other book-sellers to search their consciences to see whether they want to make money out of disadvantaged people in our society. I despise this sort of propaganda.

CABINET RESHUFFLE

Mr OSWALD: As a public opinion poll survey is being undertaken to assess public opinion of the performance of each Cabinet Minister, is the Premier in a position to confirm the mounting speculation that there will be a Cabinet reshuffle before Parliament resumes in 1984?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have not seen, nor am I aware of, such a poll, or of what the honourable member is talking about. The honourable member went on to ask, 'Is there to be a reshuffle?'. I do not see any reason why

there should be a reshuffle while the Ministry is performing so superbly.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

KOOLANGARRA KINDERGARTEN

Mr MAX BROWN: Will the Minister of Education examine the possibility of providing adequate finance to the Kindergarten Union to allow the union to provide to the Koolangarra Kindergarten, Whyalla, a complete security guard enclosure around a rainwater tank recently replaced because of the activities of vandals, or alternatively, some other security proposals? Because of vandalism in Whyalla, the kindergarten recently had its rainwater tank destroyed. However, through hard work by its committee and the generosity of business people, it has now replaced the tank. However, because there is a real fear that vandals will again strike, there is a need for a security-type fence around the tank. I understand that the cost of the fence would be about \$2 000, an amount which the committee is unable to find.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I will raise this matter with the Kindergarten Union to have discussions about security problems faced by kindergartens in general, and in particular the one raised by the member for Whyalla. I appreciate his concern and that of the kindergarten committee which contacted him. The funding arrangements for the Kindergarten Union are different from those applying to Education Department facilities or TAFE facilities, whereby maintenance and security problems come under the area of Government Consolidated Revenue and expenditure. In the Kindergarten Union the situation is that branch kindergartens are responsible for those aspects at the kindergarten level. That is not to say that the Government does not make funds available to the Kindergarten Union: it does make large sums of money available. The budgetary provision this year is nearly \$20 million, paying the salary component of staff at kindergartens throughout South Australia and also paying for the budget operating grants available to kindergartens. That is an important element in the costs or running of each individual kindergarten because they rely heavily on the sums that they receive by way of budget operating grants directly from the Kindergarten Union, but indirectly from the State Government. In the most recent Budget those funds were indexed to allow for inflation, and, if one follows the track record of the previous three years, one finds that a number of kindergartens are very happy indeed that this Government saw fit to index, and in so doing adhere to its policy before the last election. That matter of security provision and the general area of maintenance is one that I will raise with the Kindergarten Union, find out what avenues it is able to examine, and look at that whole wider issue.

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ACT

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Will the Chief Secretary inform the House when amendments to the Correctional Services Act will be introduced, following statements he made during the Estimates Committee, so enabling the regulations to be brought down, and also when it is intended that legislation will be introduced to facilitate changes to the parole system? During the sittings of the Estimates Committee, when questioned as to why the Correctional Services Act introduced by the previous Liberal Government in 1981 and supported by this Parliament had not been proclaimed and regulations brought down, the Chief Secretary informed me that his office had just received a minute from the Crown Solicitor.

In part and referring to the minute or letter, the Chief Secretary said:

There are a number of recommendations contained in the Crown Solicitor's letter referring to the legislation approved in 1981, saying that it needs to be amended so that the intent of that 1981 legislation can be implemented. There have been many problems in producing the regulations.

The Chief Secretary then went on to say:

I point out to the honourable member that I am as surprised as anybody else that, in September 1983, the Crown Solicitor is reporting to us that the 1981 amended Act is defective and that before the regulations can be proclaimed, further changes are needed.

On numerous occasions I have brought to the attention of the Chief Secretary the need for the Correctional Services Act to be proclaimed and regulations introduced. There is continuing unrest associated with the prison system, and the fact that the Government is unable to attract a suitable applicant for the position of Manager of Yatala Labour Prison emphasises that. I have been given information only today in answer to a Question on Notice that the Government has not been able to find a successful applicant for that most important position. Much has been said about the need that the Chief Secretary sees for changes to the parole system, and that is why I ask the question.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Replying to one of the last comments made by the honourable member, it is not that there have not been applications for the position of Manager of Yatala Labour Prison; the difficulty is that there are not applications from which we would be encouraged to appoint a person. So, although there are applications there has not been the sort of application one would look for. We are still searching diligently for the right person to be put in charge of Yatala Labour Prison.

In relation to changes to the parole system, it is certainly my intention and I expect to introduce legislation in the House before the end of this year, and I will be seeking the co-operation of the House to have that legislation passed before Christmas. However, that is a matter for the House to determine: I appreciate that, but the measure will certainly be introduced in sufficient time for it to be debated before the House rises in December.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: Do you want it through both Houses by the end of the year?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I would certainly welcome its passage through both Houses and the assistance of the honourable member in achieving that. Of course, the delay in having the regulations prepared and gazetted does not cause me any joy, and I agree with the honourable member when he says that there are many worthwhile amendments in the 1981 legislation which ought to be now in operation but are not. I have a very difficult problem, which my department is now addressing with the Crown Law Office to see whether, as I personally believe should be the case, the intention of Parliament in 1981 ought to be recognised by proclamation of the Act so that appropriate amendments could then be made to it.

I do not want to go through the difficulties being experienced in this regard, but I can talk to the honourable member privately, if he wishes, about some of the problems we are having with the regulations that have been drawn up and about the Crown Solicitor's comments on those regulations and the difficulties he foresees in the Government proclaiming the Act with those regulations in place. We are addressing the problems with all the urgency required, and the department is now discussing these with the Crown Law Office in order to ascertain whether the appropriate action would be to proclaim the Act with those regulations and then move the amendments, because the Act—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: You've had 12 months to decide this.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The honourable member just informed the House that he was present during the

Estimates Committee when I was presented with a report from the Crown Solicitor, so he knows that we have not had 12 months to determine this. The problem we have is to determine whether or not it is appropriate to proclaim the Act with all its deficiencies and then have the trouble that that will cause, or to try to reclaim some of the ground lost over the past 12 months and during the period when the honourable member's Government was in office and was responsible for drawing up regulations of which the Crown Solicitor does not approve.

TRAVEL AGENTS CONFERENCE

Ms LENEHAN: Will the Minister of Tourism tell the House what progress has been made to attract the 1986 Conference of the Australian Federation of Travel Agents to South Australia in conjunction with the Jubilee 150? I understand that the Minister recently visited Sydney for talks with the National Board of the Australian Federation of Travel Agents and that he suggested that it hold its 1986 conference in South Australia, which would attract about 1 000 delegates to this State for the jubilee year.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I am fairly confident that the submission presented to the National Board of the Australian Federation of Travel Agents will be successful and that the AFTA convention will be held in South Australia in 1986, our sesqui-centenary year. We felt that in our submission it was sufficiently important for a delegation to wait upon the Board, and this occurred a fortnight ago, and the members of that delegation were Mr Bill O'Gorman (State President of the South Australian Chapter of AFTA), Mr Graham Inns (Director of the Department of Tourism) and myself. As the honourable member has pointed out, a convention of that size, comprising 1 000 to 1 200 delegates bringing with them members of their families, would result in more than 200 visitors to South Australia that year, and they are not just the ordinary holiday type of visitor: one could expect that 1 000 to 1 200 travel agents from around Australia, from some of the Pacific Islands and a number of other visitors from overseas would be able to savour what South Australia has to offer and then go back as travel agents themselves and recommend and sell packages to our State.

I think that this is one of the best opportunities for South Australia to prove to those people in the industry that this is the holiday destination of Australia, and if that message still needs to be sold (I doubt whether it has been, and we should be enthusiastic about continuing to sell that message), the 1986 AFTA conference in South Australia will do that. We are competing against the desire of AFTA delegates to have their 1986 conference off-shore. It has a conference on-shore one year and off-shore the next, and an off-shore conference is programmed for 1986, but I am confident that we will be able to change their minds. Queensland is competing also for this conference and is very enthusiastic in doing so, but I am confident that we have the edge on Queensland for a number of very good reasons. There may be one other State competing, but I think that the main competition is from Queensland. We are doing all we can to ensure that South Australia is the site for the 1986 convention. I am as confident as one can be that we will be successful, but the Board will not be making its decision until its meeting in December. I think that we should all keep our fingers crossed and hope that our submission will be successful.

ELECTRICITY SUBSIDIES

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Will the Premier give special consideration to the hospitality industry in any

investigation into the extension of electricity subsidies as announced in today's *News*? The hotel industry will be particularly hard hit by the latest increase in electricity charges which will bring electricity bills to many suburban hotels to between \$18 000 and \$24 000 per year. This figure rises considerably, depending on the size and nature of the hotel, and reaches a staggering \$250 000 this year for the Hilton Hotel. I am advised by some hoteliers that the latest 12 per cent increase in electricity charges, coming on top of the 33½ per cent increase in liquor tax which comes into effect in April, could put at risk the profitability of some hotels and jeopardise employment which, in the hotel industry, is now estimated to involve some 9 500 people. In view of the industry's capacity to create employment if given the chance and the Government's alleged commitment to tourism development, it is essential that the industry be given some relief from what has become a crippling tax and cost burden.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I think that what the honourable member has said could apply to a lot of other users of electricity including, of course, industry and impact on domestic households as well, although the concession scheme provides some relief there, which is not the case in some other areas. I guess that it is true—and I have already said that we are concerned about the rising cost of electricity—the 12 per cent increase this year certainly is above the rate of inflation, although not much above it. In terms of previous years, I guess, the industry is definitely reeling under the impact of something like an average of 16 per cent in annual rises (four rises in three years under the previous Government) and I imagine that, formerly as Minister, the honourable member who asked the question had some very special concerns about the hotel and hospitality industry. I will perhaps ask her whether she has some material relating to the approaches she made then and the sort of submissions she put. I would be happy to consider the action she took in the face of those horrendous increases under the previous Government, and to take that into account in future.

ANANGU TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMME

Mr TRAINER: Will the Minister of Education tell the House whether the Anangu teacher education programme will go ahead in the 1984 academic year?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Yes, the Anangu teacher education programme, a programme worked up by the South Australian College of Advanced Education in consultation with members of the Pitjantjatjara community in the North-West of the State, has now reached the stage of having received approval for funding from the Federal Government. The College is quite eager that the matter be proceeded with, although there are still some other stages that have to be gone through. The first is that the Tertiary Education Authority of South Australia needs to accredit the Diploma of Teaching Anangu that is proposed to be the outcome of the course, and also there need to be discussions held between members of the Pitjantjatjara community in the North-West and the South Australian College of Advanced Education to resolve a number of issues, including the matter of accommodation for the course (whether it will be based in the North-West or whether it will have some of its components based in Adelaide), how students will be selected from the various communities up there, and how they will be accommodated if they are required to stay in a settlement other than the one in which they normally live.

Tony French Kennedy, the course co-ordinator, has written a letter to Stanley Douglas of the Pitjantjatjara Council putting a number of these matters to him and also proposing that a meeting be held in the North-West later in November. We look forward to that meeting taking place. While trav-

elling in the North-West area last week, I visited all the schools in the area and found a considerable degree of excitement, particularly among the Aboriginal Education workers, about the proposal for the ANTEP, as it is known. There was a great feeling that this programme is essential in terms of providing not only for the ongoing professional development of those who are A.E.W.s but also for others who want to take part in the very active education programme that exists in the North-West. They have very strong feelings about a number of issues that should be considered concerning the siting of the course as well as a number of logistical elements of the course. That is why a meeting will take place later in November.

As I mentioned before, the proposal will provide for a Diploma of Teaching Anangu, which, if accepted by TEASA and the Teacher Registration Board, will provide for full teaching status of people in the schools in the North-West who hold such diploma. This picks up the particular needs of education in a bilingual circumstance, which, of course, is the case in all but one of our schools in the North-West. It also picks up the very important cultural interface elements that need to be acknowledged by those who take part in education in those schools, as well as acknowledging the fact that students who study at those schools naturally have a right to know that they are getting an education which is of as good a quality as that available anywhere else in South Australia.

I can say with great confidence, having visited those schools (in fact, I visited two of them for the second time), that the quality of education we are providing in the North-West is high and comparable to that being provided in other parts of South Australia. We now await the outcome of the Tertiary Education Authority's meeting to be held on 16 November and its determination of what it will do with the application for accreditation.

ABALONE

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Will the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Fisheries in another place, ask his colleague to state categorically whether or not a decision has been taken to issue Ministerial permits or licences for the taking of Roei abalone, and, if so, will he say when that decision was taken and how many licences or permits have been issued? On 6 October in Estimates Committee B the Minister of Fisheries stated:

I am flagging that we will be issuing some Ministerial permits for Roei to be taken. The decision has been taken but not yet announced.

However, on 27 October in a letter to AFIC the Minister stated:

With regard to your letter of 21 October 1983, I feel there has been some misunderstanding about the possible issue of permits to take Roei abalone. Your organisation should, from its own records of meetings and correspondence, be aware of the purpose of a study currently being made into Roei abalone in western waters. Those records reveal that both AFIC and the Department of Fisheries considered that a biological study should precede the issue of licences or permits to take this species. That process is being followed and, although the study is nearing completion, data has not been sufficiently worked up for a proposition to be put to AFIC.

Quite obviously, only one of those two statements made by the Minister can be true. The industry would certainly like to know just which of those statements made by the Minister is true so that it will know exactly where it will be going in the future.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The honourable member has asked not only for an answer but indeed for a categorical answer. So, I can categorically say that I will refer the matter to my colleague the Minister of Fisheries in another place and have an answer brought down for the honourable member.

PSYCHOLOGICAL TESTING

Mr PETERSON: Will the Minister of Education say what provision for psychological testing of students is available within the Education Department, and what is the process for the psychological testing of individual students? Recently I was visited by the parents of an 18-year-old boy who has now been found to be schizophrenic and with an IQ of 70. This lad has considerable difficulty at school, and his parents believe that many of the problems being experienced stem from the fact that as a student this boy was forced to participate in classes where the standard was beyond his ability, despite their requests that he be left in special classes. The boy was not tested for mental ability at any stage of his education while placed in special classes. The parents make the point that assessment at a much earlier age may have enabled the appropriate levels of education to be provided for him or for medical treatment to be undertaken much sooner.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: In answer to the first part of the question, I point out that the Education Department has a Guidance and Special Services Section which is responsible for this area. Dr Keith Weir would be the appropriate education officer for the honourable member to contact and raise this issue in terms of points of clarification. I would be very surprised to find that there had been no contact during the schooling of the child to whom the honourable member referred if that child had been in a special class or a special school, because to my certain knowledge the Guidance and Special Services Section has frequent contact with special schools and special classes. Indeed, that is within its ambit of authority, and it offers a very good support service to teachers and students within those schools. That involves not only the identification of particular problems but also the assessment of the needs of individual students. The branch is involved in discussions with parents as well as the teachers of the students concerned. In asking the honourable member to take up this matter with the officer in the Department directly connected with matters of this nature, I am surprised to hear that this child did not receive any assistance until 18 years of age.

Sometimes there is educational debate about what should happen to children of certain abilities and about whether or not they should be in special classes or schools or integrated into the ordinary educational circumstance. There are some very strong feelings on various sides of that debate, but quite respectable educational argument can be put from each perspective. My personal view is that in many cases it is preferable if we can integrate children with special needs into the ordinary educational circumstance, provided we can offer them the adequate support that they need in those circumstances. However, there will still be children whose needs can be addressed only by special classes or special schools. But it would be wrong to say that there are no differing circumstances and that all such children should be placed in special classes or special schools. That is certainly not the case. In many cases there is documented evidence suggesting that children limited to special classes or schools have actually suffered through not having had a challenge to their ability put to them and that in fact because of that they have regressed or become problem children and caused problems for other students.

Likewise, some criticism comes where children have not been integrated into other circumstances. The guidance and special services section of the Education Department has done a significant amount of research in that area. That is not to say that the answers are perfect for individual children, as each child will have individual needs. From time to time the best decision ultimately was not made. They certainly spent a lot of effort to ensure that each individual child's needs were accounted for. If the honourable member wishes

to take it up with the education officer concerned and identify the case, I am certain he will receive satisfactory information.

O-BAHN BRIDGES

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Will the Minister of Transport be honest enough to admit his blunder in allowing the Department of Marine and Harbors to build two bridges for the O-Bahn busway at a greater cost to the taxpayer than if done by private contractors? Will he now require public tenders to be called for these bridges? I make the claim that the bridges would be built at a higher cost to the taxpayer, based on evidence that has now come to light on previous tenders submitted by the Department of Marine and Harbors for other bridgework on almost identical type bridges for the O-Bahn busway. In particular, I refer to the bridges for Lambert Road and Mara Street. There were 11 contractors for those two bridges, which are of the same design and principle as the bridges in Stephen Terrace. Of the 11 contractors, it turns out that the Department of Marine and Harbors was ninth on the list. The contractor who won the tender put in a price of \$1.2 million. The contractor after the Department of Marine and Harbors put in a tender of \$1.42 million.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member not to debate the issue.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I would not want to debate the issue—I am simply relating to the House figures for previous tenders. It would appear from the figures that the Department of Marine and Harbors price was \$200 000 or 16 per cent higher than the lowest tender. I also point out that, when calling tenders for the James Street bridge, which is also almost identical in design to the two bridges in Stephen Terrace, I find that the document labelled 'North-East busway project—Government of South Australia' (a large document featuring drawings) the panel arrangements are shown to allow for the reuse of formwork in bridges of the same kind on the busway. Apparently, as part of that tender process, it is indicated that almost 10 identical bridges would be built and the same formwork would be used on all 10 bridges. One contractor has spent approximately \$140 000 in building that formwork, expecting to be able to use it on a range of bridges—up to 10—and to write off the cost over 10 bridges if he was successful in winning the tender. He claims that he has now been excluded from putting in a tender on two bridges.

The third point I make is that private industry (and a number of people have been in touch with me this morning and late yesterday) is furious at being excluded from these tenders, having been given the clear impression by the Premier and the Minister of Transport that they would have access through the tender process to all bridgework on the O-Bahn busway. They asked what has happened to the so-called partnership this Government has with the private sector. Is this an indication of how this Government is going to deal with the private sector—that is, slap it in the face?

The SPEAKER: Order! The last remark is clearly out of order.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: It seems that the member for Davenport gets very upset that he is no longer in the Government and unable to make these decisions. He gets very annoyed about that type of thing. He is referring to the cost of two bridges that the Government intends to issue to the Department of Marine and Harbors to construct. I do not know from where he has obtained his figures. He is working them out from previous bridges that were built. I have not

even seen figures for the cost of the two bridges to which he is referring.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister's time has expired.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We are in a special situation, unlike the usual, where a certain time has been proposed.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE MARALINGA TJARUTJA LAND RIGHTS BILL

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Aboriginal Affairs): I move:

That the Select Committee on the Maralinga Tjarutja Land Rights Bill have leave to sit during the sittings of the House.

Motion carried.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

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

That one weeks leave of absence be granted to Messrs Becker and Ferguson and the Clerk of the House on account of absence on Commonwealth Parliamentary Association business.

Motion carried.

The SPEAKER: I inform the House that, during the Clerk's absence and under Standing Order No. 30, his duties will be performed by the Clerk Assistant (Mr D.A. Bridges) and that I have appointed Mr G.R. Wilson (Second Clerk Assistant) to carry out the duties of Clerk Assistant and Sergeant-at-Arms.

LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 26 October. Page 1381.)

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition supports the Bill before the House. As the Premier indicated in his second reading speech, it makes a minor change to the Land Tax Act to bring the definition of the metropolitan area into line with the new definition under the Planning Act, 1982. Presently the Land Tax Act refers to the old Planning and Development Act of 1966. Obviously, that has been superseded by the Planning Act, 1982.

The City of Adelaide is included within the definition, notwithstanding that the Planning Act, 1982, does not apply to that area. I am pleased that in this instance the amendment operates retrospectively from 30 June 1983, because it means there will be no effect on rates of land tax for the 1983-84 financial year. However, I am surprised that, in light of its current performance in relation to taxing measures, the Government has not tried to increase the rates of land tax. I presume, on looking at the Budget papers, that at least in this instance it is prepared to allow inflation to take care of itself for the purposes of receipts of this Government to this all-time high level.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Interpretation.'

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I make the point that the people of Gawler would not like to see this as the back-door method of allowing the Corporation of Gawler to become part of the Adelaide Metropolitan Development Area. There has been a clear distinction between the two over a long period. Gawler is part of the Outer Metropolitan Development Plan. Whilst I acknowledge that Gawler, for a number of purposes not the least of them land tax, on an

earlier occasion has had special consideration, that consideration which is now embodied in this particular clause is not to be taken as a *carte blanche* invitation for Gawler to become part of the Adelaide Metropolitan Area in all other respects. Its identity as part of the Outer Metropolitan Area is one which it wishes to retain. I see no particular move in this Bill to cause any upset but I would want it placed on record that any such action which went wider than this would be greatly resisted.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS DUTY BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 27 October. Page 1418.)

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): I oppose this measure. Financial institutions duty will place an additional financial burden on almost every South Australian. It will create confusion and concern within the business community. It will penalise charities and the disadvantaged. It will mean many individuals and firms are double taxed for the same transaction. It is an unwarranted tax which will stretch to every corner of our community.

Let me give some examples. The Roman Catholic Church in South Australia fears the tax will cost its operation between \$20 000 and \$30 000 a year. That money is not refundable. It is money that would otherwise have been spent on charitable work in this State. The Uniting Church believes the tax will cost it up to \$40 000 a year—again money which could have been used for charity work, money the Government is taking in the form of this new tax. Organisations like the Crippled Children's Association, Minda Home, the Anti-Cancer Appeal and the Adelaide Central Mission will all be denied vital working funds because of financial institutions duty. Even schoolchildren banking their pocket money will be caught up in this new tax. Those are brief examples to emphasise the lack of exemptions of this tax. I will go into greater detail on the impact across society of f.i.d. later in my speech. One of the most repugnant aspects of the Premier's decision to introduce f.i.d. is that he is doing so without a mandate from the people of South Australia.

I remind the House yet again of the promise made by the Premier (as Opposition Leader) before the last election. He said:

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

I quoted the current incumbent of the Premier's position—

Mr Mathwin: He probably thought he was only going to be in for 12 months.

Mr OLSEN: Perhaps that might be the case. The introduction of f.i.d. is a sad reflection on the integrity and credibility of the Premier and his Government. Within 12 months of making that pledge the Premier has introduced the first new tax-raising measure placed before this Parliament since 1974 when the Dunstan Labor Government imposed savage new taxes on petrol and tobacco products. Those taxes have become an integral part of the State's taxation system and—despite the Premier's pre-election promise—both were increased in September in the State Budget.

How the Premier can face members of his own Party, even his own sub-branch, after imposing such massive tax and charge increases on the people of South Australia, rests with his own conscience. No Government in the history of this State has ever ridden to power on such a policy of deception. There is no other word to describe the actions

of the Premier prior to the last election and his actions subsequent to that—actions of deception.

The responsibility for what can only be described as treacherous acts of deception lies firmly at the feet of the Premier himself. The Premier, as Treasurer, has squeezed the taxation lemon in this State harder than any other Premier in this State's history. That is an undeniable fact. In constant dollar terms State taxation collections in the current financial year are likely to be the highest for a decade. The *News* of 1 November said:

If the State Government has a hand in it, John Bannon has put up the price of it.

That is exactly what he has done. That statement is as true as the Premier's promise on taxes was false. It is regrettable that this measure should be debated at this time, when the public is still reacting angrily to the second increase in electricity charges since this Government came to power in less than 10 months. In the past year the Premier has demonstrated a total lack of economic understanding. He applies one answer to all economic difficulties—raise taxes and charges. I can understand his response. Obviously, his office has been getting the same reaction as my office in the last week to the recent rises. The electricity and power rise was the straw that broke the camel's back in the community. Well he knows it. The reaction out there is quite savage. No wonder the back bench was rather muted today when the question was asked in relation to taxation levels and power price rises.

Their electorate offices are getting it. That is why they have sent out a little memo to their electorate secretaries—be prepared for these power increases. This is what you can say to your constituents when they come in. Of course, a small dot point down the bottom of that related to the impost of the debt servicing charge increases to the Electricity Trust of South Australia. They obviously expected some backlash so they prepared their electorate offices for it. Well they should with the response they have had.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Who sent it out?

Mr OLSEN: It is not sourced. They have had so much difficulty with documents they have circularised. They do not put a heading on it any more.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: They didn't send it out to all electorates.

Mr OLSEN: No, they did not. They did not offer it to all electorates because they thought, obviously and quite rightly so, that when people were going to have these extra imposts put on they would go to the back-benchers of the Government, to where the decisions were made to put the extra imposts on South Australians.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: They are that busy they are not here now.

Mr OLSEN: I presume they are far too embarrassed to hear the reality of the situation that applies in the electorate. I can understand why the member for Brighton is here. She is a oncer in this Parliament, and will have perhaps three years if Parliament sees that three years out, but she will not see service beyond that time.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: A future Minister is on the back bench.

Mr OLSEN: Yes, a future Minister is there. At least he will check on the Ministerial reshuffle. I was interested to hear that the Premier thought it was a superb Ministry; they were acting so well and confidently. I can assure him that he is the only one in South Australia who thinks that at the moment. It poses the question why they have been undertaking such a significant survey in the electorate as to the performances of individual Ministers. Obviously, they are worried about the performance of some individual Ministers, and so they should be.

In more affluent economic times Labor Governments have been able to adopt a policy of automatically raising

taxes to meet the expenditure column without attracting undue public attention and criticism, but those days are gone. The Premier is now operating in a period of economic hardship, with more than 10 per cent of the population out of work, interest rates are high and the loss of overtime and other over-award payments has reduced spending power. The majority of South Australians are still affected by a wages pause which means that many workers have not received a pay rise for more than 12 months. While private industry is holding down its cost increases to below the level of inflation, increases in Federal and State Government taxes and charges are now running at an annual rate of nearly 20 per cent. The result is that the rise in State Government taxes and charges in the past 12 months has increased the cost of living to the average family of five by \$14.70 a week, or more than \$764 a year. I remind the House again that those increases have been imposed by a Premier who promised the people of South Australia that he would not increase existing taxes or impose new ones.

Mr Ashenden: When did he say that?

Mr OLSEN: Repeatedly, and he made one or two comments this year to which I will refer a little later. Those promises were made by a Premier who promised that State taxes would not be used as a form of back-door taxation. What absolute hypocrisy and deception on the people of South Australia. Another new tax is not justified in South Australia. Careful planning and prudent economic management by the current Government could avoid the need for any new taxing measure and shield the public from this extra and unnecessary financial imposition.

I give notice now that the Liberal Party intends to oppose this measure at every stage while it is before this House. If the Government defies reason and logic and uses its numbers to insist on the new tax, I will be moving a series of amendments in the Committee stage aimed at minimising the burden of this insidious measure. It is hard to believe that the Premier himself is convinced of the wisdom of f.i.d. The Premier ought to listen to this because it is pertinent and the words are his: on 30 September last year, just over a month before the State election, in challenging the previous Premier on f.i.d., the Premier said:

Political Parties should not be allowed to get away with imposing new, unannounced taxes straight after an election. Labor believes it would be wrong to introduce new taxes or abolish existing revenue sources until a thorough and wide-ranging inquiry has been conducted into the way the State raises its funds.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: At least we have stirred the Premier. We must have hit a raw nerve somewhere. If the Premier dare once get up in this debate and suggest that the Liberal Party has no right to oppose this measure, before he does so I suggest that he reads those words, the words he said prior to the last State election. They contain no ambiguity, no hidden meaning and no fudging. They are words which again highlight the lack of integrity and credibility of this Premier and this Government. In response to a written request from a financial institution relating to the possible introduction of f.i.d. by a future Labor Government, the Premier (as Leader of the Opposition) in his reply dated 14 October 1982 said:

The policy of the Opposition in South Australia is to initiate a comprehensive and public inquiry into the State's \$500 million taxation system.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: That will be done.

Mr OLSEN: Good. The Premier's reply of 14 October 1982 continued:

The inquiry would, among other things, examine the equity and efficiency of the taxation system. In the Opposition's view, it would not be appropriate to change the rate of, or to abolish any existing State tax or substitute new taxes until the inquiry has been conducted—

the words of the Premier—

and its recommendations made the subject of policy for the election after this.

They are not my words, they are the words of the Premier.

Mr Ashenden: When did he say that?

Mr OLSEN: That was a comment made on 14 October 1982. If the Premier really wanted to tackle that base, I tabled Treasury documents in this Parliament but to date the Premier has not commented on them, he has not challenged them either in this Parliament or publicly and the reason he has not challenged them is because he knows that he cannot because they are based on Treasury documents supplied legitimately to us as the Government of the day weeks before the election. So he should not carry on with this nonsense about the Treasury's position when his Government came into office because he knows that it is nonsense. The reason the economy is in its present state is that the Government has incompetent Ministers who were allowed to overspend during the first few months of Government to the extent of \$23.3 million. If the Premier had a leg to stand on he would have challenged that statement of mine in this House and he would have challenged it publicly but he ran away from it because he has no basis on which to argue it.

We now have a financial institution duty proposed, yet we still await the promised inquiry into the State's taxation base. I understand it will be announced in a day or two. I also understand that the Premier has three people ready to serve on it and it would be appropriate for him to make an announcement on that. Let us take some further comments from the Premier because they are rather pertinent. On 8 March, after he knew all about the Treasury position, he cried wolf. He said:

I am not attracted to a financial institutions tax. We must find a means of raising money which will have the least economic impact on the State.

That was on 8 March. If that was a slip of the tongue, let us go now to 15 April, when he said:

I am not attracted to that (f.i.d.). In terms of our State economy the yield of such a tax would probably not justify the problems in instituting it. And in any case, evidence suggests that there may be some benefit for us, certainly in the short term, not to have such a duty in South Australia.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: He must have a short memory.

Mr OLSEN: Indeed, he has a short memory. He has gone quiet all of a sudden because the basis of his remarks on this issue is no longer valid because we have two comments he made this year.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: I know the Premier does not like the truth coming home to him, because it must hurt. At a business Labor luncheon on 2 May this year, in response to a question the Premier indicated:

That financial institutions would be invited to submit opinions and evidence in relation to f.i.d. to the promised inquiry into State taxation, and that his (the Premier's) personal preference was to avoid the introduction of such a tax in South Australia.

On 8 March, 15 April and 2 May, the Premier said consistently that there would be no f.i.d. in South Australia. How the Premier can now rise in this House and introduce the very tax he agreed would be beneficial to avoid is again something between himself and his conscience. In assessing the Bill before the Parliament we must ask whether it is necessary. It is only necessary because this Government requires additional revenue to pay for its—

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: Inefficiency.

Mr OLSEN: Yes, lavish election promises and recoup some of the funds squandered because of overspending as a result of lack of financial control by incompetent Ministers. This year State taxation is estimated to rise by more than 14 per cent, the largest increase since 1976, and almost twice the inflation rate projected by the Federal Treasurer. The Bill before us today is another broken promise. This

Government, which said it would not increase taxes or charges, has introduced the Financial Institutions Duty Bill, which will tax every South Australian, not just every wage-earner, but every man, woman and child. Everyone, including religious, charitable, sporting, and school committees and other non-profit organisations will be affected by the ramifications of this Bill.

I now turn to the detail of the Bill before the House. On 4 August this year, when the Premier, in an unprecedented pre-Budget announcement, revealed four increased revenue raising measures plus f.i.d., I called on the Government to outline immediately a range of existing stamp duties to be abolished. The Government has acceded to some of our initiatives in the removal of stamp duties on credit and instalment transactions, a duty which has disadvantaged those in the community who, because of their financial situation, must borrow at higher rates of interest.

The Government has also abolished stamp duties on the issue and discounting of bills of exchange and promissory notes, thereby enabling this State once again to enjoy the competitive neutrality that previously existed prior to removal of this duty in Victoria and New South Wales. Removal of stamp duties on transfer of mortgages and mortgage backed securities can only improve access to housing finance in terms of the Government's initiatives in this area. But, as I will outline shortly, those exemptions are nowhere near good enough if this Bill is passed and the f.i.d. is imposed.

The Government has decided that the new duty will apply at a rate of 0.04 per cent (or 4c per \$100). This compares with a rate of 0.03 per cent (or 3c per \$100) as currently operating in Victoria and New South Wales, a rate one-third greater than that applicable to our Eastern State counterparts. It is now more than three months since I predicted that the rate of f.i.d. imposed in South Australia would be 0.04 per cent. Yet only three weeks before the measure is due to come into operation the Premier has finally confirmed that prediction. In the meantime the business community has been left in a state of confusion, trying to work out future financial projections without the key financial ingredient—the f.i.d. rate. The reason, of course, is quite obvious. The Premier held off until the last minute in the hope that New South Wales and Victoria would put their rates up to 0.04 per cent and save the Premier the embarrassment of being a tax pacesetter—a title to which he is surely entitled!

This procrastination was just another example of the Premier's weakness in making firm decisions. In his policy speech the Premier (as Leader of the Opposition) said:

The financial sector offers us one of our best opportunities for the creation of new jobs in service and high technology industries. There are many good reasons why major financial institutions would want to set up in South Australia. I believe that, given the right incentives, we can attract these companies here. Our strategy would be to see the establishment in Adelaide of the head office of a major Australian financial institution before the end of our first term.

Inevitably this will be another broken promise.

Mr Meier: He wants to help migration to Queensland!

Mr OLSEN: Indeed. The planned financial institutions duty rate of 0.04 per cent, or 33⅓ per cent greater than both New South Wales and Victoria, is clearly a disincentive for any financial institution or any other business to relocate in South Australia. Before the most recent election the Premier said he wanted South Australia to win. I assume that he was talking about economic matters and not sporting events when he made that statement. If the Premier had resisted the introduction of this tax—and there is still time for him to withdraw from that position—then South Australia would have been in a position to win. We need to do everything possible to protect South Australia's competitive position.

The financial institution duty will act as a deterrent to financial activity in this State. Businesses with extensive

financial transactions can and will open offices in Queensland and do their banking in Queensland. Companies in New South Wales and Victoria have already adopted this practice. It will happen here. Instead, South Australia could have joined Queensland as a financial centre attracting business from the other States saddled with this tax. I remind you again, Sir, of the Premier's own words:

... evidence suggests that there may be some benefit for us, certainly in the short term, not to have such a duty.

If the Government proceeds with this measure it will be simply another opportunity lost by a Government which has specialised in lost opportunities. If the Government insists on the Bill, and if the Premier genuinely wants South Australia to win, he should reduce the financial institutions rate of duty to 0.03 per cent. Certainly the Liberal Party will be moving an amendment to that effect during the Committee stage.

During the Budget debate I revealed how the continuation of a Liberal Government would have avoided the recent tax increases, including f.i.d. Under a Liberal Government, South Australians would have been paying \$41.6 million less in State taxes this financial year. We would have kept departmental spending within stricter limits than those proposed by this Government. Our spending policies would have reflected current needs in education, health, community welfare, on other priorities in areas of important community services, through seeking savings and greater efficiency in other departments. That is making the hard options on priorities that Governments are elected to do. Before the Premier rolls out the tired old argument about education cuts, let me remind the House that this Government of deception, the Party that pledged a better deal in education, cut the total Budget allocation to education from 29 per cent to 28 per cent, and the Budget for school construction and maintenance by a massive 17.5 per cent.

The figures given by the Premier as his estimate of the revenue to be raised by this Bill are part of the continuing deception. The Government will raise \$22 million gross before some duties are abolished. But, according to the Premier, the tax will cost an average family between \$7 and \$10 a year. This means that up to \$4.3 million will be raised from householders in South Australia. Most financial institutions will not absorb the remaining \$12 million to \$15 million of the tax, and it will be passed on to their clientele. It is therefore a nonsense to say that f.i.d. will cost families only \$4.3 million or \$7 a year. Financial institutions duty, after allowing for stamp duties that the Government plans to abolish, when passed on by one means or another, will cost each household in South Australia at least \$32 a year. The only way to dispute that figure is to assume that all financial institutions and other organisations will absorb the duty—and that is an absurd assumption.

Mr Meier: It would never happen.

Mr OLSEN: Of course it will not happen. This tax inevitably will lead to an increase in the price of a wide range of goods and services. But f.i.d. cannot be assessed without looking at this tax in the context of other taxation measures imposed by this Government. In the past 12 months the Treasurer has increased four separate State taxes and introduced two new ones. We have seen rises in taxes on petrol, tobacco products, alcohol, and insurance premiums, with consequent rises in their costs to the consumer. The levy on the S.A. Gas Company has been reimposed after being abolished by the former Liberal Government. And now f.i.d.! In addition, a massive range of State charges, including water, sewerage, electricity, public transport fares, and hospital bed fees has been increased.

Let me again remind the House of the Premier's promise on these matters made before the last election. On taxes, he said:

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

And on charges he said:

... we will not allow State charges—like transport fares, electricity and hospital charges—to be used as a form of back-door taxation.

Here it undertakes to increase the debt servicing charges to ETSA and those fees rise, with a corresponding increase in revenue to this Government—back-door taxation the like of which we have never seen previously!

Mr Baker: How much extra will he get out of this recent rise of 12 per cent?

Mr OLSEN: Millions; he will pick up about \$2.7 million. That is the net effect to revenue. Talk about crocodile tears! He is the one crying crocodile tears, increasing fees to the public whilst reaping the benefits. Those broken promises to which I have referred will cost the average South Australian family of five under this Government \$14.70 a week extra. Therefore f.i.d. cannot be looked at in isolation. It must be assessed in the light of the Government's original promise and the overall burden now being placed on every taxpayer in this State. The only possible credible aspect of this tax, compared with others applied by State Governments, is that it is broadly based. But that is no justification for breaking a specific, clear, unequivocal election promise.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: That means it hits everybody.

Mr OLSEN: Indeed, it hits everybody, including charities, non-profit sporting groups, and school kids banking their pocket money who all get caught up in this net; and I repeat: the tax would be unnecessary if the Government had adopted different and more responsible economic strategies. The former Government proved in its track record that it could be done. In fact, under the former Government taxation levels in this State fell to the lowest of any State in Australia—and well the Premier smiles; he knows that it is an undeniable fact that the track record of the former Liberal Government achieved it on the board. In 1981-82, the tax levels fell by 5.2 per cent (quite a significant achievement), and under this Government we have a rise in the first year of 14 per cent.

The Government is using f.i.d. not as a broad-based tax to replace existing less desirable taxes, but purely as a measure to raise significantly more revenue to feed its demand for more money and its appetite for increasing revenue. The Bannon Government is requiring others to collect f.i.d. for it. The costs of being an honorary collector of financial institutions duty for the Bannon Government eventually will come out in additional charges for the range of services offered by those organisations. My inquiries reveal that some financial institutions in South Australia will incur costs of more than \$50 000 in modifying their computer programmes alone to collect f.i.d. The impact on individuals cannot be under-estimated. Indeed, one financial institution is writing to the Premier (if it has not already done so) to indicate that, because of this tax starting on 1 December rather than 1 February, the cost to that institution will be between \$120 000 and \$150 000 during that period in fees that it is unable to recoup, and asking the Premier to take some action to offset the impost on that financial institution—a South Australian financial institution, what is more.

Each time a person deposits money with a bank, building society, credit union, or other financial institution for the credit of any type of account (and in terms of this legislation, even school children carrying out their banking with the Savings Bank of South Australia) he or she will be liable for the tax. Not even the pocket money of our children has been spared in this tax raising measure. Those people who, by arrangement with an employer, have their wages credited direct to a bank account and then transfer funds for payment of other accounts, such as an investment account, Bankcard,

repayment or personal loan repayment will be subject to multiple duty. Duty will be payable on the initial lodgment, then on subsequent transfers on an increasing basis.

As I have already pointed out, there is no doubt that the Premier delayed the introduction of this measure so that he would not attract the further political odium of breaking new ground for the rate of this tax. However, in attempting to deflect some criticism, he has caused significant inconvenience to the financial institutions in South Australia which will have to charge this tax. Indeed, this has been a common concern expressed by the financial institutions. While the legislation is complex, New South Wales and Victoria have set the precedent, so it should not have been difficult for the Premier to draw up the legislation once the decision to proceed with it had been taken. Early decisions would have allowed the financial institutions to write computer programmes and to make all the other necessary administrative arrangements.

In a statement on 12 October, I pointed out some of the difficulties the Premier's dithering and delay will pose. I have already referred to one South Australian based bank that will have a significant impost placed on it because of the way that this Government has gone about the introduction of this tax measure. In that statement, I also recalled the recent history of the introduction of this measure in Victoria and New South Wales, where there was widespread confusion and worry, particularly among small depositors and investors in banks, credit unions and building societies. I therefore called on the Government to defer introduction of the tax for at least two months to 1 February 1984.

In the *Advertiser* on 13 October, an adviser to the Premier was quoted as saying that plans to impose the tax by 1 December were on schedule. The report continued:

He said financial institutions had mentioned some problems during talks with the Premier's Department and the Department had attempted to rectify these.

The Bill now introduced by the Premier concedes that in fact these problems have not been rectified and admits to the validity of my call for a deferral. However, the Premier has only gone a part of the way by allowing the duty to be paid on an estimated basis for the first three months. It appears that the Premier cannot wait to get his hands on the money of the unemployed, pensioners, charities and other hard pressed individuals and organisations in the community who will have to pay this tax. It is very well for the Premier and his advisers to laugh. In fact, that is the position: they will be paying the tax the same as every other individual. He has done little to explain how the tax will work, who will be affected and who can seek exemptions.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: He hasn't been told.

Mr OLSEN: Perhaps he has not been told. He has not recognised in any meaningful way the difficulties it will cause to financial institutions. I will be interested to see the Premier's response to financial institutions when they point out the actual cost this year because of his dithering and the short amount of time given for that bank to implement its programme to collect his tax. The provision to allow the tax to be paid on an estimated basis for three months is a token gesture, and nothing more. The explanation of this legislation by the Premier only gives greater force to my proposal for a deferral of its introduction until 1 February, and I will so move in Committee.

The Premier has gone to some length in his attempts to suggest that this tax will have very little impact, and that taxpayers need not be too concerned about it. In the *Advertiser* on 28 October, he even described it as 'a very good tax'. Yet seven months earlier, on 15 April, the Premier said:

I am not attracted to that (f.i.d.). In terms of our State economy the yield of such tax would probably not justify the problems in

instituting it. And in any case, evidence suggests that there may be some benefit for us, certainly in the short term, not to have such a duty.

Mr Mathwin: Who said that?

Mr OLSEN: The Premier, only a few months ago. He seems to have quite a significant lapse of memory, like his Deputy.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Perhaps he was misquoted.

Mr OLSEN: He could not be misquoted time after time. We have got down to the basis of not believing anything he says at any stage in the future, because his word is not worth anything. Indeed, the Premier does not seem capable of thinking in terms of anything less than hundreds of millions. Lower amounts just float past his eyes without comprehension. An example occurred on the last day this House sat—27 October. The Premier began that morning with a speech to a conference on superannuation during which he referred to financial arrangements for the railway station redevelopment. He referred to specific figures, saying that the Kumagai Company would lend an amount of \$48.5 million for the project.

Let us remember that figure of \$48.5 million, because it was repeated in a press release by the Premier that morning, and in a Ministerial statement to this House and a question from me early in the afternoon. I asked the Premier a question because, on the face of it, there was a rather significant discrepancy of more than \$10 million between the figure the Premier was then quoting and the figure of \$60 million widely quoted following the signing of the agreement in Tokyo for Kumagai's involvement. In his reply to my question, the Premier obviously was not aware of the detail of these financial arrangements. He was not able to give a reason for the discrepancy. While later in Question Time, the Premier had to confess that his error was due to a typographical mistake, it had not been picked up by him in a speech, a press release, a Ministerial statement and my first question to him in the Parliament. Just a mere 10 million bucks! With the Premier clearly unable to grasp the detail of financial arrangements involving tens of millions of dollars, it is of little surprise that he has treated the financial impost of this measure in such a cavalier and contemptuous manner.

For the enlightenment of the Premier, and so that he does become aware of what he is now perpetrating on the public of South Australia, let me give him some examples, because there are many people and organisations in our community who are forced constantly to count their cents and dollars, so that they can spread them as far as possible. This applies more particularly following a period under a wage pause. Let us take the position of sporting clubs. They seek to raise funds to provide new facilities or improve existing ones, so that people can participate in recreation in a beneficial manner.

Under this Bill, tax will have to be paid on these funds because sporting clubs are not exempt. The Premier therefore is putting a tax on leisure and recreation. Other organisations with similar motives include community groups which seek to raise funds to provide other important facilities for children, the elderly, and so on. They will be caught in the Premier's tax net as well. Worse, the Premier is also putting a further tax on the work of churches and other organisations seeking to raise funds to help the poor, the disabled, the down and out in our community.

The f.i.d. will cost the Uniting Church up to \$40 000 a year, quite apart from its impact on other charitable branches of the church such as missions, hospitals and education bodies. The Adelaide Central Mission is one of those bodies which will be hard hit. Based on the mission's income for 1982-83, it will be liable to pay \$6 000, or \$500 a month, because of this tax.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: That is on top of the \$40 000 for the Uniting Church?

Mr OLSEN: Indeed it is. A submission from the mission states, in part:

Obviously, we would much prefer to be exempted from the payment of such tax as the former process (temporary retention of duty paid) could delay application of the funds to the purpose for which they were given for a period of up to 12 months, increase administration costs, which is a sensitive area to all voluntary care agencies, and deny any income earning potential on funds paid over the Government. An individual \$6 000 donation is a significant contribution to any voluntary care agency and is extremely rare.

That is the opinion of the mission, and yet the Premier intends to take away those funds from the Adelaide Central Mission. I remind the House that the mission is responsible for assisting, in a direct way, some of the most unfortunate and disadvantaged people with the provision of assistance to unemployed youth, homeless men and women, alcoholics, Lifeline, and so on; even the soup kitchens. The drain on the Roman Catholic Church will also be significant. Let me quote some points from a submission by Father K.T. McLennan, Chancellor of the Catholic Church Office, Adelaide:

Our church is decentralised and has a history of opening a separate bank account for each separate work or income. The question would be: 'Does the Catholic Church pay only \$20 per year or does it pay \$20 on each bank account?'

The answer to that question is quite clear. The church will be liable for \$20 on each account, which, in the case of the Catholic Church, will make it liable for anything between \$20 000 and \$30 000 a year in financial institutions duty. That is not my estimate; that is Father McLennan's estimate. His submission also raised some serious concerns about administration of the tax. 'How is the tax to be reimbursed?' he asks. He goes on to explain some of the administrative difficulties the church will face, and again I quote:

Because of the proliferation of bank accounts, the church could be involved in a costly exercise to keep records of the tax and application for reimbursement. Our church has a large volume of money passing through our financial accounts. Grants are received from Commonwealth and State Governments. Appeals conducted at local level are forwarded to the State office and hence to the national office. Local donations and collections are forwarded to the central office for investment. Consequently, the same money can pass in and out of our accounts three and four times before ultimately being expended. Our cash flow position is so critical at the moment that we would be financially embarrassed to wait 12 months to recoup our \$24 000.

The last figure related to the amount of this tax, temporarily held by the Government, which would be refundable at the end of each 12 months for accounts on which more than \$20 had been levied. It is obvious that the Premier has not considered circumstances such as these in drawing up the Bill. In the case of the Catholic Church, as well as its being liable for financial institutions duty of up to \$30 000, the Government will retain amounts of church moneys over a period of 12 months building up progressively to an estimated \$24 000. While the \$24 000 will be refundable, that is of little consolation to the church, which could put it to beneficial community use in the meantime, instead of it resting in the Premier's coffers interest free for up to 12 months.

Other denominations are in a similarly difficult position. This imposition on churches, charities, sporting bodies and other non-profit benevolent organisations is intolerable and should be resisted by this Parliament. To put it as simply and starkly as possible, the Premier is taking money from the sick, the unemployed, the disabled and the handicapped—those people in the community who really do need support. For example, the Premier will deprive Minda Home of an estimated \$4 400 during a full year. While much of that is refundable, it is money in the Premier's hands rather than the hands of the home. That means the home is denied

access to capital for its vital work. He is also putting a tax on the Good Friday, Telethon and Christmas appeals which our television stations run as a community service. He is putting extra burdens on homes for the aged, and organisations such as Red Cross and the Anti-cancer Appeal. He is putting an additional impost on organisations which seek to provide opportunities for sport, recreation and community activities, at no profit to themselves. Accordingly, during the Committee stage, I will move an amendment to exclude from any liability under this tax religious, charitable, educational and non-profit benevolent and sporting groups.

Another aspect of this tax which should be of serious concern to this House relates to the extent to which it will encourage more widespread payment of wages and salaries in cash. This will occur in particular because of the potential for multiple application of the tax. For example, people who, by arrangement with their employer, have their wages credited directly to a bank account so that they can transfer out of that one account to other accounts, such as bankcard, an investment account, or for repayment of a personal loan, will be liable to this tax on every such transfer. The duty will be payable on the initial lodgement and then on each subsequent transfer on an *ad valorem* basis.

This opportunity for multiple taxing of direct pay-roll crediting will lead either to employees requesting salary payments in cash, a number of separate pay-roll lodgements, or payment by negotiable cheque. Payments in cash will increase security risks to the employer and the employee. Preparation of multiple pay-roll credits will increase the administrative costs of the employer and the financial institution and, unless stamp duty on cheque forms is abolished, payment by negotiable cheque will be relatively expensive, when bank account keeping fees are also considered.

Already, significant concern has been expressed by some employee organisations. The agenda for this year's annual conference of the Public Service Association (something with which the Premier would have close contact) includes a number of items relating to the impact of this tax. The first proposed resolution is:

That fortnightly paid public servants be able to request that their salary or wages be paid in cash or the requisite amount of the levy be included by the Government in the payment of salary or wages made by a cheque or deposit.

The second resolution is as follows:

That the Public Service Association support members to be paid in cash, on request when a financial institution duty is levied. Further, that a campaign be undertaken to remove these charges at a level which affects workers' wages and that the P.S.A. also protests at its introduction at a time of rises in costs and reduced wages and salaries.

The third resolution is:

That in view of the additional impact of the f.i.d. tax, this conference calls upon the State Government to give its employees the choice of payment by cash or negotiable cheque.

Undoubtedly, similar requests will give impetus to the cash economy, because duty is not applied on cash transactions. Other potential for multiple taxing exists when a depositor of a financial institution changes his address or place of business or employment. Where this involves the transfer of an account to another location, the duty will be incurred on any balance transferred. The question of payment of wages and salaries also concerns operators of cash collection and pay-roll service organisations. As part of their cash collection services, these organisations pay to a client a company cheque equal to the amount of cash taken at each collection.

Under this legislation, the client (often a small business such as a supermarket, a service station or a take-away food outlet) will be levied financial institutions duty on banking of the cheque, and the cash collection service will pay the

same amount of f.i.d. when banking the cash on its own account.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: That is double dipping.

Mr OLSEN: Indeed, it is double dipping—it is double taxing, but the way the Premier is going in this place it is hardly surprising. At least the public is beginning to understand the situation. In the case of pay-roll services, pursuant to an agreement with the client and the client's bank, the pay-roll service draws cash on behalf of its client, prepares pay-rolls and delivers them to the client in exchange for a cheque to the value of the pay-roll. When banked to the account of the pay-roll service, the cheque will attract financial institutions duty. However, the tax could be avoided if the client cashed his own cheque with his banker.

As a result of these and other similar services, millions of dollars a week are passed through accounts held by financial institutions. In no case, however, are these funds generating profit for the owner of the funds. They are being held or moved only to ensure security, to save administrative costs and for convenience. The Government should not be able to take advantage of what amounts to prudent arrangements for managing and moving funds.

I understand that the activities of two such security services alone will generate financial institutions duty of about \$700 000 in a full year. Because of the highly competitive nature of the industry, margins are slim and the security companies will have no alternative but to pass on the tax to clients. This will mean one of two things: there will be less use of these security services (and I do not need to elaborate to members on the security implications of that); or users of the services will have to increase costs. In simple terms, it will mean yet another tax on the PAYE taxpayer, who is already the victim of an unreasonable burden under this Government. The consumer will pay the costs which will be passed on—there is no doubt about that.

To cover the anomalies in this Bill which I have highlighted in relation to transfers between accounts and multiple taxing on funds handled by security services, I will move amendments in Committee to make transfers between accounts non-dutiable, and to allow pay-roll companies to operate exempt accounts. The question of multiple taxing also arises in relation to trust accounts held by land and business agents and legal practitioners. The Land and Business Agents Act requires agents and brokers to pay all moneys they receive in a professional capacity into a designated trust account. The Legal Practitioners Act imposes a similar obligation on solicitors.

In the case of land brokers, financial institutions duty will be levied at three stages: first, when the buyer's funds are paid into his broker's trust account; secondly, when those funds are transferred to the selling broker's trust account; and, thirdly, when the selling broker pays the vendor. In the case of a property sold for \$60 000, the State Government receives \$1 700 through stamp duty on the memorandum of transfer, plus other duties and charges to be paid out by the land broker on the purchaser's behalf. On top of this, financial institutions duty will now have to be paid not once but three times on the same transaction. In effect, it will amount to a tax on a tax on a tax.

Legal practitioners will be liable for this new tax not only on conveyancing transactions but also on other moneys held in trust on behalf of their clients. Often, these latter amounts can be quite considerable. In other words, this Bill has an inbuilt multiplier effect on business transactions of a conveyancing and legal nature.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Who will be the eventual losers?

Mr OLSEN: The eventual losers will be the people who are trying to buy a house, as the cost will be passed on to them. It will be the little people who will be hurt by legislation of this nature—by imposts to the extent of \$14.70 a week

brought in by this Government in its first 12 months. Also, this measure will increase the cost of houses. It will increase the cost of legal aid. These are just two more of its objectionable effects, and the Opposition opposes them and will be moving amendments in Committee.

The duty can be avoided by by passing the trust account—that is undesirable from an audit and security point of view and with legal practitioners is likely to have an adverse impact on funds available for legal aid. In Committee, I will move amendments to allow land agents, land brokers and solicitors who by Statute must operate trust accounts to have those accounts exempt from this duty.

It has been drawn to my attention by representatives of the pastoral finance industry that some aspects of the proposed legislation will have more onerous repercussions for them than in the case of their counterparts in New South Wales and Victoria. The provisions of clause 31 (5) of the Bill are presently too narrow to achieve the purpose for which special accounts for pastoral finance companies were created. An amendment will also be moved in Committee to rectify this anomaly.

I have already dealt with the extent to which this legislation will jeopardise South Australia's competitive position with the Eastern States in relation to the rate of duty. The Premier has said previously that pay-roll tax is a disincentive to industry and that f.i.d. is a new and unnecessary taxation burden. Members should also be aware that in Victoria stamp duty on cheque forms was abolished when f.i.d. was introduced in that State, yet the Premier does not propose a similar move in South Australia. I believe that he must do so, and consequently I give notice that we will be seeking to move in that direction also.

If the Government fails to reduce the rate of this new tax and to abolish stamp duty on cheque forms, it is inevitable that the financial operations of South Australian offices of Victorian-based companies will be relocated. We need not only to match our neighbouring State but to be more competitive.

For the benefit of members, I now summarise the Opposition's attitude to this measure. We will oppose it at the second reading stage because the Government has no mandate for a new tax with substantial net gains in revenue. If that is unsuccessful, we will move amendments to the Bill which will have the effect of minimising the impact of this measure on all South Australians and seek to maintain our competitive position with other States. In particular, I will move: that there be exempt accounts for all charitable organisations, sporting clubs and other non-profit-making organisations, land brokers, land agents' and legal practitioners' trust accounts, and pay-roll/cash collection agencies; that transfers between accounts by the same persons by the same financial institutions be non-dutiable; that the provisions for conduct of special accounts by pastoral finance companies be widened; and, that the Act does not come into operation until 1 February 1984.

I also give notice that, consequent on the Bill passing in such an amended form, I will move during debate on the Stamp Duties Act Amendment Bill to abolish duty on cheque forms. I will move a number of amendments to this Bill and, as they are detailed on some eight pages, I will circulate them to members as soon as available.

In closing the debate, I quote to the House from last Thursday's *Advertiser*, how the Jones family is now faring under this Premier, who has no regard for his election promises and a reckless disregard for the present economic circumstances of many South Australians. The *Advertiser* stated:

Against all odds, the embattled Jones family has survived for one more quarter. This is despite the combined efforts of Federal and State Governments to point the way to the soup kitchen. But

the plan to add 12 per cent to the electricity bill immediately and the introduction of the financial institutions duty next month might well prove the final straw.

Indeed, it will prove the final straw to the credibility of this Government and, more particularly, of the Premier who heads it. I have no doubt that one of the main issues over the period leading up to the next election will be the tax issue. What people will judge it on is not political rhetoric but actual performance—the performance of a Liberal Government in reducing the tax level, the impost on South Australians, to the lowest of any State in Australia and in the last year by 5.2 per cent compared to the increase of 14 per cent in the first year under a Bannon Labor Government.

There is a discernible difference between the Liberal Party and the Labor Party. There is a basic difference and that is what we will be highlighting to the people of South Australia, not that we need to do so because the people of South Australia are recognising that as these imposts, accounts and taxes are flowing through and taking more out of their weekly pay packet.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: They recognise it by the weightlessness in their hip pocket.

Mr OLSEN: Indeed they do. This has obviously struck a raw nerve: the Premier cannot take it any more and has left the Chamber.

Mrs Appleby interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: It is all right for the member for Brighton: she may as well enjoy it while she is here, because she will not be here after the next election, with the imposts this Government is inflicting on people. No doubt she is getting some reaction in her electorate as a result of increased power bills. I hope that she can use that short memo distributed by the Premier, attempting to answer his deception in relation to his tax measures. His scruples are so few that, when it comes to seizing the average family's hard-earned dollar, he is even prepared to take advantage of the computer to bring in a tax like this. For that reason, the Liberal Party opposes the Bill.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Where are all the Labor Party members? We had a couple of aspirants to the Ministry here for the most part of the Leader's speech. The rest were too ashamed to front up to this debate. They are hiding their heads in shame, and so they ought to. They are showing no interest at all in this debate. The reason they are not in the House, of course, is that they are feeling so awkward about the dishonesty of the Government and the problems it has caused for them. They are not prepared to come here. This Bill is a major piece of legislation. It contains 80 clauses, with a special index and a schedule. Although it is a major piece of legislation we find the Labor Party showing no public interest in this matter at all, because we know that its members are completely ashamed of it. They are hiding, and so they should. They are skulking in dark corners hoping they will not be seen. They do not want to be associated with this measure.

The first point I want to make is that the Labor Party is a high tax Party. One cannot get away from that basic fact. Throughout history all of its programmes point to the undeniable fact that it is a high tax Party. It is only in recent years that its members have sought to hide that fact. They are changing their tactics, in this State, in Victoria and in the Federal scene. The Labor Party has sought to deceive the public, to put it bluntly, to lie its way into Government by denying the fact that it is a high tax Party.

How on earth can one fund an expansionary programme to put more people on the public pay-roll, to spend more of the public's money, to redistribute more of the public's money in various schemes dear to their hearts without

raising taxes and charges? We pointed out in Opposition that the equation would not balance, but the Government has changed its tack.

Let us look back at the history of the 1970s when Government members sang a different song. Premier Dunstan used to say, 'We will tax the tall poppies.' If we heard that once we heard it *ad nauseam*. What did they do? They put a tax on electricity which is contributing very markedly to the high level of electricity tariffs in South Australia at the moment. That raised \$25 million. That was a Labor Party initiative: 3 per cent initially increased to 5 per cent, and they have kept it on.

They put a tax on gas. They increased water rates markedly, and they say they are taxing the tall poppies. At least they did not deny the fact that they were a high tax Party. They increased succession duties markedly. One of the first things I recall on coming into this House was a whole range of increases in succession duties, lumping assets together, etc. They said they would soak the wealthy. They succeeded in putting a lot of farmers out of business, or at least ensured that their sons could not carry on.

When it came to the crunch, the people Government members were really getting at were the hundreds of thousands of home-owners in metropolitan Adelaide. So, it is a high tax Party. We came from being the lowest taxed State at the end of the Playford regime to the second highest and, at times, the highest taxed State in the nation. That was the record of the Dunstan pace-setting decade. We were well back on track, as the Leader pointed out, under the Liberal Government elected in 1979. We again became, by dint of difficult and prudent financial management, the lowest taxed State in Australia. In fact, in real terms there was a fall of 5.1 per cent in State taxes during the last year of the Liberal Government. However, we are well on the Labor Party's beaten track of becoming the highest taxed State in the Commonwealth again.

Mr Oswald: And highest inflation too.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: My colleague the member for Morphett interjects quite correctly. We will become the inflation capital of the nation. The only thing is the Labor Party has a couple of rather good competitors in other States because they, too, are under Labor Administrations. If we happened to be the only Labor State we would win hands down. This Party has a couple of good competitors in Premiers Wran and Cain (and now there is also a Labor Government in Western Australia), who have put on quite a high level of taxation in a number of areas. But, nevertheless, we are fast regaining our place among the highest taxed States. The Labor Party is hell-bent on the redistribution of wealth and money. It has no conception whatsoever of generating new activity and new wealth, which is the only way in which we can increase the standard of living for the community of South Australia. As I say, this is a new tax and, in the true traditions of the Labor Party, follows its well beaten track. It is indeed a high tax Party.

The second point I want to make is that the Labor Party now seeks to deny that it is a high tax Party. There seems to have been a new twist to politics in the past few years. We have had two elections, and the Australian Labor Party deliberately seeks to deceive the public. It says it will do all sorts of things, it will follow its traditional programmes, put more people on the pay-roll, employ more teachers, restore levels in the Public Service to pre-1979 levels and spend money on all sorts of welfare programmes. It outbid the Liberal Party in relation to pensioner concessions. Whatever the Liberal Party said it would do the Labor Party would go a couple of notches higher.

One could never win an auction in the Labor Party: it would outbid one every time. The only significant difference in the way that Party has behaved in recent years is that it

has sought to deliberately deceive the public. We had the then Leader of the Opposition Bannon proclaiming to the world that he could fund all his programmes. He was assured he had accurate financial information. He had the programme performance Budget papers and the Auditor-General's Report. He is not going to suggest that those papers were false, is he?

Mr Lewis: He didn't even know he was going to get the windfall gains from the wages pause.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: No, I will come to that in a moment. Is he suggesting that the Auditor-General's Report is dishonest? He was saying he had accurate financial information, and he could predict quite confidently that there would be no new taxes, no increases in taxes and no back-door taxes. The then Leader said that he had good financial information from the Auditor-General and the programme performance papers. Is he saying that those papers are false? Of course they are not false. The Auditor-General in this State is above reproach, and the Premier knows it, yet he says he was relying on the information from those documents that enabled him to make that confident prediction. In effect, Government members lied their way into office. They were repeating the performance of the Cain Government in Victoria. Cain went through the same process. He said he would not increase taxes; he would give them the world—name it and they would get it. Within weeks of gaining Government he was back-peddalling fast and a range of taxes had been visited upon Victorians, the like of which they had not seen for years.

Encouraged by this spectacular success of the widespread deception, lo and behold the same tactic was repeated in the Federal sphere. Hawke had some public appeal as perceived by the electorate, so they stabbed Hayden in the back and pushed Hawke to the front. Hayden was unceremoniously dumped and along came—

Mr Gregory: He resigned.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Well, he resigned, but he had his throat cut. Hawke was to be the front man because he had some public appeal. The ex-A.C.T.U. President Hawke was then Leader of the Labor Party.

Mr Becker: Plus the blow wave.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: As soon as they get sick of his blow wave and his new suits, and as soon as he slips in the polls, he will be history, despite this hoo-hah of a convincing win, 55 to 46, in the Federal Caucus. With five votes in an electorate of over 100; with the lefties (they have a good track record) and the A.C.T.U.—Dolan and company—gunning for him, he only has to slip from 60 per cent to below 50 per cent and I bet my bottom dollar his hairstyle and new image will not save him.

Mr Gregory interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The honourable member opposite has been around long enough to know that what I am saying is the truth. He has been attached to the T.L.C. and A.C.T.U., he is a staunch union man, and he knows that, as soon as Hawke's popularity slips he is history. With 46 out of 55 gunning for him in the Federal Caucus when he has been there for less than a year, in his position I would be feeling shaky being in charge of the Party.

Mr Hawke tried the same formula—lie your way into Government; tell the public a pack of lies—it does not matter, they will soon forget! Tell the public you will give them the world; taxes will not be increased; in fact, they will be reduced! That is what he said. After the Cain experience some of the interviewers in South Australia were getting a bit cagey about this tactic, and that is why Premier Bannon was pressed a little more closely by some of the more perceptive interviewers and was asked how he would fund his promises. He said that he was sure he could because

he had the Auditor-General's Report and the programme performance papers which gave all the details.

The second point I want to make about this massive new taxation Bill is that it is the result of clear premeditated deception using a formula which was devised by Premier Cain in Victoria and then adopted holus-bolus by now Premier Bannon, a deception of the public, making clear unequivocal statements in the election speeches that there would be no new taxes. This is a brand new tax, the first new tax for eight years, but the Premier, as the then Leader, went further than that and said that no increases in taxes would occur, yet we have had a whole heap of them introduced in the House in the last few weeks; for instance, increasing taxes on petrol and cigarettes. This is the Party which is supposed to look after the workers. These are the people who stand for the little people. This is a Party that attacks the tall poppies. Yet it has taxed electricity, gas, cigarettes, beer and petrol. Are they taxes on the tall poppies? I notice that Government members have changed their tune and are saying that they like this tax because it is broad-based.

Mr Trainer: What's this tall poppy business?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The honourable member has not been here long enough to know that we used to get that week after week. That was the catch cry of former Premier Dunstan. The public has woken up to that one. The Government now likes this tax because it is broad-based, because it does hit everyone. It is a dishonest tax. How about this for the quote of the week (and this lines up with the Premier's statement that he will not introduce any new taxes); this week he said that the Labor Party is still opposed to uranium mining and yet in a second breath—

Mr Trainer: What has this to do with f.i.d.?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Government members do not like this, because it points out the absolute dishonesty and hypocrisy of the Labor Government and in particular its spokesman, the Premier. I give this quote, because it ranks alongside the other statements the Premier has made during the month. In one breath he is cock-a-hoop—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Whitten): Will the Deputy Leader please keep to the financial institutions duty?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Thank you, Sir. I am pointing out the absolute hypocrisy and dishonesty in what the Premier says. In one breath he is cock-a-hoop because Roxby will go ahead, yet last year he was calling it a mirage in the desert. Last year he said that we were over-blowing it, but suddenly he is cock-a-hoop about this venture going ahead—the largest uranium mine in the world. In the next breath he says the Labor Party still stands opposed to uranium mining. If one could go through the mental gymnastics of reconciling those two statements, I guess one could go through the mental gymnastics of making the sort of accommodation one has to make when a Premier goes to an election and says that he can assure the public of South Australia that there will be no new taxes and no back-door tax increases such as an increase in electricity charges. He said his Party had costed its proposals, and he could assure the people that there would be no increases in taxation. However, he has broken all those promises—and broken them blatantly.

I do not believe for a moment that he believed that, because I do not believe that any new financial information suddenly appeared on the Premier's doorstep when he snuck out and joined the celebrations on election night. On television I saw everyone in his garden but he did not show himself until he was certain the numbers were up. Then he came out and that very night he back-peddled on his promises. Next day he was back-peddalling even faster, and he has not stopped since. Let me refresh the memories of the Government members as to the sequence of events before

the Premier had any new financial information and was back-peddling. You could tell that he had suddenly become cautious. Political reporter, Matt Abraham, headlined an article with the words 'No new taxes under Labor, says Bannon'. The article stated:

A future A.L.P. Government would not increase State taxes or charges or bring in new taxes during its first term in power, the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Bannon, said yesterday. Mr Bannon said this in a press conference after a clash with the Premier, Mr Tonkin, in the House of Assembly over the economic policies of the two Parties—

Even then we knew they were telling lies. The article continued:

'We have no plans to increase State taxation (in first term),' he said. The Government blocked an Opposition attempt to debate in Parliament the respective policies of both parties. Mr Tonkin refused to allow Mr Bannon to move a suspension of standing orders to debate the issue, despite challenging Mr Bannon during Question Time to give details of how the A.L.P. would fund its election promises.

That was in July last year. We knew that they were seeking to delude the public. Those sorts of statements were repeated during the election campaign.

Mr Groom: Tell us what you would do.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I commend to the honourable member that he read and study the alternative Budget put to this House by the Leader of the Opposition, where he said quite clearly what we would do. Turning to the economic document, in the lead-up to the election we had the glossy document with the Australian flag on the front, a nice shiny cover, the A.L.P. and the Premier had a special hairdo—Hawke had his hair blow waved, the Premier had his styled! There he was all glossy on the front of this glossy document! Out it came, the Labor Party's blueprint for the future, the enterprise fund and all of that nonsense. The impression was that it was a professional publication of the A.L.P. proposals. One of the things said in the economic document was:

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

The Government has conveniently forgotten the part about an inquiry, and we are certainly well into the taxes. Then on 27 May on the *A.B.C.* news the Premier said:

The inquiry will be established by the next Government, by us in Government. Obviously, if there's 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.

What he was saying there was that when in Government there would be an inquiry and no new taxes: taxes would be increased at the next election—he was talking about 1985. Within a year, all of this is well forgotten. Then on the 23rd in the *Advertiser*, and I have quoted this already, he said:

We have no plans to increase State taxation.

Mr Bannon in his policy speech on 25 October said:

The A.L.P. will not reintroduce succession duties and will not introduce new taxes...

Yet here we have major new taxes. He continued:

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

There it is, unequivocal, in black and white. On 4 November, the day before the election, the Premier said:

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

Again, on 4 November he said:

We estimate that revenue collection will match the extra expenditure we propose.

Also on 4 November, in the *Advertiser*, he is reported to have said:

As I understand it, Cain had been given certain information which proved to be wrong.

When asked whether that could happen to him, he said:

We've got the Auditor-General's reports, the programme and performance budgeting information.

So, he had the facts, he knew what he was saying was right: there would be no new taxes. However, on 17 November when he emerged and during interviews the next day, suddenly there was a change; he was back-peddling immediately. There was a note of caution because he had deliberately deceived the public, and he knew it. By 17 November, from memory less than a fortnight after the election, he was saying this:

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

By 29 November, a few weeks later, he said:

The exact nature of the deficit has not been determined yet. But I have some information indicating the situation isn't good.

That is what Premier Tonkin had told him in July of last year but he chose not to believe that information. He sought to take some interpretation, he says, from the Auditor-General's report—I do not believe that for a moment. On 1 December he sought to blame the former Government for misleading the public. I have been through the history of events surrounding the economic document released by Mr Bannon, and the rest is history. We know that the Labor Party has savagely increased a whole range of taxes and here we have this brand new tax which will hit everyone.

The third point I wish to make in these remarks is that this tax erodes the State's competitive position. Not content with imposing this financial institutions duty across the board, the Premier is levying it at a rate higher than our natural Australian competitors, the Eastern States, except for Tasmania, which will further become a financial haven. I predict that, as a result of these taxes, there will be a greater and an increasing influx of funds into financial institution operations in Queensland to avoid these taxes. However, not only is the Premier introducing this tax and broken every promise he has made in relation to it, but he is destroying any competitive edge which we have gained during the Liberal Government's term of office from 1979 to 1982 because he is levying the tax at a higher rate, .04 per cent as opposed to .03 per cent, than in the Eastern States.

Traditionally this State has only survived and expanded in the manufacturing sector, and in any sectors where we showed some marked expansion after the Second World War, because we managed to maintain a competitive edge. We cannot consume all the goods produced in the manufacturing industry and indeed in most industries, and we had to find markets elsewhere. The logical markets and the places we found those markets were the Eastern States. The only reason succeeding Governments managed to build up that industrial development was because we had a clear competitive edge. Labor Governments, in the pace-setting years of the Dunstan era, certainly did a lot to erode that competitive edge and this Government is on the same track. We sort to recover some of it and, as I pointed out earlier, we became the lowest taxed State under a Liberal Government. Now we are up and running, and running faster than the other States. We are taxed at a higher level, and that is a matter of serious concern to the Opposition and to the business, industrial and commercial community of South Australia.

The fourth and final point I want to make in these remarks in the time remaining is that not only is the tax to be levied at a higher rate but this Government keeps on (in colourful and emotive terms) claiming that it represents the workers, though I do not know where it gets that nonsense from. I do not know of anyone on this side of the House who has not had to work for a living. I took the time to read through the declaration of interests. There are capitalists

on the other side of the House, if one wants to push the point; that is where the capitalists are. Under the guise of socialism they love the system.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Maybe the honest people are on this side.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: There is the member for Elizabeth, fresh from gathering numbers in Canberra. I welcome back the member for Elizabeth. It is a pity he reached only 46. He only needed another five and he would have won the day.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I rise on a point of order. I would like to place on record that this has nothing to do with the debate before the House. I wish to make it very clear that I have not been to Canberra in the past fortnight or three weeks. I do not know what the honourable member is talking about.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: We welcome the member for Elizabeth back. We missed him. He is the only one on the Government bench who has any colour. We disagree with him, but at least we can say that he is colourful. The last point I make is that not only is this duty at a higher rate but it hits everyone; it is across the board. Not only that, the Government has its hand in the collection plate. It does not even allow exemptions for charitable and church organisations that exist in the other States. When the collection is taken in church and it gets to the back, Premier Bannon will have his hand in the plate, in the piggy bank. He will have his hand in the collection box for every charitable organisation in South Australia. That is not the case in the Eastern States. So, here is the Government which says that it is looking after the under privileged. It is an absurd proposition. The only way in which the working people of this State are better off, and in fact anyone in this State is better off, is if we produce more, do it more efficiently and sell it, and add to the general pool of prosperity and wealth in the community.

By being hung up on redistribution, by taking with one hand and giving away with the other and losing a fair bit on the way, not one jot is being done to improve the lot of the working man in this State. That is why there has been such an uproar in the past few days in relation to this back-door taxation by way of electricity charges. Not only do we have the back-door taxation; not only has the Labor Party increased in excess of 70 taxes and charges since coming to office in clear breach of the undertaking it gave to the public but we also have a brand new tax to hit everyone in this State. We oppose this Bill, and we shall attempt to amend it. However, it is a disgraceful day for the State when the Government can come in by deception and seek to foist on the public of South Australia a measure of this type.

Mr MATHWIN (Glenelg): I oppose the fid Bill, as I understand it to be called. If it is not, it is the f.i.d. Bill, but I will call it the fid Bill because it is a ridiculous name for a ridiculous Bill, in my view.

Members interjecting:

Mr MATHWIN: If members on the other side want to get in line with it, that is all right by me. I am glad to see that my learned colleague the member for Hartley is back again in the Chamber. I am surprised that he has not sat on the front bench where he ought to be and, of course, it will not be very long before he sits on that front bench. I think that the honourable gentleman is well worthy of a better position than the back bench where he is now.

I think that the f.i.d. Bill is a shocking Bill. As I said earlier, it is an attack on charities, organisations, churches and the like which help the poor, the aged and infirm, and the sick people in this State. That includes charities such as the marvellous organisation in my district, namely, Minda

Home, and an organisation which is probably in most members' electorates, namely, the Red Cross branches and the like which help people who are not as well off as themselves and who are ill. All those will come under the cloak of this shocking Bill. It will affect all the Red Cross branches and all the people who are doing good for their organisations by running fetes and other money-raising functions to assist people who are in poor circumstances, and they will all be affected.

What initiative will that give to people who give their time voluntarily to help such worthy organisations? It will also affect young people and infants. As mentioned by the Deputy Leader, it is like getting into the piggy bank. Many young people are given money to put into the bank when they start off in life, and they will all be affected by this Bill. Young people and children who save up and bank their pocket money and who want to withdraw it for a bike or buy a present for their relations, mother or father, will be charged under this legislation for drawing money out of the bank.

Mr Meier: How will their parents explain that to them?

Mr MATHWIN: It will be very difficult. I am glad that my colleague, friend and near neighbour in this House has mentioned this. It will be very difficult for parents to explain to these young children just what is happening as far as this Government is concerned. They are not old enough to know as we know that the Bannon Government, like all socialist Governments, lives on high taxation. That is the basis of their philosophy: high taxation. They say, 'We will rip it off the rich and give it to the poor.' As the previous Premier of this State said on many occasions, 'We will clip the tall poppies.' However, this goes far away from that situation. It clips the poor people, the little people, the people who can least afford it and indeed it upsets and hurts the organisations which are working so very hard within the State and throughout Australia to help people in need. They will be the ones who will be affected by it. It will indeed be a sorry day for them and I hope that they realise what this Bill is about. I hope that they realise what this Government is doing in the race to get as much money as it can into the coffers of the Treasury.

The youth in this State will be affected by it: everybody is touched by it. It will affect young people who play sports and join sporting organisations. What better thing can one do than to encourage young people to join different sporting organisations and so on? They will fall under the cloak of this new tax raiser. Even the Adelaide Harriers, or whatever it is to which the Premier belongs when he is chasing around the countryside—

The Hon. J.W. Slater: The Enfield Harriers.

Mr MATHWIN: Even the Enfield Harriers with its member of Parliament will be affected. I understand that the Minister of Sport and Recreation is a harrier. I would be surprised if he is. I know that he is a good duck. He can duck the blows, but he is not a harrier. The Premier's own club will be affected by this Bill. Whether one is a long distance runner or a sprinter, one will come under the cloak of this Bill in relation to taxation which we will be obliged to provide for the ever-gobbling Government.

Mr Meier: I wonder if they realise that they will be affected by this legislation?

Mr MATHWIN: I do not think that they do, and I think that it is about time that members of the Government came clean. Little docketts have been sent around to the electorates, but only to Labor Party members. My electorate secretary did not get any information on it. She was not given the answers to give over the telephone and the excuses when an avalanche of people telephone about the situation which has developed in relation to this legislation. However, I hope that members on the other side of the House will

come clean about this matter and explain to the people of their electorates just what it is all about and who will be affected by this measure.

Of course, as I said earlier, the A.L.P. will tax people to the hilt. Indeed, it will get taxation wherever it can and it has proved it in this Bill which has been a shock for me to read and try to decipher. Indeed, it is a very heavy Bill and one that will be very difficult to explain. I will be very interested indeed when the Premier stands in this place and explains to members of the House in some sort of detail—not just wiping it away with a wave of the hand—just what it is all about. It is a very complicated piece of legislation and a very difficult piece of legislation to understand. I suggest with due respect to the Premier, who is not here now, that he will not be able to explain the Bill. I will be very interested to find out whether he can give some answers and when we get to the Committee stage just how he will perform when the pressure is on.

Mr Ashenden: Do you think his back-benchers will speak to support him?

Mr MATHWIN: I doubt it. I think that they have had their orders to keep quiet. I am quite sure that the back-benchers of the Government will have been muzzled on this occasion. Of course, as my friend the member for Todd has explained, they are too frightened. I see that the member for Newland is not in the House today. I wonder if he is doorknocking around Todd at the moment.

Ms Lenehan: He happens to be ill.

Mr MATHWIN: It is nice to see the member for Mawson here today. She has been very busy on the telephone dealing with all the complaints from her constituents and making excuses in accordance with that little list that the Premier sent her to enable the honourable member or her electorate secretary to answer all the questions raised by the member's constituents in relation to the effects of this legislation. It has been remembered that when in Opposition the present Premier stated that a Labor Government would not increase taxes at all during its first term of office. I suppose that perhaps members thought that a Labor Government might be in office for only 12 months, because otherwise they could not honestly have said to the public that there would be no increases in taxes or charges, having regard to the fact that a term of office encompasses a three-year period. However, unfortunately, the public believes the Labor Party and it is now suffering the consequences. The Premier is on record as having said in this place when Leader of the Opposition that under no circumstances would he ever support any backdoor-type taxation. He said the situation was very grim indeed.

The f.i.d. will increase charges to everyone in the State. Even the little people in South Australia will have to foot the Bill in some way or another. Of course, the banks and those types of institutions will be affected more than anyone. One can recall the advice given some time ago by a former Prime Minister who suggested that in the future people would have to put money under their beds or in an old sock. It is quite apparent that that is what will happen when the provisions of this legislation come into force. People will not be encouraged to bank their money and will put it somewhere in their home, in a wardrobe, or in an old sock hanging behind a cupboard door. People will not put their money into banks, preferring to keep it in their homes, which will be a very sorry situation, because it will be dangerous for people to do that sort of thing.

Mr Mayes: We would rather hear about what you saw last week.

Mr MATHWIN: If I were given two or three hours I could talk about the gaols we visited in New South Wales and Victoria. In relation to the measure before the House, banks and shops will increase their charges because of these

provisions. Clubs will be affected by it, whether they be sporting clubs or clubs for aged or invalid pensioners. As has been pointed out already, churches will be affected. The Uniting Church has said that it will suffer a loss of \$40 000 in the first year of the operation of the legislation. That church provides support for aged people and those in need of assistance and guidance. One must never forget the great job that the churches do in the community. They need money to help the poor and people in need of assistance, such as alcoholics. They assist people who are released from prison, people on drugs, suffering in that way, and so on. All those sorts of people are assisted in some manner or means if they seek out the assistance of the church.

Also, churches have groups who help single parents, and we all know of the involvement of the churches in regard to providing cottages for the aged, and help for people with problems within their families. Such programmes are funded by the churches (although they are assisted by Federal and State Governments) from donations by people, and that applies to other organisations too. The programmes provided by churches and similar organisations have to be funded by people in the community. It is a sorry situation that the Uniting Church will lose \$40 000 because of the imposition of this duty. It can ill afford to pay that sort of money into Government coffers, irrespective of which Government it is. It is quite wrong that that money should be ripped away from them having regard to the marvellous job they do within the community.

Likewise, it has been estimated that the Catholic Church will lose between \$20 000 and \$30 000 during the first year of the operation of this legislation. Members would know of the vast amount of work that that church does within the community and of the jobs that it provides. A number of churches have their own bank accounts and the like which will all come under the cloak of this shocking legislation. This is not the first time that the Bannon Government has proved that it is unable to manage the State. It has been proved before that the Government could not run a Christmas club or a Boy Scouts group. I would not like to give any member of the Government a chance to look after a sporting club with which I were associated. The problem is that not one member opposite has had any experience in private enterprise.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: You're ignorant. You're wrong.

Mr MATHWIN: I think the Minister had a shop which went broke, which is obviously why he got his present job. I understand that the Minister was a prominent member of his union. That is fair enough; he climbed to the heights of fame within that union. However, in regard to actual business experience, I do not think any member opposite has ever had any.

Mr Mayes interjecting:

Mr MATHWIN: I know that my friend the member for Unley is an economist. The only thing worse than having the opinion of two economists is having the opinion of three, because they never come up with the same answer. It is the same as having the opinions of a brace of lawyers: some have one opinion and the others have another. To run a Government, one must have some business knowledge. I am afraid that there is no-one opposite who has ever been through that experience. One cannot get by with the opinions of intellectuals alone.

Mr Mayes interjecting:

Mr MATHWIN: It is all right for the member for Unley to say that he has his little certificate with gold braid in a little black frame, which I suppose is hanging in his office.

Mr Ashenden: All theory and no practice.

Mr MATHWIN: That is true.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Whitten): I am sure the member for Todd realises that the member for Glenelg has been in this place long enough to not need his assistance.

Mr MATHWIN: Thank you for your assistance, Mr Acting Speaker. The Government has failed very quickly in managing this State. It is having its 12-month anniversary, although it seems a lifetime to me.

Mr Trainer: On Thursday.

Mr MATHWIN: I suppose we will have the flag flying at half mast on Thursday. The Government has proved in that short period that it is in real trouble. To get out of it, it has to bring in legislation of this nature which will affect the people whom it professes to protect, namely, the small or working-class people. Members opposite say that we know nothing about working-class people. I suggest, with great respect, that we are all from working-class areas and have all had to work for our living, although some have worked harder than others. In this world it is a case of work or starve.

The Premier, with his lust for more money to put into the never-ending bin, is taking that money from the people of this State. That money is not free—it has to be provided by the people who live in the State. The quicker the Government realises that it is not a bottomless pit and takes responsibility for the spending of money, the quicker it will realise that there are other ways in which it can manage the State and run departments in a better way than it is currently doing.

We can recall the gross overspending in almost every department under every Minister. The Ministers were pulled to a halt by the Premier, but the damage was done. It is all very well to talk about millions of dollars, as the Government does, but we are not dealing with Monopoly money. One can play Monopoly with one's children, but this is the real thing, and we must look after the State and run it properly. I refer to what the Deputy Premier said, when he was Acting Leader of the Opposition, in regard to increased charges. In regard to increased electricity charges, he stated, in the *Advertiser* of 27 January 1982:

The Tonkin Government was using electricity charges as a form of backdoor taxation . . . Mr Wright said electricity bills had soared since the last State election and were now contributing to the home-payment crisis being faced by thousands of South Australian families.

In the *News* of 5 February 1982, the now Premier is reported as follows:

South Australians are being softened up for an increase in electricity charges, the Opposition Leader, Mr Bannon, claimed today. . . Mr Bannon said that Mr Goldsworthy's use of security of supplies as an excuse for a new increase was an attempt to pull the wool over consumers' eyes.

If anyone is pulling the wool over the eyes of the people of this State it is the Premier. The report continued:

'With every rise, more gets siphoned off to the Treasury, but you never hear about that,' he said.

A report in the *News* of 23 April 1982, in an article headed 'Charges up by \$20 million: Bannon', states:

The South Australian public has paid more than \$20 million in higher State charges since the South Australian Liberal Government took office, according to the Opposition Leader, Mr Bannon. A total of 90 State charges had been increased, Mr Bannon said. He accused the State Government of using higher State charges as a means of 'backdoor taxation' which the Government did not wish to acknowledge. 'People are coming to realise a higher charge is no less painful than a higher tax,' Mr Bannon said.

It is a pity that the Premier cannot remember that statement. What a hypocrite he is when he has a Bill before the House which he expects will bring in \$20 million. Yet, he is saying that a number of charges by the previous Government came to a total amount of \$20 million. The report continues:

'When the Labor Government was in power we held back many increases—especially those for public transport—as a matter of public policy,' Mr Bannon said. 'The Liberal Government has imposed higher charges as a matter of deliberate policy. This comes from a Government that sought office largely on the basis of cutting taxes.'

How hypocritical of the then Leader of the Opposition—now the Premier—to come in with the same situation when he has blasted the previous Government for higher taxes. He has done more than that. He has increased 72 taxes in 12 months since he has been in office. That is how the Premier saw the situation. Another report on 24 April 1982 states:

The South Australian Government has increased 90 State charges since coming to office, the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Bannon, said yesterday. Mr Bannon said he estimated the total effect of these increases exceeded \$20 million.

This one Bill before us will bring in that amount of money in one hit. This Government has increased 72 charges in one year and has now come up with this vicious Bill.

In the second reading explanation, the Premier said that duty would be at a low rate on the receipts of financial institutions. If he thinks that he will blind the public into believing that it is not going to pay through the nose for this extra taxation, then he is a hypocrite. The tax will affect everyone—man, woman and child, the young and the aged, the ill and the healthy. They will all have to pay through the nose to satisfy the Premier's and the Government's lust for more money to run the State.

The Government had no conception of running a business. The running of the State is the biggest business that we have as members of Parliament. He further stated:

The Government has decided that the new duty should apply at the rate of .04 per cent or 4c in \$100. This compares with a rate of .03 per cent currently operating in New South Wales and Victoria.

He is saying that he will charge more than is charged in Victoria or New South Wales. Quite obviously, for some reason, the Premier would believe that, although Governments are receiving a lot of finance in the other States, it would not be sufficient for what the Government of this State has in mind as a solution to the problems it has created. The Premier also said, in part:

No provision is made for special treatment for local authorities and their banking will, therefore, attract financial institutions duty.

That, of course, would mean that that it would affect local government and the ratepayers. It will affect sporting or other organisations which councils subsidise. That money will be reduced. Everyone in the State will be affected by this obnoxious Bill.

I had intended to deal with a number of the clauses in the Bill, but it would appear that my time is running out. The Premier said that he had talked to the banking and other organisations principally concerned with this matter. He has not given us much idea about what they said, but it is obvious that they were not thrilled about it. When they looked at the draft Bill after getting over the initial shock they must have said something less than complimentary to the Premier about to what they would do.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I oppose the Bill. A little over 12 years ago in this place I first encountered a Labor Party hell bent on eventually destroying itself, but more specifically hell bent on raising large sums of money from the populace. The Minister who sits on the front bench at present, having come in at the same time, will well remember the debates which ranged over a series of taxing measures which were 'firsts' for South Australia at that stage and which were going hand in glove with a number of measures which sought to increase the size of the take on already existing taxes. Again, in 1973-74 we saw further

taxing measures introduced. Fortunately for the people of this State, there have been no others until this session of Parliament. I thought that the experiences available to the Labor Party from an earlier occasion relating to bringing forward taxing measures which were poorly thought through would not have been a fact of this Parliamentary activity ever again. Regrettably, they are in this very ill-conceived and poorly structured measure to which we are asked to address ourselves. Lightning has struck twice in the one place. Unless anybody is thinking that it is pure rhetoric, I ask members, particularly those who are here for the first and only time, to go to the *Hansard* record of 25 March 1971. At page 4410 they will see the introduction of the Places of Public Entertainment Act Amendment Bill.

That measure, which sought to introduce a tax on amusements, was fought strenuously by members on this side of the House. During the course of the debate it was revealed that the Ministers, including the Premier (as Treasurer) did not understand the measure that they had brought before the House. If members care to look at page 4473 of *Hansard* of 30 March 1971, they will find that progress was reported half-way through discussion on the clauses, because suddenly the Government found that the words it had introduced into the Bill would place a tax on annual membership on every person who was a member of a football, racing, or any other kind of club, where there was a collective annual fee in excess of \$2, even though the individual cost of entry to the various meetings of that organisation was to be considerably less.

Indeed, on the following day, 31 March 1971, after that progress had been reported the Premier of the day came into the House, sought leave to incorporate new clauses, and spelt out the finite detail of how this taxing measure was to be applied so that it did not have the far-reaching and damaging effect which was contained within that supposedly thought-through taxing measure. Just to complete that story, before bringing it into reality with the measure we have before us today, the Bill was finally passed after a great deal of argument and was proclaimed. However, it was annulled within 24 hours of the proclamation because the Government suddenly found that the Dracula that it had created, the measure to improve the taxing measures of the State, would cost more in administration than it would raise by way of taxation.

I ask members who might doubt the comments that I am making to look at the records of 1971, look at the public statements of the Premier, subsequent to the passage of the Bill, in which he admitted in this House that the measure that was to have been a successful fund-raising measure for the State was in fact a disaster and was withdrawn because of its inherent failings. I raise this point because I believe there are a number of quite definite failings associated with this measure with which we are dealing.

The Leader of the Opposition has very clearly pointed out a number of issues indicating that many charitable, school, religious, and other vital bodies in the State will suffer a financial impact upon their activities which will reduce their ability to provide the charitable and educational assistance for which they were designed. It is all very well perhaps for some members opposite to say, 'But they raise the funds and eventually they will get them back because there is a form of exemption.' It does not get away from the fact that those organisations will have been denied the use of large sums of money during the time from one 12-month period to the next. They will not have been able to benefit from interest accrual which, in a number of these organisations, makes up a quite sizable and beneficial part of their total annual income. We conceivably are developing a situation where the Government, through community welfare or other departments, will have to provide additional

Government funds to prop up the activities of these very important bodies in our community. In having to provide that money by way of subsidy or prop the obvious end is that the organisations become beholden to the Government, can become political footballs, with the end result of their activities being dulled as a result.

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

WRONGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill implements the twenty-third report of the Law Reform Committee of South Australia dealing with civil actions against witnesses who have committed perjury, which was received in 1972. I seek leave to have the remainder of the explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Remainder of Explanation

Criminal liability for perjury by witnesses has been long established and is dealt with in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. However, the Law Reform Committee at page 3 of its report points out 'a consistent line of cases from Queen Elizabeth's reign has established that there is at present no civil claim for damages against a witness who commits perjury.' The Law Reform Committee recommended that the law should be amended to provide that a civil action should lie against a witness who has committed perjury in a civil action, at the suit of the person who has suffered damage as the result of perjury. This Bill brings into effect this recommendation.

The issue of whether a civil action should lie against a person who has committed perjury in a criminal action was not addressed by the Law Reform Committee as it did not fall within the terms of their 1972 remit, and is not therefore covered by this Bill. It is my intention to refer to the Law Reform Committee consideration of the question of whether a civil action should lie against a person who commits perjury in a criminal case at the suit of the person who has suffered damage as the result of the perjury. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the insertion in the principal Act of a new section 33. This section provides that a person who gives perjured evidence in civil proceedings is liable to any person who suffers consequential damage. However, the plaintiff to the civil action must establish that the defendant has been convicted of perjury, found guilty of contempt by reason of his perjury, or committed for trial on a charge of perjury. Furthermore, in accordance with a recommendation of the Law Reform Committee, the perjured evidence must have been material to the outcome of the proceedings. It will not be a defence to an action under this section that the perjured evidence was accepted as true by the court before which it was given.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS DUTY BILL

Debate resumed.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): Prior to the dinner break, I indicated the farcical situation which arose in this

place in 1971, when an ill conceived and poorly constructed amusement tax measure was introduced and subsequently withdrawn as it was found to be quite impractical, mainly because the cost of collecting the funds would have been almost equivalent to the value of the funds raised. It should be recognised that the reason for drawing the parallel is that I believe that this is an ill conceived measure, one likely to have quite a serious impact upon the community, and one on which I believe the Government will have to retract in a very major way. The submissions made by the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon pinpointing the number of quite obvious deficiencies which the Government had not considered supports that view.

I am concerned not only because of the impact that it will have on church and sporting groups, schools, and other community bodies but I am disturbed because it will be not only a double dip operation but a triple and quadruple dip operation in many areas of activity. The very nature of a number of community and church bodies is for the progressive passage of funds from one account to another. This is a time honoured method of approach by these organisations, and each time the action is taken, these bodies will be debited with a sum of tax.

It is quite obvious that many aspects of the issue will have to wait until the Committee stage, where we will seek to obtain from the Premier a clearer understanding of the definitions contained within the Bill, and a very positive understanding of the exemptions that are expected to be instituted. I point out to the Premier and other members (and it is a matter that you, Mr Speaker, would be fully conversant with) that it is not what the Premier or any members of this place believe the interpretation to be, but the manner in which the courts eventually determine the interpretation that is important.

Whilst it may be the intention of the Government to proceed on a particular basis, and quite often that attitude has been expressed by the Ministry, it is the eventual interpretation by the court of the words which appear in the final Act which is all important. I am saying to the Premier that, unless this matter is properly thought through by the time we come to the Committee stage, I can see hours of argument as to precisely whether the impact of the definitions is adequate or whether it is deemed by the Opposition to be inadequate.

I believe that the consultation process to which the Premier has alluded is rather similar in this Bill to the consultation process which we recognise as being undertaken by a number of Ministers of the present Government with interest group bodies where the organisations are advised of the intention of the Government and asked for feed-back and input, which, is denied recognition when the final Bill comes out, either because the matter has been rolled in a Caucus committee or because the Government did not really mean 'consultation' when it used the term 'consultation' but meant that it would make available material to the organisations and give them a view that they were being asked to sincerely involve themselves in the construction and proper finality of that measure, and then walked away from the considered opinion of those organisations in the final result.

I will cite one or two particular examples in relation to this measure. On 26 October in this House I asked on behalf of the Opposition a question of the Premier as to whether he would consider varying the time of operation of this Bill because of the great difficulty that a number of financial institutions were having in coming to grips with aspects of this measure when they were being advised that it would become operative from 1 December. However, they were not given a clear indication of the final words in the measure and were not able to determine positively the full impact of the measure on their operation from the

inadequate briefing that they had received from the Government. It is all very well to stand, as the Premier did on that occasion, and say that there has been full consultation with the industry and that the industry knows what is intended. However, as I have indicated previously, it is not until those intentions are transposed into words that those words are able to be properly considered by legal advice as to whether the intention is passed on into the actual delivery clauses of the Act.

The plea I made on behalf of a number of financial institutions in that question on 26 October is as real today as it was then because, as indicated by the Leader of the Opposition, and in a number of letters which are circulating to the Premier and other persons, there has been a very unclear and concerned questioning of the impact of a number of the measures.

Here we are on 8 November considering a measure which has yet to run the gauntlet of this House and of another House and which may possibly have to go to a managers' conference if the Premier cannot provide a clear and concise definition of the final terms of the Bill. Industry is being asked to gear up for what at present is a phantom measure. It is no good members saying, as the Premier implied, that industry can prepare itself and write its computer programmes in readiness to put into effect the provisions relevant to the determination of the Government's impression of the measure, because they cannot do so until such time as they have been able to obtain final legal advice as to how the implications of the measure will come out in the wash.

I express, as others have done, very grave concerns in regard to the impact of the measure on the finance industry, which is a vital part of commercial activity in the community. With its hands tied behind its back, it has been asked to come to grips with a measure which is to become effective in some three weeks from now, but as yet the t's have not been crossed and the i's have not been dotted.

I am also quite concerned about the retrospective deferred payment aspects which are inherent in this measure. One may ask what these are: quite clearly, under this measure the passage of funds from one suborganisation to another by the methods devised over a long period of time in regard to various sporting, charitable and church organisations will mean that a considerable sum of money will be tied up.

In some cases, because of the repayment or the rebate provisions implied in the Bill, it will be 12 months before organisations will again have access to the money that they have been forced to lodge. I do not believe that any member in this place from the Premier down is fully conversant with the impact that the tying up of these sums of money is likely to have on the delivery of services by these various organisations to members of the community.

It has been only within the past 36 or 48 hours that a number of church communities have had a chance to address this matter and its effect on their activities. The member opposite may look startled, but those communities have had the opportunity to come to grips with that realisation only over the past 36 hours. A number of organisations that meet on a fortnightly or monthly basis have not had the opportunity to study the Bill, which was introduced on 27 October—a matter of only 11 days ago.

Mr Meier: They don't realise that it is going to affect them.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Exactly. A parallel to this 35 concerns the document introduced into this House by the member for Elizabeth when he was Attorney-General relating to the incorporation of associations.

The honourable member had sold the measure to his Party as a desirable document. It had been publicly stated as being a desirable document and was then sent out to the

various organisations upon which it was going to have an impact. Regrettably, it was some five to six weeks before the real factors associated with that measure started to sheet home to the organisations that would be most affected by them. It is not a secret any longer that the organisations most affected by that original document were the church organisations and football and sporting clubs.

The Lutheran Church highlighted the deficiencies of the document to other church groups, and it was not very long before all of them were drawing to the attention of members the real impact of the measure. I am only mentioning it now, not because it is a measure currently before the House but because it is a like piece of legislation, breaking somewhat new ground because of the changes which have been introduced and which took the community six to seven weeks to come to grips with. The f.i.d. document, which has been in circulation for 11 days (notwithstanding that some aspects of it were made available to interested groups before that) and its impact have not yet been fully understood by all organisations that will be caught by it.

This afternoon the Leader made announcements in regard to the attitude of the Catholic and Uniting Churches and of school bodies. I am sure my colleague the member for Torrens will have quite a deal to say about this when he makes his contribution in relation to educational organisations, from universities right through to primary schools and kindergartens. The feedback from the universities and other organisations is just beginning to come through the system. The full impact of those measures is only just now starting to be understood by the various organisations that are caught. I believe that there is an unnecessary haste relative to the passage of this measure, notwithstanding that the intent of the Government was made known some months ago.

My question as to the haste aspect is that the advice which many organisations require to adjust their thinking and find their place within the scheme of things has not yet been received as they have not had ample or sufficient time to clearly identify the problems involved. I suggest to the Premier that the material that is already feeding into his office (I am led to believe that it is feeding into his office, because some members on this side are starting to get copies of documents relating to the concerns of bodies and other organisations) suggests that the Government has a tiger by the tail and does not realise its fierceness at this time.

Organisations are finding that a number of the propositions put to them in the so-called consultative process are not the propositions that are contained in the final Bill. The impressions given to them in the period of time over which consultation took place are different from the legal advice that they are now getting on the impact of those causes upon their form of operation.

What happens in relation to other organisations such as the Electricity Trust, American Express, Engineering and Water Supply Department, and various other instrumentalities including the Land Tax Office, that allow for payment of their accounts through any bank? Are they going to be contained within the various exemption clauses, because they are Government or semi-government instrumentalities, or are they not? There is no clear indication at this moment, and even if there was a statement by the Premier that this or that organisation were to be exempt, there is nothing to stop a Government which has already shown in the South Australian arena over the past 12 months that it can back off from its commitment in no time at all that the exemption will be withdrawn from an organisation, or that another method of collection will be placed upon such an organisation virtually overnight.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: In other words, they demonstrated they cannot be trusted.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Exactly! It is a happy anniversary period. This week it is 12 months since the election of the Bannon Government. I suggest that the honourable member for Mawson enjoy this birthday because there will not be any more birthday parties from now on. There might be anniversaries, but they will not be happy ones because of the impact that these sorts of measures are having upon the public at present.

It is very clear, as has been outlined earlier today, that the Ministry is concerned at the impact of Electricity Trust increases and the further impact that this measure is likely to have on the Trust and other service organisations. The honourable member's constituents and mine will have to pay more for those services. Considerably more public unrest will occur because of the number of straws which have been loaded on the camel's back.

I notice that the Ministers who were responsible for the delivery of a document advising members of the Labor Party how to answer these criticisms of the Government and its financial management did not circulate members on this side. That is a rather good indication of the political nature of the measure, as opposed to genuine Government concern about its impact on the constituents of South Australia. There was discrimination in providing a form of advice to members in particular areas, rather than across the total electorate, which clearly indicates the Minister's concern and, therefore—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time having expired, I call the honourable member for Alexandra.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): The Leader of the Opposition and colleagues on this side of the House have canvassed their general concern about the Bill before the Parliament. Indeed, they have identified a number of institutions—industrial, charitable and sporting—that will suffer as a result of the Government's proposal. The short title of this Bill is misleading, without even entering into the detail and accompanying explanation of the Bill. It refers to an imposition of duty upon financial receipts and to provide for the assessment and collection of that duty, and as in most financial Bills of this kind, incorporates the words, 'and for other purposes'.

However, one finds after reading the very early paragraphs of the Bill that the duty is payable on both receipts and expenditure identified: in other words, all transactions are embraced within this dutiable field. The impact on the organisations, community groups and individuals canvassed by my colleagues will become known to the Government over its period in office and I believe progressively over a period in the very near future, and that impact will fall politically on those who have been responsible for bringing through the back door this form of taxation.

My reason for entering this debate is not to recanvass the areas that have already been discussed but simply to signal to the House my concern on behalf of a section of the community that will suffer considerably as a result of this legislation if and when it proceeds to the point of proclamation without amendment. Indeed, even with the amendments which have been signalled and which are intended to be moved in this House and, hopefully, supported in another place, the impact on the community and those to whom I propose to refer will be significant.

That section of the community that has not been acknowledged so far is the rural sector, a sector of the community which, by virtue of its practices and pursuits, handles a lot of money. Indeed, the gross turnover for a primary producer in these times, in regard to each individual property, certainly in regard to the vast majority of the broad acre rural pro-

perties, involves a very large sum: \$100 000, \$200 000 or \$300 000 turnover for a primary producer in the broad acre areas of our State is not unusual, and those figures, under this legislation, attract yet another cost factor which that section of the community (the primary producers) has no hope of recovering. Whether the product be livestock, wool, wheat, or whatever, the returns are derived from a system of selling which allows the primary producer no control whatsoever over the price recovered in the form of return for the product.

The auction system of primary produce in this country is such that, after bringing the item of produce to an appropriate condition for market, the primary producer has no control whatsoever over the price that he will be paid. In other words, he has absolutely no way of incorporating in the costs or charges for the product the cost of producing that item. Measures of this kind that are thrust upon the community by a Government or any other supplier or service organisation are irrecoverable by that section of the community, unlike the secondary industry groups, which are in a position to assess their costs, albeit under competition in their field. They are able to derive a price and tag the item for market that they are offering to the community or to the consumer.

Primary producers generally will see the situation with which we are faced as yet another burden in relation to which they have no hope of recovery from any activity of farming practice. I have read the second reading explanation that accompanied the Bill and I cannot find any indication of where the Government, the Premier, the Premier's officers in Treasury or anyone else on behalf of the Government has consulted with groups that represent the rural sector in South Australia. This is yet another example of this Government's ignoring that important portion of the community, on which we all, one way or another, depend.

I would have thought that out of courtesy to about 23 000 primary producers in South Australia the Government might have signalled its intention or at least made some attempt to consult with those people, or the organisations representing them, to gain an indication of the impact of the new duty and gain a better understanding of the burdens that already exist as well as the additional burden that this legislation will impose on that section of the community. Someone mentioned tonight that a farmer this year may recover from the sale of his wheat, for example, a \$200 000 receipt on which automatically, under this Bill, the sum of \$80 is attracted as duty payable to the State Government. That is on receipt of that sum.

On deposit in that primary producer's account, that gross return attracts a further \$80 duty. On distribution of that gross amount to those who have an entitlement or a share in the sum in regard to expenses resulting from producing that amount, each transaction attracts pro rata duty at the defined rate, that is, .04c in each dollar. All the way down the line, whether it involves two, three, four or five or more transactions involving that one gross return for the farmer's product, each transaction attracts multiple duty.

Certainly, it is not a one-off tax, like income tax or like stamp duty on the gross return or the taxable return or any identifiable figure, but a clouded and multiple application of a penalty—in this case it is described as a duty—levied on that section of the community which has no hope of recovering a return. I do not know how far you, Mr Speaker, will allow members to canvass the impact on the communities of the duty this legislation attracts, and I do not feel inclined on this occasion to test the limits of your patience in that direction, but I cannot emphasise strongly enough the concern that I have for the community, and that section of the community in particular to which I have referred, and the lack of appreciation, understanding and feeling that

this Government continually demonstrates with respect to the rural sector.

I have referred to the example of the gross return of a wheat farmer in a year such as this but, generally speaking, even in the ordinary season, the amounts of money that a farmer is required to receive, distribute, pay in wages, the range of expenses and financial involvements of a primary producer, are vast. His involvement in merchandise and all the other items that go with the maintenance of his stock, plant, pasture, land, buildings and ratings is in many respects wider and more comprehensive than those that apply to other small businesses in the community.

I have referred to small businesses in this instance because, although primary producers tend to be seen by the community at large as big business people with big, wide-brimmed hats, having big flash motor cars, and all those other wild allegations that they are branded with, generally the vast majority are small business people in the community who, by virtue of the stock and produce in which they are involved, are required to handle large sums of money, but it has no bearing whatever on the net return to primary producers at the end of each financial year.

I suggest, with respect, that the vast majority of primary producers in South Australia are receiving less money than are many salaried employees in the Public Service and in other employment in the community. Farmers' returns, in the wash-up, are quite meagre, but they are trapped within a system that requires them to become involved with the handling of large sums of money and with multiple transactions. Accordingly, they become victims of legislation such as that now before us. I have no sympathy for this Government in its efforts to raise large amounts of revenue. I believe that there are a number of areas of activity within the system generally, and within the Public Service structure particularly, where costs could be pruned considerably, so that by shifting funds from an area of wastage to one of effective use the Government could prune its calls upon the community for greater taxation returns.

It is quite appalling that the Premier and his Ministers sit here and in the other place expecting to retain any degree of credibility after the Premier's announcements prior to the last State election, when he gave an unqualified undertaking to the community that there would be no increases in taxes or charges and that no new tax measures introduced during his term of office, yet on his first birthday in office we see that there have been upwards of 70 such increases in taxes imposed upon the community at large. To be hit with this further tax on that birthday is no credit to the Government generally, or to the Premier particularly, in his capacity as Treasurer. I intend to support a range of amendments which have been prepared and which will be introduced during the Committee stages of the Bill in an attempt to modify the impact of this legislation. This is done in an attempt to introduce some fairness in the application of the duty so that it is applied to that section of the community that can reasonably absorb such increases and not to the section of the community that should avoid the burden of such a measure.

I hope that my remarks on behalf of the rural sector generally, and of those people in the community who have no way of passing on this added cost or incorporating it in the sale of their produce in order to get a portion of it back, might cause the Premier to consult with Treasury officers and officers agricultural and rural departments under his administration so that he comes to realise, before he gets too far down the track, what a real impact this will have and what an added burden it will be on those people we all represent and on whose behalf I have a duty to speak. I will make a significant contribution in support of the proposed amendments to this Bill during the Committee stages.

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I oppose the Bill. This is the fourth time, during the short time I have been a member of this House, I have risen to speak about taxation increases. We have another brand new taxation system being introduced, after this Government's promising the people of South Australia that there would be no increases in taxes or charges during its term of office.

In fact, of course, we have had in that short period (some 12 months to this week) 72 increases in charges, some of them exceptionally significant; others—some of the charges in registrations—small as they may be, have shown significant percentage increases. Of course, this new tax, which is now imposed on a very broad range of the community, is the first new tax imposed since 1974, and is a burden with which every South Australian will at some stage be hit. As was said earlier today, it will be imposed on items from children's bank books through big and small businesses to charities and sporting clubs—a very broadly-based taxation impost which I do not believe we need at this time.

In the past few days, probably the biggest cry coming to my electorate office has been about the increase in Electricity Trust charges, which have gone up approximately 40 per cent in the time of this Government. The first increase, of course, was in the pipeline prior to this Government's coming into office, and it cannot be blamed for that.

The most significant increase, as was pointed out today, was due to the change in interest charges, which rose from some 6 per cent to some 12 per cent on loans, and which represents 6 per cent of the increase in tariff, or some 50 per cent of the current increase charged to the constituent. Now we have the introduction of a brand new tax which will bring to the Government some \$22 million—a net effect of some \$14 million in a year. It is, as I said, the first new tax introduced in this State since about 1974, in the Dunstan era.

I would like to ask the Premier to explain to the House the definition of 'receipts' on page 3 of the Bill. There is a tremendous amount of confusion in the community at the moment about this definition, which reads:

'Receipt' includes a payment, repayment, deposit or subscription and the crediting of an account.

That virtually says an inward and outward movement of money generally, and there is confusion at this stage as to what the word 'receipt' means. I hope that, in his reply to the second reading debate, the Premier will fully clarify what is meant by this definition.

Large charitable institutions in this State will be taxed for the first time with this new tax. In this case, we have heard today cases of churches (and in particular the Catholic and the Uniting Churches), where sums of between \$20 000 and \$40 000 out of their working capital will be paid. Admittedly, a large percentage of this money will be paid back to them at the end of the financial year, but that money will be held by the Government interest free, out of use of the churches and charitable organisations in their useful work for the disadvantaged and in the charity work generally done by them. In the area of working capital, it is an extra \$60 000 which they are unable to use towards necessary work. The financial institutions duty is a new tax but one which has been levied in New South Wales and Victoria at the rate of 3c in \$100. In this State it is 33 per cent higher, at a rate of 4c in \$100.

Mr Groom: On \$60 000 that is \$24.

Mr INGERSON: As I am reminded by the member for Hartley, it is an extra \$24 that people in South Australia will have to pay, as opposed to those people in Victoria and New South Wales who do not have to pay it.

Mr Groom: Charities will get it back.

Mr INGERSON: But other people will not. The Premier made the comment about making South Australia the finan-

cial centre of Australia. If we are disadvantaged in terms of financial transactions people will shift their money into other areas. We are the highest taxed State in this area and it will be a disadvantage to many people who move money from State to State. Commenting on the Premier's statement that an inquiry into the taxation system will be carried out, hopefully we will see some action in that area fairly quickly. That was a promise made by the Premier after the election, that the State taxation system or the revenue building system would be seriously looked at, and that this would be done very quickly.

After 12 months we have seen a massive rise in taxes: over \$100 million extra tax this year. Interestingly enough, we still ended with a deficit of about \$5 million. There has been a massive rise in taxation, but apparently in the near future there will be an inquiry into the system. Hopefully that will be done before the next election which could prove to be interesting for us all. The tax, as well as affecting any small business which shifts money both internally and externally, will affect small companies that operate at both the wholesale and retail level, bringing money in at the lower or wholesale level and shifting money through, at small profit, into the retail area. An example of that is the small motor dealers who purchase motor vehicles at a wholesale price, usually through a particular company, and then sell them, usually through another company, at a retail price. Those companies will pay double tax, or there will be 'double dipping' as far as this tax is concerned. I ask the Premier to look at this area and hopefully he can resolve some of the problems created.

Even though I am opposed to this tax, it is a broad-based tax and one which, if it is to be introduced, the Government ought to contemplate introducing because of that fact and because it is fairer than some of the taxes currently being levied. This tax will raise about \$4.5 million from householders and some of the areas caught by this tax are in the house purchase area and household banking accounts, whether it involves children's and adults' bank accounts, normal transactions of depositing money in bank accounts, or the payment of rent from household bank accounts.

They are the areas where it is a little unfair and I think that those particular areas should be looked at. As far as business is concerned, whether it be small or large business, any increase in expense unfortunately is passed on to the consumer, and the effect of any of these taxation pushes is that the consumer ends up paying, irrespective of the size of the burden. This one is an extra tax which will be passed straight on to the consumer so that, in the final instance, the consumer pays more and continues paying a loaded-on rolled-on tax, and the escalating retail prices have become an area of concern to all people today.

Any tax that is added on anywhere must result in increasing retail prices. I am now talking particularly about the retail industry, but the same applies to any industry where goods are sold. In relation to banking institutions, there is no question at all that this tax will not be absorbed but will be passed on. It was noted earlier today that, because of the quickness of the introduction of this tax, some of the institutions will not be ready for it because of the inability to get computer programmes prepared. It is a pity that, having known about this tax when the Budget was introduced, it was not brought down earlier to give people time to get their house in order.

As reported earlier today, one large State banking institution will be considerably out of pocket because of the rapid bringing on of this Bill. Of course, the other area of concern relates to the payment of wages where large numbers of people have their wages paid straight into their bank accounts. It seems that, here again, we have a tax very similar to the pay-roll tax. Both of these iniquitous taxes

are paid on wages. It is a pity that this sort of tax may encourage the use of a cash system and it is noted that cash transactions are not covered by this tax. Knowing the way that business works, business will adapt to change and make changes to shift money around in different ways within a system, and individuals will do the same. Therefore, it is a general encouragement towards a cash economy which is something which I do not believe that Governments ought to be doing.

Another area of concern relates to sporting clubs. In fact, this sort of tax is a tax on leisure and recreation activities. All the transactions of community groups will be heavily taxed. I have already referred to the problems that churches will have. Also, there is a problem of schools in the collection of money for their general funding, which will be caught up with this institution tax. Those are the sorts of organisations that the Premier should be considering in regard to making some sort of dispensation.

In the electorate that I represent there are two very large fund-raising organisations, the Julia Farr Centre and the Queen Victoria Hospital, both of which are run by heavy endorsement from fund-raising organisations. It seems a pity to me that the fund-raising activities of those organisations are to be caught up in this institution tax measure. The Queen Victoria Hospital provides a service for young children coming into being. Some \$9 million to \$10 million a year is raised in charity funds by the Julia Farr Centre, and those will now be taxed. Also, there is the Good Friday and Telethon appeals as well as the Red Cross and the anti-cancer appeals which will also be subject to the provisions of this Bill.

Another area of concern is the situation that arises should a person change his place of residence. If a person moves to a new house and wants to open up a new bank account that person will be caught up in making that change or if a person needs to have another account he will be caught up in any double dipping. I have already spoken on the matter of double dipping from wages, and I am concerned that a situation will exist whereby tax is collected by way of payroll tax and f.i.d. tax from the same amount of money. As far as housing is concerned, there is a possible problem concerning the three or four transactions involved in the purchase and sale of houses and one could have three or four payments of duty on the sale of one house. This is a matter that hopefully the Premier will address. In that area there is the problem of trust accounts of land agents, brokers and solicitors, a matter which hopefully will be considered during the Committee stage.

Earlier I referred to the fact that the tax in South Australia is .04 per cent or 4c in every \$100 whereas in the major competing States of New South Wales and Victoria it is 3c in every \$100. Even though the maximum payment in South Australia is \$400 compared with a maximum of \$300 in the other States, that is sufficient on a transaction on a one-off basis for some people dealing in this State to consider moving their accounts, perhaps to Queensland (where there is no tax at all), as was suggested earlier today. However, such people would probably move their accounts to Victoria and New South Wales in preference to making transactions here in South Australia.

In conclusion, I refer to a point I made earlier, namely, again we have an example of a further charge even though it was maintained that there would be no increases in State taxes or charges. Under the previous Liberal Government there was a reduction of some 5.2 per cent in taxation, whereas during the past 12 months there has been an increase in taxation of some 15 per cent. I refer again to some of these areas as well as to church and sporting bodies. We can again look at the fact that here we have specific organisations which are doing charity work and whose money is generally being used for disadvantaged people. It involves

people who generally spend a lot of time working for those who need help in the community.

We have, in this instance, a tax that is virtually taking significant sums of money out of their working capital for at least 12 months. That money is being refunded at that time but they are working funds that could and should be made available for these charities to enable them to get on with the job of looking after disadvantaged groups. Many of the church areas are working with alcoholics, drug addicts, and so on. To have their funds reduced or to be put out of use is something at which I hope this Government will look. To sum up, I am disappointed that we have again introduced into this place another new tax, and I will oppose the measure.

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

A quorum having been formed:

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): We heard it 12 months ago this week and we have been hearing it for four weeks: 'We want South Australia to win.' Who made that statement? It was the Labor Party, in particular the Premier. I wonder now how he feels about the claims he made during the election campaign 12 months ago. I wonder now how everyone in South Australia feels about the claims he made in that election campaign 12 months ago. More importantly, I wonder how the people of South Australia feel not only about the claims but also about the taxes that they have had to bear, in spite of the promises made to them at that time.

Mr Meier: Very let down.

Mr LEWIS: I dare say they would. The record indicates that they would be entitled to feel that way about it. The Deputy Premier would know, much to his chagrin, that that is exactly how people in South Australia are feeling about the performance of the Government of which he is a Minister—very let down, very much deceived and very unhappy. He must be feeling very uncomfortable, along with you, Madam Acting Speaker, because the effect of these measures that we have seen brought before this House in the past 12 months, and particularly this measure, has been to discredit the capacity of the Labor Party to be given any trust whatever by the electorate. Statements and claims were made that the Labor Administration before the election knew what it was going into, and that there was no necessity to increase taxation by any means whatsoever to deliver the promises it was making.

We have, nonetheless, found that the contrary has been true. That must make you, Madam Acting Speaker, feel very uncomfortable in your marginal seat because it means that the people of South Australia have begun to understand that they cannot trust you, the Premier, the Ministry and the Labor Party. It is not capable of making statements that are trustworthy.

We have only to look barely 18 months ago (on 27 May 1982) at some of the statements made on behalf of the Labor Party by the then Leader of the Opposition and now Premier:

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.

Have we had a thorough and wide-ranging inquiry conducted into the way in which the State raises its funds? It has not been brought to my attention or that of any other member on this side of the Parliament, nor to the public of South Australia. On 27 May, on the A.B.C. news Mr Bannon said:

The inquiry will be established by the next Government, by us in Government. Obviously, if there is any major change 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.

What proposals were put to the people of South Australia at the election? They were quite clearly that there would be no increases in taxes and charges, no new taxes and no backdoor taxes. Yet, quite the contrary has occurred.

This measure is part of that contrary action. In respect of the undertakings given, in spite of the promises and commitments made by what are called, by themselves amongst themselves, honourable men, men of principle, men who can be trusted and men who have never said anything to mislead anybody (women are included in that statement), I do not find that adds up very accurately very well at all with the record. That is in the first 12 months. We have two years to go. Heaven knows what sort of horrors the South Australian people can expect during the next two years if this is what they have had to put up with, as indeed they have had to put up with in the first year of this Government's term of office.

It is small wonder that I feel compelled to point out to this House and to the people of South Australia that this Government is incapable of surviving if it expects to survive on its record and on its integrity. The Government's record is not plausible or credible, and it has no integrity. This is the first new tax of its kind that has been introduced into South Australia for eight or 10 years, and it has been introduced by a Government that came to power on the promise primarily that it would not increase taxes or introduce new taxes. In July 1982, the Premier was quoted in the *Advertiser* as saying:

We have no plans to increase State taxation.

This measure is yet another increase in taxation of the kind that we were promised would not occur. This is not just an increase in overall taxation, but a new tax. It has never been seen before: it is in diapers at this time. In October, just over 12 months ago, during the election campaign the now Premier made a policy speech. If one can believe anything, surely one can believe a politician's policy speech. Small wonder that the public calls into question our credibility and integrity when statements like that are made. The present Premier further stated:

The A.L.P. will not reintroduce succession duties—

the Government has not done that yet—

and will not introduce new taxes or increase existing levels of taxes during our term of office.

Those statements were made in a policy speech, but within 12 months the Government has turned its back on its promise. Perhaps people think it is legitimate to expect political opponents to expose the inadequacies of their opposition, and maybe members opposite would choose to cynically regard the remarks I am making as nothing more than they would expect from a political opponent. However, I put to members opposite that the people of South Australia are feeling that way right now.

What happened on 4 November, still before the last State election? A question was put to Mr Bannon, the now Premier, and as I understand it by preamble the journalist stated:

Cain [Mr Cain, the Premier of Victoria] had been given certain information which proved to be wrong.

Apparently, the Premier of Victoria had given explanations as to why, after he had been elected, he had had an about-face. Mr Cain did exactly what the Labor Party in South Australia has done—he increased taxes, imposed higher charges, and sought to discover new taxes that he could impose. The journalist then asked Mr Bannon:

But could that happen to you?

And remember, this was on 4 November, before the last State election. In reply, Mr Bannon stated:

We have the Auditor-General's Reports, the programme and performance budget information, the Premier's [Mr Tonkin's] own speeches on the economy.

Clearly then, Mr Bannon was intimating that he understood the Treasury position and that he was well aware of the circumstances he would find in the event that he won government. That statement gives the lies to arguments put forward by the Premier and other speakers who have supported the Government's trying to explain to the public of South Australia how it can justify a complete abrogation of every undertaking it ever gave, every contract it made with the majority of electors in this State prior to the last State election. Remember, that was 4 November, before the last State election, 12 months ago.

On 17 November, as was pointed out by my Deputy Leader in his remarks and by my Leader, immediately after the election we heard the Premier (to use the terms of the Deputy Leader) back-peddalling flat out, without even turning around to see where he was going; he knew he had to go backwards fast. He knew we would have to face some financial dilemmas. Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr LEWIS: There we were, with the Premier sitting on his seat facing frontwards, pedalling backwards flat out, saying on 17 November last year, not even 12 months ago, that we would face financial dilemmas. I refer to the *News* report attributed to him, where he states:

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

By that time the Premier was in Government and casting around for reasons to justify raising the extra revenue needed to meet some of the promises he had made to the electorate for the provision of goods and services. We know what has gone on behind the scenes in that regard. Of course, this measure seeks to impose a completely new tax on every transaction conducted by a citizen or body corporate through financial institutions. That is the f.i.d. tax—I guess we could call it the fido tax, where the dog runs around, rounds up the things that need to be rounded up, and puts them in place. Regrettably, Mr Speaker, I must draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. Peter Duncan interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: I think that is wonderful: I have just had a message delivered to me on behalf of the Labor Party by the member for Elizabeth—

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Not on behalf—

Mr LEWIS:—well, on your own behalf—to let me know in no uncertain terms that if I keep requiring the Government to provide the quorum in this Chamber he will make a speech about it in appropriate language. I do not mind that. I wish he would; I will look forward to it. I am sure that it will go on record as one of the most interesting if infamous speeches that the member for Elizabeth will have ever made as a contribution in this place.

The sooner it is over with the better. We need to understand what Governments' responsibilities are, not only to the people but also to Parliament. If Governments cannot understand them, then I guess that Oppositions will have to ensure that such matters are brought to their attention as often as necessary. I will explain to members present, and those not present (such as the member for Elizabeth, who has just left the Chamber followed by the Premier and the Minister of Housing), that when Governments make these moves to collect public revenue in this way it has an unfortunate effect on the economy and the confidence of the private sector. This is because funds are taken from the private sector and put into the public sector. In the process of so doing, as is being done by this measure, jobs are destroyed in the private sector.

Every dollar collected as a tax dollar from the private sector is incapable of being invested to provide another job,

or of being spent to form part of the wage necessary to sustain that job in the private sector. Such action transfers that money from the private sector to the public sector. In the process of so doing, it not only transfers the job from the private sector to the public sector but also becomes an additional burden and a disincentive to the private sector.

This tax misses nobody—it casts its net very wide indeed. The only people who can possibly avoid it are those who do not have any reliance whatsoever on any financial institution; in other words, if they have a home they have paid cash for, and have never relied on a bank or any other financial institution to take care of their funds. It is the kind of tax that discourages thrift. It is the kind of tax that discourages trust in Governments because it is introduced by stealth and in contravention of promises made that it would not be introduced.

It also encourages people to hoard their money, to stash it away in old socks, Ovaltine tins, under the bed, behind the hob, in the fireplace, or wherever they can put it where they think it will not be found so that they will not have to pay tax on it. Make no bones about it, this is just the start: this .04 of a cent in every \$100 is just the beginning, but where will it end? When income tax was first introduced by this State and then transferred to the Commonwealth Government it began at modest levels, not much different from this tax. However, it was less than half a century before that tax became, on average, about a third of every person's annual income after their allowable legitimate deductions for their family, sustenance and essentials. First, we see the beginning at almost a painless level and we see that idea accepted. Once the idea is accepted and does not seem to be very painful, the amount is increased. Governments have learned how to pluck the goose without too much squawking, as Governments have done systematically and continuously this century. I am not complaining about the necessity for Governments to raise revenue. Rather, I am complaining about the deceitful ways in which they do it, such as the way we see being used in this instance. The principle is then established that the Government transfers money from the private sector, the citizen, to the Government to finance further programmes involving Government expenditure.

By making these remarks I do not mean to imply that the projects about which I have complained as being necessary for the people whom I represent are in any way less than necessary. They are essential if the people whom I represent are to be given an equivalent or equal share or (to use a word which has come into misuse in recent years) some equity—'equity' does not mean 'equality' or 'even-handedness'; it actually means having a grub stake in the outfit. I notice that by stealth and trickery it was first used by an advocate of the A.C.T.U. before an industrial tribunal, and it is intended ultimately by using it in that way that everyone will think that it means 'equality', whereas what they really will be arguing for is a slice of the share capital in due course. But that is an aside, and an explanation that I give to this House as to why I think that it has come into misuse.

The people whom I represent have been ignored for too long, and the projects about which I have spoken in this place as requiring attention and expenditure from Government sources of public funds are their just entitlement to make them equal in their share of the kinds of services which are seen in this democracy of ours to be properly provided at public expense. Therefore, I am not saying by arguing against this new tax that there ought not to be some commitment to provide the people whom I represent with their fair share of the tax dollars to which they contribute; I am not saying that at all, and it would be quite wrong of the Premier or any other Minister to interpret my remarks

in that way. I am saying that there are some additional forms of expenditure and Government programmes being undertaken that it is simply not possible to afford at this time.

We are ahead, if one can call it that, of our time with those kinds of programmes. There is too much inequality in the incidence of taxation and the expenditure of that tax money at present in society for those programmes to be mooted. I need only to refer across time to things such as the lack of universal free education for all children 100 years ago. In fact, when the First Fleet landed here we did not have any welfare services; the people stood up and made a go of it or died. It is only because we have saved some of yesterday's efforts and put them aside against tomorrow's misfortunes that we have been collectively able to improve our lot.

We ought to look very closely at the incentives which have been provided in this country by successive Governments over the years since we first settled this continent with Europeans and which have generated that wealth and prosperity. We ought not ignore the lessons that have come to us from an examination of that history. There needs to be incentive, and if we tax the effort that is made by people and companies in the private sector to the extent that we destroy the incentive we will kill the goose that lays the golden egg and we will not have it here.

The effect of this taxation in this State and in the other Labor States of the mainland of Australia will be wherever it is or has been introduced to drive citizens and organisations out of their States with their financial activities. The services that they seek from financial institutions can be happily obtained in Queensland. Let us consider for a moment: it is within the right of all employees in this State to require the employers to provide them with a bank cheque upon which they will not have to pay any 'fids' or fiddlers—that is, this tax. They can then mail those cheques to their bank accounts in Queensland, withdraw their funds as they need them in the form of cash or otherwise on those accounts, either by using the credit card automated teller systems that we have now introduced or by operating on a cheque account in that State. So, the tax in those terms is self-defeating. We heard this Premier and this Government say prior to the last election that they wanted South Australia to become the financial institutions centre of Australia.

According to the Premier, it would encourage the development of financial institutions activity and so create jobs and bring decision-making here. This kind of tax smacks of quite the opposite in practice and will indeed mean that it will drive business in the financial institutions out of this State—not only out of this State but out of the Southern States and into Queensland. People will work out, whether I say it or not, that the simplest way to conduct their business, without losing any of their money to this form of taxation, is to open their accounts with financial institutions that will take care of their funds in Queensland, where they will never have to pay this tax. They will be able to withdraw cash from accounts in South Australia and therefore pay any bills they incur, if not with cash then with cheques drawn on that account, and not have to pay any of this tax.

I regret that it is necessary for me to draw to the attention of the House and the State the regrettable effect which this kind of tax, indeed any tax, has on inflation. Public sector inflation is running at an all-time high, disproportionately to private sector inflation: it is presently higher and has been for some time. I refer to an article written by Jacob Abrahami in the current edition of the *Australian Institute of Public Affairs Review*, of Spring, 1983, which states:

The price increases imposed by Federal and State Governments in their recent Budgets—

and this tax is not only post-Budget, but it is a new one; it is no different from any other tax—

For a range of goods are yet to be reflected in published consumer price indices. Yet even before the latest range of imposts were announced—

and this is part of them—

it was clear that Governments and their authorities have been far less disciplined in restraining prices—

which will have to be met finally by the citizen—

than the private sector.

I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard*—

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

Mr BAKER (Mitcham): I, too, rise in opposition to this Bill. Many of the reasons for the viewpoint taken by this side have already been adequately expressed and need no repeating. However, a number of aspects of the Bill are quite Draconian and need a complete rethink. Of course, in principle, the Party on this side of the House at least is a low-tax Party; it was a low-tax Government, and we proved that during our three years in office from 1979-82. Here we see a compounding of the taxation measures by the State Labor Government which will seriously affect the people of this State and eventually bring about the demise of the Labor Government. The little that we can do is to express our opinions and dissatisfaction regarding these measures which, as I have said, hit at the heart of the South Australian population.

Many areas have already been outlined. Charitable organisations have been mentioned, and that is a serious problem. There has also been the double-dipping and triple-dipping that occurs when moneys are transferred from one account to another on a variety of transactions, and there is the well quoted case of land transactions. A number of other sticky areas have been mentioned, areas where measures such as this will cause enormous problems. However, what I would like to fundamentally address tonight is the cost of implementing this measure. In his second reading explanation, the Premier said:

We are aware of the difficulties which financial institutions will face in complying with the legislation from 1 December 1983, particularly in view of the comparatively late announcement of the details of the Bill. Transitional provisions have, therefore, been included to enable duty to be paid on an estimated basis for the first three months. In recognition of the special problems faced by South Australian institutions provision has been made for an extension of this transitional period in exceptional circumstances.

That is an absolute indictment of this taxation. What it really says is, 'We did it all in a bit of a rush, and we really did not take enough care, but we have a let-out clause so that people can, if they like, make some approximations.' However, the Premier does not suggest how these approximations can be converted into retrieval of cash. Therefore, he is quite willing for the institutions to pay the duty on those transactions for which they have no adequate recording methods, but he has not allowed for them to recoup the duty so collected. Why did not the Premier give details early? Why did he not give sufficient time?

One of the major thrusts of our amendments will be to defer the date of introduction until 1 February 1984. At least this gives some element of fairness and provides some opportunity for the institutions to gear up properly for the introduction of f.i.d. The Leader of the Opposition has mentioned at least two cases where the costs of complying with the Act will be quite significant. Let me say that the costs of implementing this measure would have been very high in any event, but the way in which the Premier has gone about it has increased the costs considerably. From

talking to members of at least two financial institutions involved, it is my estimate that the cost of setting up the facilities and systems to handle this legislation will be very close to equal to one year's duty. That means that we are placing on these financial institutions the burden of some \$20 million in setting up and running the system.

The Premier should have taken the time to talk to members of these institutions and understand the sort of problems that are being felt not only in the computer systems themselves but in the staffing area, where there will be great difficulty particularly in explaining to older people why they are getting debits on their savings accounts. I know that the financial institutions are very concerned that a large number of people will be asking, 'What is happening to our savings accounts?' When speaking to one gentleman on this aspect today, I was told one of the problems when the Commonwealth transactions debit tax came into effect was that an enormous number of people asked why this tax was being put on them. It got to the stage where the institutions concerned said, 'We will bear the cost of this measure. The administration associated with this measure is far too expensive.' They were willing to forgo the tax to the Commonwealth so that they could give their customers the service they deserved.

That same gentleman said that, because of the enormous burden being pressed, they can no longer carry both State and Commonwealth transaction taxes which are somewhat different in nature but which impact again on the citizens of South Australia, and this will bring on the Commonwealth taxation in that area. So, at least for some institutions we will see the introduction of both a Commonwealth and a State tax. Of course, some other institutions have already had the Commonwealth tax applied. I cannot stress too highly the problems that will be caused to people who traditionally use their savings accounts for a variety of purposes, but mainly to process their pension cheques or their child welfare or endowment cheques. Such people will be asking the financial institutions why they have a debit shown against their balance. Therefore, there will be long queues in those institutions.

Mr Lewis: Of course there will be.

Mr BAKER: There will be a lot of heartache. Of course, if that is extended one step further one can then contemplate what impact this tax could have.

Mr Lewis: What does the Government care about that?

Mr BAKER: It does not care. They did not even give any time for education within the banking system itself or the customers who will be affected by it. A large number of cheques for salaries, pensions, child endowment or superannuation are paid into banks. Also, a large proportion of people who pay those cheques into the banks operate their accounts on virtually a zero balance. The money is received by the bank, it might be left in the account for a day or two and it is then taken out. What this measure will force people to do is to request Commonwealth instrumentalities to forward their cheques by post. Everyone knows that the postal system is inefficient in regard to the sending out of cheques. There are losses, and there are costs associated with the postal system. Anyone who has any idea of mathematics would realise that it is far cheaper for debits to be made on those accounts through the system which pays the cheque into an individual account rather than pay the costs associated with posting out cheques to an individual. Payment of this cost will be simply transferred. The Commonwealth Government will then have to bear the cost of sending cheques through the mail because people will decide that they do not want cheques forwarded to their savings account where they will attract a debit.

Mr Lewis: That will create jobs!

Mr BAKER: It will create jobs—we will have a few more Commonwealth public servants.

Mr Lewis: And higher postage charges.

Mr BAKER: Yes. Perhaps there will be benefits to the system, although I really cannot envisage that because the system will become less efficient. So, on a cost benefit basis a movement from payment of funds into a bank account to payment by way of the postal system will be less efficient and something that I would not like to see. There are two angles to consider: the economic angle and the security aspect. We are all aware that older people are at risk if they hold large amounts of money. If people feel that by receiving money into their accounts it will attract a debit, no matter how small that cost, then many of them will consider using the cash system which will place them at greater risk than they would otherwise be.

Mr Lewis: There could be increased crime.

Mr BAKER: This measure has a whole range of ramifications. Institutions have to spend a lot of time with their customers when there is any small change in the arrangements of the operation of those institutions. The impact of the measure now being considered by the House has not yet filtered through to the people of South Australia who are being treated quite shabbily in this matter as are the financial institutions.

Mr Lewis: They were not even consulted.

Mr BAKER: They never are consulted.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mallee has had his allocated time for contribution to this debate and he should not intrude into the member for Mitcham's time. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr BAKER: The aspect of costs to the system is very interesting. I have mentioned the fact that the initial setting up of the system will involve an enormous cost which very likely will equal the income derived from the first year's duty. In itself that is an indictment of the way in which the Government has introduced this measure. It has given the institutions insufficient time. Because of the pressure placed on the institutions involved they are having to develop systems and adapt existing systems to cater for this tax.

The institutions have to do it in a greater hurry than they should. The Premier stands condemned on his lack of sensitivity on the way the measure has been introduced. He could have let the Bill lay for some two or three months to allow the institutions to adjust but he has not done that. It is all very well to say that we will have an averaging system where one can put in an approximate return to the Treasurer, who will determine the duty. However, those institutions have no way of recouping the money.

To do an exercise in mathematics, for the people who dreamt up this marvellous scheme: in South Australia today we have 2.258 million operative Savings Bank accounts. If those accounts are turned over but once on average—some will be turned over a number of times a month whilst others will go on for months without any change—we would have 2.3 million transactions—an enormous number.

Mr Lewis: I wonder how much each one is worth.

Mr BAKER: That is the interesting point. How much is each transaction worth to the system? It must be worth at least .01 per cent. That is the figure I have. This system will not only cost the citizen of South Australia for his duty but will also cost him, as the banks will have to bear that burden as well. They will have to put up their charges: it is simple mathematics. We are going to create an increased cost so that not only are we taking 4c in every \$100 but also we are taking \$20 million for setting-up costs and another 25 per cent at least in servicing costs with the computer. That is a minimum figure. It is difficult for the institutions to estimate such a figure.

On the estimate for queries and time spent with customers, there is also an enormous cost as resources will have to be diverted, if the experience with the Commonwealth tax is any guide. Initially an enormous amount of resources will be tied up in explaining to customers what has happened to their accounts. We are not talking about a taxation measure that can be implemented simply—it has some horrific consequences.

On that point, how is the tax supposed to work for those people who deposit very little? We have the schoolchildren who put 20c into their bank account every week. If one is a mathematical genius one will know that that is only 80c a month and that 4c in \$100 will be difficult to debit against such accounts. I will assume that the Savings Bank would carry that cost as the cost of administering it would be enormous. That is the situation regarding schoolchildren. We have had no direction on what will happen in that case—we only know that the bank will have to cut its losses in that area. What about the small transactions area? If we say that certain bank accounts—a large proportion—have an average of \$25 deposit every month, each account will be debited with one cent. Not only will we be upsetting those customers—

Mr Lewis: It is 1c out, too.

Mr BAKER: Yes, when they take it out and put it somewhere else there is another problem, but let us say they put \$25 in. Let us look at that situation. That costs the banks 1c for that transaction. The Government is getting its 1c. It is costing the bank 1c. In that situation the additional cost is 100 per cent. There are literally millions of transactions a month within the financial institutions.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BAKER: Yes, \$22 million, actually. They will do a little bit of a trade-off. If anyone wants a fundamental lesson in computers, one will understand that the computer files are set up with various fields. They have various storage and processing capacities. That is why the initial setting up has become such an enormous task, because in many instances they do not have a system which can be managed within the existing fields. In some cases, they have to expand their capacity. In other cases, they have to reorient their systems.

Little appreciation is given to the fact that computers have made this tax a little more palatable than having a clerk sitting down working out that for every \$25 he has to take off 1c. The cost in that respect would be absolutely astronomical. Computers have facilitated this tax, but they carry with them costs in their own right. Computer systems that have been developed in some ways do not cater for the sort of things that we are seeing here today.

I would like the Premier to suggest how the banks will carry the burden. I understand that he is quite happy for bank charges to go up to cover the additional costs to which I have already alluded. They are not small costs; they are very significant. Unfortunately, I could not get from the available statistics the number of accounts which process very small amounts. From what I could gather, there were 2.3 million deposit accounts, and during June 1983 \$1.1 billion was deposited in the savings bank system.

In the trading bank system, of course, we have larger amounts. The costs there of administering small accounts will not be so high because the number of accounts is, I think, approximately one-tenth of those in the savings bank system, but the amount held is approximately double. So, there are difficulties in the savings bank system just as there are in the building society system and credit unions, some of which are still in the process of setting their records up on computer.

The Premier (I want to make this point quite clear) has not had the decency to allow many of these institutions to

allow their computer systems to develop rationally. He has rushed through the duty. One effect of this could well be that their total system will be upset because they are not even allowed to develop it in the way in which they have done in the past. They suddenly have to cater for this particular transaction. As we all know, the computer development lead times are quite significant, particularly in the software area. There are a number of packages available, but they are generalised and do not necessarily meet the needs of individual institutions. I think it is disgraceful that the Premier has not taken the time to work out this particular area.

I would like to now make a brief reference to the Act. I have read the second reading explanation and have gone through some sections of the Act. One of the questions that we will ask the Premier—and I am sure that he will be able to respond to us—is, for example, ‘What is the mean distribution of number of deposits made and the standard deviation of those deposits and the amounts that are being deposited?’

The Premier should be able to answer these questions, because he has introduced this tax. We will ask him questions about what will happen to the piggy banks of schoolchildren—that is a very interesting problem. Does the Premier expect the banks to subsidise this area? The banks already subsidise in terms of manpower, but does the Premier suggest that they wear this cost? The Premier has introduced this measure knowing that the banks will have to pick up that cost. Will he be able to give some details of the estimated cost of setting up the system in South Australia? Obviously, the Premier has consulted with the financial institutions and he will have those answers; if he does not have the answers, he should take this measure out of Parliament and start right from the beginning and do it properly.

I hope that the Premier will have an enormous amount of detail to provide in the Committee stage. It is not sufficient for him to say that this tax is a very good idea. The Premier has great ideas, but the problem is that he is very scant on detail. At last I have received answers to Questions on Notice, and I understand now why that took such a long time—the Premier must have considered whether or not he would answer my questions. I asked the Premier for a listing of all Government charges, fines and fares, either gazetted or announced in the media.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: These questions increase the cost and the burden on the Public Service—that is a nice attitude to take.

Mr BAKER: I missed the impact of the Premier's statement: I think he said that, if we do not approve these measures, the burden will fall on the Public Service.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: The questions that you ask are aimed at tying up the Public Service in a very costly manner: at the same time, you oppose any measure to try to raise revenue to employ people in the Public Service. That is quite inconsistent.

Mr BAKER: I would have thought the measures themselves had been well thought through, with the Premier understanding the impact on the institutions that have to comply. That is a simple fact. If the Premier does not have such detail, if he has not bothered to find out that detail, he has been quite remiss in his duty. As I stated previously, I have asked questions about the taxation measures introduced and the Premier referred me to the Budget papers so that I could find the answers for myself. Of course, the Budget papers do not cover all those taxation measures. Admittedly, if the Premier had answered my Question on Notice, a few pages of *Hansard* might have been filled up in the process, but such action would have shown that the Government is quite willing to indicate clearly the areas of taxation.

Either the Government does not really know where its revenue is coming from or it is afraid that, once those areas are shown in list form, people will be more disappointed than they are already. I also asked about interest rate arrangements for the public sector, and this is a very critical issue, which affects ETSA and a number of other Government operations. In reply, it was stated:

A full discussion of the restructuring of public sector debt and interest rate arrangements is contained in attachment 5 of the Financial Statement of the Premier and Treasurer.

That is hardly a full reply. It was further stated:

Details of proposals for each department and statutory authority have been conveyed to each Minister and statutory authority concerned. Consultations are currently taking place with them. Until such consultations are completed and final decisions are taken, the Government believes it is inappropriate to release details for each particular department and statutory authority.

I thought the decision had been made: I thought we were talking about an averaging system. I intend to pursue this matter further, because this is another financial taxation measure in regard to those authorities which have traditionally worked on a low rate of interest on their borrowings and which have now been taken up to an average. I will be most disappointed if I find that there has been differential treatment in regard to some bodies. I am most disappointed that the Premier has resorted to this averaging measure.

This is what I mean; the Premier has said, ‘Seriously, you should not be opposing this measure.’ We are saying, ‘Seriously, Premier, you should know a little bit more about the measure; seriously, Premier, you should be able to give some details of its impact; seriously, Premier, we would like to know a little bit more about what will happen to South Australia as a result of this measure.’ It is no good to say that New South Wales, Victoria, and Western Australia already have this duty and it is working well.

I understand that it is not working well. A friend of mine works for a company with national links. He said that it is not working well, and he works with a firm dealing with pastoral enterprises. He said that the imposition of this duty is not working well and is causing enormous difficulties in some States. Whilst it may be an easy mechanism for the Premier to get a count of credits from each institution of \$5 million, \$200 million or \$1 billion, or whatever, and say that the Government will allocate the .04 per cent—that makes his job easy. However, it is not easy for the institutions. For them it means much hard work and the expending of much money. Returning to the Bill, I have some questions about its provisions. I do not claim to be a lawyer, but I find the secrecy provisions a very interesting aspect. Perhaps the Premier can advise the House about clause 12, which provides:

A person shall not divulge or communicate information that is or was acquired by him by reason of his being, or having been, employed in, or in connection with, the administration of this Act except—

- (a) with the consent of the person . . .
- (b) . . . the administration of this Act;
- (c) to an officer of the Commonwealth, or of a State or Territory of the Commonwealth . . .

That clause really means that the Premier can now have knowledge of all bank accounts in every banking institution in South Australia. I seek an explanation of that clause. There are a number of other clauses which I do not understand or about which I have some reservations. Can the Premier assure me that the imposition of this duty is not opening up new areas of Government control?

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

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

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 10 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): Honourable members well know that 6 November heralded 12 months of the present Government. This year 6 November fell on a Sunday. The State election was held 12 months ago on a Saturday. This year Saturday happened to be 5 November, which traditionally has been the day when Guy Fawkes has been recalled, remembering when a certain gentleman tried to blow up the Houses of Parliament in Britain. It seems here, after one year in office, that the Premier and his Government have made every attempt to blow up South Australia, because there is no doubt that South Australia unfortunately is losing.

Certainly, the promises were there, the desires were there: we want South Australia to win. Who did not want South Australia to win? Many people had grave reservations about whether a Labor Government could do it, and those reservations are being borne out here again in this Bill. It is most disconcerting, because this tax is not one in isolation, but comes on top of over 70 increases in taxes and charges over the past 12 months at the State level, excluding any Federal increases.

I believe that one must consider this financial institutions duty in relation to other taxes because there are right and wrong times to introduce new measures. It is clear to anyone who has any perception of current economic conditions that this is the wrong time to introduce a new tax. I say this because already there have been increases in the liquor turnover tax, tobacco tax, petrol tax and the insurance levy, as well as many charges. At the Federal level the most savage tax has been Hawke's 10 per cent withholding tax. As if these tax increases and new taxes were not enough, we now have this financial institutions duty being imposed. Coming in the same 12-month period as other tax increases, this tax will help to burn South Australia out; the whole of the State is affected by it.

The rural sector will be hit harder, once again, than the urban sector. I say this because rural people have less opportunity to pay for their transactions by cash than has the average urban dweller. Many of their payments have to be made to a central organisation, situated possibly in a capital city, so a cheque is the most often used means of making payments. Country people do not often have an opportunity to walk into a central office and pay in cash, so they cannot escape this duty. It will hurt farmers, particularly through their stock agents. One must, in this context, remember the word 'agent', because the stock agent acts for the farmer and finds markets for his goods. He often finds that there are several transactions involving the one cheque and if that happens the financial institutions duty will be paid more than once. The Premier looks at me in amazement. He does not live in a rural electorate. He would have found that when the withholding tax came in—

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: It is 40c on a \$1 000 cheque. Have you looked at it?

Mr MEIER: It seems that the Premier is not interested in small sums of money, and feels that they will not have any effect. I am talking about the rural community generally.

Ms Lenehan: Are they writing cheques for hundreds of thousands of dollars?

Mr MEIER: I think honourable members opposite will find, as the Leader pointed out, that one church group says this duty will be affecting it to the tune of \$30 000.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: They had not studied the rebate system—so they made a mistake.

Mr MEIER: Members opposite seem to be missing the point that this financial institutions duty is having a widespread effect and, even though it might involve small amounts, is affecting people in the farming community more than others because of the number of transactions involved. Members opposite ignore the fact that there may be only a few cents involved in some transactions. I do not think that that should be ignored. Governments make a big spiel about giving a few cents to people, but if they take a few cents away they say, 'What's a few cents? People are not going to miss it anyway.' The service clubs are part of another area where this financial institutions duty will be having some effect.

The service clubs, as people well realise, rely entirely on voluntary work and on voluntary contributions from people. We can consider them: Rotary, Lions, Apex, Jaycees, Rural Youth, Red Cross, C.W.A., business and professional women's organisations, and there are many others. All of that work is done freely. So often the person's time is more valuable in these service groups than in other areas, and the money raising is done not for their own benefit but for the benefit of others, but we realise that when these amounts of money going into financial institutions are processed through their bank accounts, they will be losing money, and the Government will be taking it. It must take some of the incentive away from many people who have done this voluntary work over the years. I also will be interested to hear the Premier's response later as to how it will be explained away.

Sports clubs have been mentioned previously. How many sports clubs do we have? So many: bowling clubs, tennis, basketball, netball, cricket, football, soccer, hockey, lacrosse, golf, the many water sports—and virtually all of them would have their own banking accounts and therefore be subject to this tax as well. I would be very interested to know just how many are aware that they will be affected. It seems that the time given for people to become aware of what effect it will have on their groups has been very limited; in fact, a previous speaker mentioned 11 days. Certainly, f.i.d. has been discussed for a lot longer than that, but the specific details apparently have been out for only 11 days. For a brand new tax, that seems a very limited period. Possibly we will find that this debate will be adjourned and people will have another couple of weeks to think about it; that would be a very good move, but I suspect that it would be unlikely, too.

So, many organisations will be affected. It is a great pity, as we have heard before, that this tax has not had the mandate of the people of South Australia. It has not had it because of the clear words from the present Premier (the then Leader of the Opposition) that the A.L.P. would not introduce new taxes, nor increase levels of existing taxes, during its term of office. We know that that statement has been broken time and time again. I suppose that I have to pay some credit to the Premier for being game enough to come into this House and face the Parliament in view of the number of times that that promise has been broken.

It is particularly disturbing, following on from the earlier line, that this is the wrong time to introduce the tax: we realise that there is still real economic hardship for so many people in this State. Something in the order of 10 per cent of the people are out of work; interest rates are high. The loss of overtime in many industries has reduced the spending power of people. The wage pause has meant that people have not had more in their pockets for quite some time, yet they have had to adjust to the increase in the prices of so many goods and the increases in more than 70 taxes and charges.

It would appear that private industry is doing everything in its power to hold down costs in an endeavour to get the

State moving again, but the State Government seems to be doing everything in its power to take more money from people, and it does not seem to have controlled its Budget in the way in which one would have hoped. So, even the disadvantaged people will be further disadvantaged by this tax. It was interesting to see the following in the *News* of 1 November:

If the State Government has a hand in it, John Bannon has put up the price of it.

It is interesting when one reflects on those words and, when one thinks of the number of areas in which the State Government has increased its charges and taxes, one realises that there is some truth in that statement. I do not know how this State will get on its feet again in this current economic climate, particularly at a time when there is a State such as Queensland which does not have this tax and which has kept other taxes lower. We have already heard about the differential in cigarette prices and the problems that that has caused. We well remember many of the slogans during the last election campaign in Queensland, and the statements by the Premier, Joh Bjelke-Petersen, that if Labor came to power taxes would rise.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: So they wiped your Party out.

Mr MEIER: We are well aware that the non-Labor Party came to office in Queensland, and it works out that the National Party—

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Did they wipe your Party out?

Mr MEIER: That is by the by. If one looks at the policies of the National Party in Queensland and the Liberal Party policies in South Australia, one sees that many are very similar.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: It is very interesting. Do you like Russ or Joh?

Mr MEIER: That is not an area to be debated in this financial institutions duty debate. I am more interested in the fact that thankfully there is still that mainland State and Tasmania to which people will, unfortunately, be attracted. It worries me what industry's next move in this State will be with a further burden imposed on it. The first 12 months has been rather disastrous for the people of South Australia. It has not been an impressive time for the Government. We will see what happens in the next 12 months. Hopefully there will be no further increases in taxes or charges. As a matter of fact, that will be out of the question because the promise made was that there would not be increases for three years. However, they have all increased in the first 12 months, so I guess that it is a safe bet to say that there will be no increases in the next two years at least.

Mr Mathwin: Do you really think they will run dry?

Mr MEIER: I certainly would not take their word for it. If they said that there would be no increases, then one could virtually bet that there would be.

Mr Mathwin: Lay your money.

Mr MEIER: If I was a betting man, I probably would bet on it if they said that things would not go up. Assuming that all charges and taxes have increased in the first 12 months and that there will be no increases in the next two years, even then industry has a long way to go to pull itself out of the situation in which it finds itself in in South Australia. It was asked earlier (and I would like to refer to it also) whether the Premier himself is really convinced of this financial institutions duty. It is interesting to note that on 30 September last year the then Leader of the Opposition, Mr Bannon, said:

Political Parties should not be allowed to get away with imposing new unannounced taxes straight after an election. Labor believes it would be wrong to introduce new taxes or abolish existing revenue sources until a thorough and wide-ranging inquiry has been conducted into the way the State raises its funds.

What hypocrisy! The present Premier clearly stated that it would be wrong to introduce new taxes or abolish existing revenue sources until a thorough and wide-ranging inquiry has been conducted into the way in which the State raises its funds. In fact, his going back on that statement is another clear indication of where the Premier, in my opinion, has lost his credibility.

I really do not know how he can explain that away. If nothing else, I suppose that the lesson has been learnt by the Premier that he must not make statements that he cannot uphold, but we are all waiting for the time when the first statement will be made that will be held to, unlike so many that have been made in the past which have not been. In response to a written request from a financial institution relating to the possible introduction of a financial institutions duty by a future Labor Government, the Premier, as the then Leader of the Opposition, in his reply on 14 October (if my memory serves me correctly, that was the date when Parliament was prorogued before the last election) said:

The policy of the Opposition in South Australia is to initiate a comprehensive and public inquiry into the State's \$500 million taxation system. The inquiry would, among other things, examine the equity and efficiency of the taxation system. In the Opposition's (Labor) view, it would not be appropriate to change the rate of or to abolish any existing State tax or substitute new taxes until the inquiry into taxation has been conducted, and its recommendations made the subject of policy for the election after this.

We heard the Premier say earlier today that that inquiry will be set up, but what a way to set it up: not before one introduces the new tax, but after the tax is in and then we will let them have their say! What sort of consensus is there in that approach? I believe that the Premier has clearly misled this State, and there is no doubt that he has deceived at least one financial institution and by inference all the financial institutions in this State when he said that the inquiry would come first and then the taxes would be considered. The Premier made a further comment on 8 March this year, as follows:

I am not attracted to a financial institutions tax. We must find a means of raising money which will have the least economic impact on the State.

And there were other similar statements, so I guess that the Premier has real gumption to be able to face this House. It certainly seems that other members of the Caucus must have had the greatest influence, because the Premier's personal opinion did not seem to be in favour of a financial institutions duty last year and earlier this year. Therefore, why should a financial institutions duty have been introduced? One could guess at various reasons, but it would seem that the promises that the Labor Party made before the last State election and the overspending that has occurred have meant that money has to be found from somewhere and, when one does not take any rational approach to keeping Government employees within limits, one can expect that the amount of money required to pay for them will get out of hand.

It is certainly disappointing that this year State taxation is estimated to rise by more than 14 per cent, whereas during the last year of the Liberal Government the estimate was that taxation had decreased by 5 per cent. Again, that clearly indicates what the Queensland Premier was referring to when he said that under a Labor Government the people will be taxed much higher. It is clearly shown here that under a Liberal Government in South Australia the people were taxed lower and, from the way that the Leader has outlined the various policies to date and the way that the Liberals would have conducted the affairs of this State, taxes would not have to rise in the way they have risen under this Labor Government. Again, the Premier in his policy speech was well aware that the financial sector of the

State offered a real opportunity for the creation of new jobs in service and high technology industries.

The Premier said that there were many good reasons why major financial institutions would want to set up in South Australia and that, given the right incentives, South Australia could attract companies to set up operations here. He said:

Our strategy would be to see the establishment in Adelaide of the head office of a major financial institution before the end of our first term.

The net result is that the financial institutions duty to be levied in South Australia is not the same tax as applies in Victoria and New South Wales. The f.i.d. in South Australia is 33¼ per cent more than the rate that applies in either of the two Eastern States. Surely that must be a disincentive for any financial institution or other business considering relocation in South Australia. In fact, the f.i.d. will act as a deterrent to financial activity in this State. The obvious conclusion to be drawn is that people will want to set up their head offices in a State such as Queensland, and South Australia will be the poorer for that.

It does not require a lot of imagination to understand that this tax will inevitably lead to an increase in the price of a wide range of goods and services. The impact of the financial institutions duty cannot be assessed without looking at that tax in the context of other taxes imposed. As I mentioned before, the rises in costs for petrol, tobacco products, alcohol and insurance premiums have all led to increased costs to the consumer. A levy on the South Australian Gas Company has been reimposed. It was abolished by the Liberal Government. Also, a massive range of State charges including those for water, sewerage, and electricity, as well as public transport fares and hospital bed fees have all been increased, even though the present Premier as Leader of the Opposition said that a Labor Government would not introduce new taxes or increase existing levels of taxes during its term of office. I hope that the Premier never forgets that statement.

The duty will also have a great impact on individuals. Each time a person deposits money with a bank, building society, credit union or other financial institution for the credit of any type of account (and under this legislation even schoolchildren banking with their local school bank will be affected), it will attract a tax charge. I wonder how this tax will work in respect of the school banking system. I would like to know how parents will explain to their children that unfortunately some of their money that they have put into the bank has got to be given to Mr Bannon and his Government. People who by arrangement with their employer have their wage credited to a bank account and who then transfer funds for the payment of accounts, such as investment accounts, Bankcard, or personal loans, will be subject to payment of multiple duty, because duty will be payable on the initial lodgement of funds and then on subsequent transfers. Therefore, it will be found that in some cases the tax will be applicable more than once.

I wonder just what will be the effect of this on various organisations. It seems that to date the information given out about this has been very limited. Also, there is serious concern about the extent to which f.i.d. will encourage more widespread payment of wages and salaries in cash.

Mr Groom: Are you saying that you would repeal this if you were in government?

Mr MEIER: As the honourable member has just come into the House, he would have missed what I have been saying. If the honourable member had heard what I have said, he would realise that I have been referring to all the hardships that the imposition of this tax will cause.

Mr Groom: But in government would you repeal this Act?

Mr MEIER: If the honourable member had been listening he would know that I said that under our Administration

there would have been no need to introduce this legislation. In two years time this State might be \$200 million in debt and even Roxby Downs might not be able to help us out of the situation. The rate the honourable member's Government is going, with over 70 tax increases and charges so far, in two years time the State may be bankrupt and Hawke will have to buy us out. He will not have any money and some overseas country such as Saudi Arabia may have to take over.

Mr Groom: Let us hear your solutions.

Members interjecting:

Mr MEIER: The solution is to lower taxes and provide greater incentives to private industry rather than increase taxes and increase the Public Service as this Government is doing.

Mr Groom: So, you are going to reduce the Public Service, is that right?

Mr MEIER: The honourable member saw what happened under the previous Tonkin Government. The Public Service was decreased through natural attrition. There is no doubt that that was helping South Australia.

Mr Groom: You are going to reduce the size of the Public Service? Who are you going to put out of work?

Mr MEIER: No one will be put out of work. The number of people employed will increase.

Members interjecting:

Mr MEIER: I would like to have a fair go in this House.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs Appleby): Order! The honourable member will continue his speech in silence.

Members interjecting.

Mr MEIER: I would hope that the others would keep silent. The member for Hartley mentioned the former Prime Minister, Mr Fraser, and said that he felt that Fraser would come back to lead a revival. He referred to a newspaper article along those lines. I am pleased that he mentioned Mr Fraser because, at the last Federal election, Mr Fraser said that if a Labor Government gained office people would have to keep their funds under the bed. The f.i.d. is yet another example which proves that Mr Fraser was spot on. Even with the Hawke Government's 10 per cent financial institutions duty and the situation with people receiving superannuation as well as the possibility of pensioners losing half their pension if they had a certain number of assets, it would be much better to have the money under the bed. This legislation is another example, and it looks as though Fraser will be proved to be correct.

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

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I do not intend to take a great deal of time but wish to make one or two remarks on this legislation and refer to the effect it will have on my electorate. The measure has not come as any surprise to anyone who has studied what the Premier's colleagues in Victoria and New South Wales have done with the finances of their State. It was obvious that we would get some form of general taxation increases in this State. The Premier appears to have used the same electoral manual. The idea is to promise the people everything and once you have been elected to Government you set about increasing a number of taxation measures as quickly as possible and blame your predecessors for what you have done. Mr Wran waged an election campaign against surcharges and income tax. However, he has introduced more taxes than most of his colleagues. It appears that Mr Cain has the same manual and, to a lesser degree, so does Mr Burke.

When the Premier of this State and his financial advisers sat down to work out the strategy they were going to use they even allowed their own enthusiasm to run wilder than expected. They have made so many promises, yet honoured

so few, that it is no wonder the people of this State are getting sick and tired of the manner in which they are increasing charges.

As one who sits on the Subordinate Legislation Committee I find it amazing that every week we see increases in fees and charges. I wonder how big the list will be tomorrow. I suppose we will get another sheet of fees and charges that have been increased. Yet, I still recall the Premier sitting in the Leader of the Opposition's seat going on at length about charges, fees and back-door methods of taxation that were being used. Of course, as soon as anyone says in this Chamber that the Government should put its house in order we have people like the honourable member for Hartley getting up and saying, 'Who are you going to sack, where are you going to get your revenue from?' That was a trick Don Dunstan pulled on the people of the State for years, largely putting the same old tired record on.

Mr Trainer: What do you propose to do?

Mr GUNN: I will give the honourable member some answers. Do not worry about that. Let us just refresh the member for Ascot Park's memory about some of the spending spree which his members engaged in. The first thing Premier Dunstan did was to sell off the railways to the Commonwealth. He lived off that money for a while. We are still living with the problems in my electorate in Peterborough trying to work out who owns the houses. The agreement was reached in such haste that they did not dot a lot of 'i's' and cross 't's'. The Minister of Transport is still trying to solve some of those problems which are causing real headaches in my electorate. Then we had the city that never was. It was the only place the Labor Government did not erect a plaque in.

Ms Lenehan interjecting:

Mr GUNN: It is very well for the temporary member for Mawson to interject about Monarto but if the honourable member thinks that \$25 million spent at Monarto was well invested I find her economics rather strange. Then we had the Frozen Food Factory where \$16 million went down the drain for nothing. One could go on at length in relation to finding money. South Australia is in a difficult financial position, for a number of reasons, partly because we are over-regulated and over-controlled. We are getting in the way of business. We should be encouraging people to invest and spend more money.

The State Planning Authority and that bureaucracy is inflicting far too many controls, interfering with development, which costs jobs and investment. That is the first point. We have had a downturn in exploration because of environmental nonsense. Unreasonable claims have been made, not by Aborigines but by people purporting to represent them. That is certainly having an effect on the mining industry. Last year we had a bad drought. Fortunately, this should be a good year for agriculture, which will certainly benefit on the economy of this State.

Mr Lewis: Especially this tax.

Mr GUNN: Yes, when all the wheat, barley and oats cheques go into the bank the Government will get a few dollars out of that. The Premier had something to say about the \$7.5 million by which he will reduce stamp duty revenue. I think that everybody will agree that is a good thing. That could go a step further because stamp duties are certainly a burden. But, when one looks at the figures for this year for stamp duty it is estimated that the State Government will receive \$136 million. We will still have \$129 million left from stamp duty.

In relation to other charges and taxes we see that this year the Electricity Trust will contribute \$22 million to revenue. I have on numerous occasions, and I intend to do it until justice prevails, raised in this House the problems that the high cost of electricity and water is causing for my

constituents. Funds can be found for a number of purposes. We saw in last week's paper that the Minister of Environment can find \$700 000 to spend on cliffs to the south of Adelaide. Yet, the Government cannot find \$500 000 to spend on projects where people have not even got water and they are getting charged to the hilt for electricity. It is purely a matter of priorities and, as long as these environmental cranks get themselves involved in things that they should not be involved in, taxes will rise and the economy will be stifled.

I could go on at length about the nonsense and the waste of taxpayers' money. The Minister for Environment and Planning is talking about having a coroner's inquiry into national parks. Blind Freddy knows that there should be controlled burning in national parks, but the environmentalists and the officers in the department do not believe that. They carry on with this nonsense. Untold havoc has been inflicted on the people of this State because a proper burning off operation was not carried out in a number of national parks.

The Government continues to find money for other matters: \$700 000 was provided. We are quite happy to go on subsidising the Festival Theatre at a cost of \$4.3 million, and \$100 million has been found for O-Bahn. Let us not say that it is not a matter of priorities. In the next few days I will go through the Auditor-General's Report and state clearly where subsidies can be provided. I want to know why people in the outback areas, particularly people in my district, will be slugged again with taxes of this nature while receiving little return. It is about time there was a bit of justice in this place so that people in isolated communities were given the sort of benefit to which they are entitled.

Mr Groom: Are you saying that you would repeal this in government?

Mr GUNN: I am not saying that at all; it would depend entirely on the economic situation that the Olsen Government inherits when it wins government. That is a trick: members who have been in this House long enough have woken up to the smart lawyer tricks that the honourable member tries to pull in this place. He may be able to engage in that sort of activity in the electorate, because unfortunately his constituents do not know any better, but we know that that is a classic Dunstan trick of trying to divert the attention of the people from the mismanagement of the Government and the irresponsible promises which were made at the last State election. We could read all the comments that the Premier has made, but that would not serve any useful purpose. That has been done on a number of occasions.

I can tell the Premier that some of us will question him very closely about where he intends to spend this money. I want to know whether the Premier will use this money to fund the salaries of people like Gary Foley, whom the Premier's friend, the Minister of Health, has appointed—a person with a dubious background. Will that hard-earned money be fleeced from the taxpayers to fund political activists and to pay people who want to bring Cubans into this country? Will the money be used to pay the salaries of people like that, or will it be used to fly members of the Port Augusta Hospital Board to Adelaide to attend a board meeting, pay their accommodation overnight, and fly them back again? Will the money be used for that sort of irresponsible behaviour? We certainly want answers to those questions, and we want many other answers. It is about time the Government took charge. I have referred to only one Minister who has engaged in irresponsible activity, contrary to the views of the people who know anything about those areas. I could go on at length in relation to what has taken place at the Port Augusta Hospital, but I will do so on another occasion. Large amounts of money have been spent in this area.

I want to know where some of the \$14 million-odd (this financial year) or the \$22 million in a full year will be spent. Anyone could recognise that the Government must have funds to operate, but I believe that taxes should be fairly based. What concerns me in relation to this matter is that any chance that South Australia had of becoming the financial centre of Australia is gone. I understand that the Premier advocated some time ago that that should be the case. The Premier of Queensland, Mr Bjelke-Petersen, will be rubbing his hands with glee when he sees the other Eastern States, Western Australia and South Australia bringing in legislation of this nature. I am fairly confident that Mr Bjelke-Petersen will do everything possible to attract large companies to set up head offices in Brisbane. Obviously, if it was economical for such companies to take that action, they would do just that. I do not really think there is any purpose in my repeating what other members have said. The Leader of the Opposition clearly outlined the problems and the attitude of the Parliamentary Liberal Party in relation to this matter.

I can say to the Premier that I intend to pursue with all the vigour at my disposal the problems in my electorate. While the Government can see its way clear to spend millions of dollars on areas which in my judgment are not productive, I will continue to raise those many problems in my electorate such as the high cost of water and the extension of water mains. I do not intend to accept again that the Government cannot afford to provide those services when it can spend tens of millions of dollars in other areas without even blinking an eye. One can go through the financial statements and the Auditor-General's comments, as I did a couple of weeks ago, and easily find where money has been spent in many cases where people did not want it spent. I have talked about the situation at Whyalla, and the recreation and arts centre to be funded there. That money should have been spent in other areas; it should have been spent on building roads and extending water services rather than building at Whyalla an arts centre which will provide entertainment for a small section of the community.

Doubtless, the community facility will be excellent but, when one looks at the economics of the situation, one finds that it just does not add up. It has been referred to as an Eyre Peninsula centre—it is not, it is a Whyalla centre. People will not drive hundreds of kilometres in those circumstances, yet the Government is spending about \$3.5 million on that project. One can go around the State and see similar wastage—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr GUNN: I will not comment on that matter. There is no point in my pursuing the matter any further.

Mr Groom: It is not—

Mr GUNN: The Leader is capable of answering the honourable member's slick questions. The honourable member is not in court now. If he has so much advice, let him rise and give it to the House. We will wait for it with bated breath. Honourable members know that he is making a run to become the next Minister, and obviously he is just getting in practice. He and his Government colleagues are sitting there quietly tonight without having anything to say, yet since 1979 and 1982 they found much to say. Certainly, we will be interested to hear from the member in justifying this measure, especially in view of his Leader's statements prior to the election, when he promised that there would be no new taxes, and the other comments that he made about backdoor taxation. I will be pleased to hear the member's explanation.

Mr Mathwin: He is not allowed to speak.

Mr GUNN: As I have 14 minutes left, I will sit down, because I am happy to make way for the honourable member if he can assure me that he can explain why the imposition

of this duty is necessary. I will wait with baited breath to hear the honourable member give the House an explanation.

Mr Plunkett: The member for Eyre has run out of material. He just starts throwing his hands around.

Mr GUNN: That fine upstanding orator, the member for Peake—

Mr Plunkett: You may be able to continue for 14 minutes now that I have assisted you.

Mr GUNN: With all due respect to the member for Peake, I really do not need any assistance from him.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member please to continue without anyone's assistance.

Mr GUNN: Thank you, Madam Acting Speaker. I do not need the protection of the Chair. I do not need anyone's assistance, particularly that of the member for Peake. I doubt that he will be involved in this debate.

Mr Plunkett: What about when you predicted that I would not return after the last election? You made an error then.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: It's lucky that the Deputy Premier is not going down that way.

Mr GUNN: It is fortunate, indeed.

Mr Plunkett: Many predictions were made by members opposite, but you fell on your face.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! Will the member for Glenelg please come to order?

Mr GUNN: The member for Peake has a smile on his face now, but he did not a few weeks ago when he thought that he was going to be demolished in the redistribution.

Mr Plunkett: You thought that.

Mr GUNN: No. The honourable member thought he was gone. He is now a very relieved man, and we realise that he has had a temporary reprieve. I believe that the Premier has brought the whole institution of Parliament and politicians into a bad light because of the promises he made before the last election. He set out to be all things to all people. To break the undertakings he gave has not helped the image of members of Parliament. I do not think that that has been a good thing.

The Premier then said that he was not aware of the financial situation of the State at the time of the change of Government, but that is something he can easily overcome in future. I suggest to the Premier, so that there will be no repetition of the situation in which he alleges he found himself on coming to office (I believe he was aware of the situation), that he should ask the Auditor-General to audit the financial statements of the State Government and have the Electoral Commissioner publish those findings on the issuing of the writs. Everyone then would know the facts. I challenge the Premier to put this or a similar idea into operation, so that there will be no repetition of his quite irresponsible action at the time of the last election when he had his financial people produce glossy documents and made the promises he made. Let the Auditor-General, the Under-Treasurer or some other appropriate person publicly release these figures and give a copy to each candidate who nominates for the Parliament. We will then be rid once and for all of the political nonsense and dishonesty indulged in by this Premier and his advisers. If the Premier is not prepared to accede to this suggestion, I would like a response from the member for Hartley.

This trick has been pulled by three Labor leaders. Let us bring it out in the open, once and for all, and deal with it. If the Government is sincere it will take positive action. I do not think it would be difficult for the Government to put my suggestion into operation and for the Auditor-General, the Under-Treasurer, or both, to release these figures publicly. People will not then be able to say that they did not know or understand the financial situation. The Leader

clearly demonstrated the State's financial situation when he released Treasury information provided to the previous Government. I sincerely hope that this Government in future will be more honest with the people of this State when discussing financial matters and will not promise more than it can provide. I hope that it comes to its senses. I support the comments made by the Leader and oppose the second reading of this Bill.

Mr GROOM (Hartley): Nobody likes to see taxation increased, and I think that that generally goes for both Parties. It is regrettable that it is necessary to introduce this tax. Honourable members opposite have asked why this tax is necessary. The origins of that necessity go back to the three years between 1979 and 1982. Had the former Liberal Government exercised proper restraint in the sense of prudent financial management, and had it not allowed its budgetary situation to completely run away from it—and there is no hiding the fact that after the August 1982 Budget it simply lost control of the situation and made announcements when there was no budgetary appropriation—

The Hon. Michael Wilson interjecting:

Mr GROOM: The member for Torrens knows very well that because the Liberal Party was coming into an election period it desisted from increasing taxation so as to curry favour with the voters. Had the Liberal Party won the 1982 election it would have had to increase taxation massively, and it would have done it.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

Mr GROOM: I heard the Leader of the Opposition say in this Chamber several months ago that had the Liberal Party been in office, it would have run a Budget deficit of about \$44.7 million. We all know that the actual Budget deficit is \$68 million; \$63.9 million left over from the manner in which the previous Liberal Government managed the State's finances, and a \$5 million deficit for this financial year. So, somehow or other the Liberal Party would have had to raise another \$24 million in taxation.

Where would that have come from? One cannot get the Budget deficit down from \$68 million to \$44 million without increasing taxation. We all know that honourable members opposite, when in Government, deliberately allowed the State's finances to deteriorate, because they were facing an election period and they know darn well that had they been re-elected to correct the imbalance (the runaway situation that they had permitted to occur) they would have had to increase taxation massively, and they would have done it. They said in introducing the August 1982 Budget that it was to be a balanced Budget, but we all know that that was ridiculous.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GROOM: I recall that in the *News* of 19 November the then Minister of Agriculture said in relation to the \$9 million that he had announced during the election campaign for drought relief (there was no budgetary appropriation), 'The money was there; I had Cabinet approval. The former Premier (Mr Tonkin) gave me an open cheque book.' That is what honourable members opposite did from the time they came into an election period: they had an open cheque book without budgetary appropriation. They were making announcements. I am not saying that the drought relief was not necessary—indeed, it was necessary—but there was no budgetary appropriation for it.

What about the member for Chaffey? He told Parliament on 10 August that the cost of additional water pumping would be up to \$4 million in excess of the pumping costs for 1981-82; yet when the Budget was brought down two weeks later less money was actually provided to cover the cost of pumping than in previous years. We have had to pick up the tab for that; that is very poor financial man-

agement. They are two instances where we have had to pick up the tab for sheer financial incompetence on the part of honourable members opposite.

An honourable member: Rubbish!

Mr GROOM: There is the statement from the former Minister of Agriculture. He said, 'The money was there; I had Cabinet approval. The former Premier (Mr Tonkin) gave me an open cheque book.'

The Hon. Michael Wilson interjecting:

Mr GROOM: As the member for Torrens well knows, that was the motive behind postponing the electricity charges. Had honourable members opposite, in Government, taken a much firmer stand, South Australia would not have been facing the hikes in electricity charges that we will face and have faced this year and for the next two years under the formula agreed because—

Members interjecting:

Mr GROOM: Members opposite should have stood up. When that arbitrator brought that decision down members opposite should have stood up to that arbitrator and taken some positive action. What members opposite did was postpone the 80 per cent increase in electricity charges until after the election, ensuring that an incoming Government would have to inherit that situation, grapple with it, and agree to a formula. Make no mistake: they agreed to a formula whereby the Cooper Basin producers would get a 170 per cent hike in gas prices over the next four years. What sort of protection for the people of South Australia is that: just simply postponing the charges? Members opposite should have taken on that arbitrator's decision, because in New South Wales an arbitrator brought down lower prices. Members opposite ought to have taken a firmer stand, but they took the easy way out and simply postponed the charges so that they could get out of the election period and overcome that.

Mr Lewis: What has this got to do with the new fiddler's tax?

Mr GROOM: A number of honourable members opposite got up and bleated about the State's situation, without accepting any responsibility. When the Opposition came into office in 1979 there was an accumulated surplus in Treasury. What occurred in the three years of a Liberal Government was that the State's finances deteriorated to such an extent that on 14 December last year, within a month of the election, the Premier had to announce that a Treasury review indicated that there was at that point in time about a \$30 million deficit, which was likely to increase to a \$55 million deficit. Because the members opposite were facing an election period, they allowed the administration of their departments to get completely out of hand. They did not act in a financially responsible manner. The committee it had set up did not correct departments overrunning their budgets. Where is the logic behind an announcement of \$9 million for drought relief when there was no allowance made in the budgetary appropriation for it?

Mr Lewis: We didn't know the drought was going to happen.

Mr GROOM: For the benefit of the member for Mallee, I am not saying that that drought relief was not warranted. I am saying that it was financially irresponsible to make that announcement of \$9 million without an appropriate budgetary appropriation, and it is as simple as that.

Mr Lewis: In the event it was all provided by the Commonwealth Government.

Mr GROOM: With great respect to the member for Mallee—I do not know whether it was he who asked why all this was necessary—I am setting out why it was necessary: because of three years of complete financial incompetence. They talk about increasing taxes or charges as if they are some sort of virtuous pretenders. What happened with inter-

est rates? In 1979 when they came to office interest for an average home was about \$260 a month for average repayments. By 1982 that same interest had increased to \$355. Where was the restraint? Where was the protection that honourable members opposite exercised for the people of this State? That was the effect of their policies. Thankfully, interest rates are coming down because of the policies of the Federal Labor Government and the State Labor Government and make no mistake about it. What about bread?

Mr Lewis: What has that got to do with the Bill?

Mr GROOM: Honourable members opposite got up and complained about increases in charges and prices during these 12 months. I am analysing the reasons why, and showing them that when in office this is what occurred with them. A 680-gram loaf of bread went from 60c in 1979 to 85c in 1982. They complained about beer prices, but what did they do to beer? They put it up from 89c a bottle in 1979 to \$1.26 a bottle in 1982. What about a hospital bed? It was \$40 a day when we left office in 1979 and, by 1982, it had reached \$105 a day. Where were the controls, constraints and considerations for the pensioners and the aged? Let us look at electric power. For a typical all-electric home the annual bill in 1979, when we left office, was \$243, and within three years it had risen to \$400, and that does not take into account the fact that honourable members opposite had allowed a formula to be accepted whereby there was to be a 170 per cent hike over the next four years. What about excess water rates? What did they do to water rates? They were 24c per 1 000 litres in 1979 when we left office and they have risen to 37c per 1 000 litres by 1982.

Mr LEWIS: I rise on a point of order. I wonder, Madam Acting Speaker, whether you would rule on whether you think these points are in any way relevant to the Bill before the House.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I would expect the honourable member for Hartley to link his remarks to the Bill.

Mr GROOM: I will certainly link them up in due course to the argument of honourable members opposite.

Mr LEWIS: Madam Acting Speaker, in view of the importance of the remarks being made by the member for Hartley, I ask whether we might have your attention drawn to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr GROOM: Members opposite have said, 'Why is it necessary?' The Premier cannot hide behind the cloak of rhetoric as members opposite can. He is the Treasurer and he has the responsibility to ensure that this State is properly managed. I was illustrating the way in which members opposite administered this State as far as State taxes and charges were concerned, and I was dealing with excess water rates which went up from 24c per 1 000 litres in 1979, when we left office, to 37c in 1982. I refer to bus fares, which is another area of State charges. What did members opposite do to bus fares when in Government? The fare for two zones was 40c when we left office in 1979, and in 1982 it was 70 cents. That was their record in Government. They allowed the State's financial situation to deteriorate to a very alarming level simply because they were entering an election period. Make no mistake: I have yet to hear any honourable member opposite say that, had they won the 1982 State election, they would not have increased State taxes immediately following that election. They have been very quiet on that because they know darned well that, because of their budgetary situation, they would have had to increase taxes to correct the imbalance.

Mr Lewis: Rubbish!

Mr GROOM: I am pleased to hear the honourable member say that because only two months ago his Leader said that, if they were in office, he would reduce the Budget deficit from \$68 million to \$44 million. I would like the

honourable member to explain from where they would get this other \$24 million to actually reduce the Budget deficit. It either has to come from an increase in State taxes and charges or one has to do what the member for Todd said, that is, he would have put 2 000 public servants out of work: that is what they would have done. The Leader of the Opposition said several weeks ago that, in addition to somehow reducing the Budget deficit by \$24 million (and I do not know from where they would get this \$24 million if it was not through State taxes), they would have 740 less people employed in the public sector. That is what the Leader of the Opposition said.

Of course, the member for Todd said that he would put off 2 000 people, so that is probably one way of reducing the cost of the public sector: to put people out of work. I would like honourable members opposite to say how many teachers they would have put out of work, how many public servants, and which departments: where would these 740 or 2 000 people have come from?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally interjecting:

Mr GROOM: I am indebted to the Chief Secretary. How many police officers would they have put off, because one has to put off these people from somewhere? From where would these 740 or 2 000 people have come which the member for Todd disclosed by accident one night? I understand that one night he over-reacted and confessed: the first one who has told the truth since they have been in Opposition. He confessed: he said, 'We would have put 2 000 off.'

Mr Lewis: That's a lie.

Mr GROOM: That is what the honourable member said; he can argue about it, but that is the effect of what he said. In addition, I point out that if members opposite had been in Government there would have been an increase in expenditure. A Liberal Government intended to go ahead with the Finger Point sewage treatment plant and with the upgrading of the Cobdogla irrigation area, to please the member for Chaffey. It would have gone ahead with all that which would have cost \$11 million. Where would all that money have come from, if not from an increase in State charges and taxation? Of course a Liberal Government would have increased taxation had it been re-elected to office. Liberal members confessed as much, but they are not honest enough to get up in this House and say that that is what would have occurred. They are pretending that that would not have happened. It is admirable to be a low tax State: there is no question about that, and that is the aim of every Government. But to pretend in the way that members opposite are doing is nothing more than deceitful and blatantly dishonest.

The former Liberal Government deliberately postponed increases in State taxation and charges until after the 1982 election, which it expected to win. The present Labor Government has had to carry the can for the former Government's financial mismanagement. I have already indicated that the former Minister of Agriculture had announced an allocation of \$9 million for drought relief when not even a budgetary appropriation had been made for that amount. The former Minister of Water Resources made a completely inadequate appropriation for pumping charges in the 1982 Budget, and the present Government has had to carry the can for that. On a whole range of matters members opposite were completely financially incompetent in the way that they managed this State's affairs. That contrasts with the situation that prevailed when the Corcoran Government left office and when there was an accumulated surplus in Treasury. Members opposite are nothing more than virtuous pretenders. On top of all that, South Australia has had to grapple with some of the worst disasters to occur in its history, adding something like \$16 million to the cost of

the Budget. Had the former Liberal Government's Budget been an honest one—

Mr Lewis: Why don't you tell the truth?

Mr GROOM: Why doesn't the honourable member get up and tell the truth?

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! Will the member for Mallee please desist from interjecting.

Mr GROOM: The simple fact of the matter is that the Liberal Government maintained that its 1982 Budget was going to be a balanced one, yet by December 1982 Treasury papers revealed that there was a deficit of \$30 million increasing very quickly to \$55 million. Had members opposite been appropriately honest in that Budget and had they grappled with the State's finances at that time and corrected the imbalance—

Mr Lewis: What's the relevance of what you are saying?

Mr GROOM: The member for Mallee knows that the relevance was that the Liberal Government was entering an election period and that it was not prepared to be honest with the people of South Australia. In fact, members opposite know darned well that they were prepared to be dishonest and to go to an election with a completely dishonest Budget in an attempt to fool the people of South Australia. They do not have the courage to stand up and admit that had the Liberal Party won the 1982 election it would have increased taxation, because that would have been the inevitable result of its policies. The present Government is carrying the can for the previous Government's financial incompetence. That is why the very regrettable taxation measures are necessary to correct the State's financial imbalance.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON (Torrens): We have just heard from the member for Hartley another one of his typical contributions to this place with the most extraordinary statements contained therein. In particular I want to canvass one matter raised by the honourable member, who said that the Liberal Party had not shown enough restraint while in Government. According to the member for Hartley, it was because the Liberal Party had not shown enough financial restraint that the incoming Government found the Budget in such a mess. That is the nub of what the member for Hartley was saying. Let me put that to rest. Soon after the last election the Leader of the Opposition laid down the Treasury documents that had been presented to the then Premier, Mr Tonkin, on which the Liberal Party based its election strategy. Those documents showed a Budget deficit of \$13 million. Not once has the Premier denied the validity of those documents. The member for Hartley still says that the Liberal Party did not show enough restraint whilst in Government, yet when we were in Government his colleagues were screaming from the other side of this place for more money to be spent by the then Liberal Government.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Indeed, as my colleague from Coles reminds me, the current Chief Secretary was one of the worst protagonists on the other side of the House for the spending of money by the then Government. We had the member for Albert Park requesting me to spend more money in the provision of additional bus and train services—

Mr Ingerson: An extension of the boulevard.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Yes, the extension of West Lakes Boulevard—the list is endless. Yet, the member for Hartley says that we did not show enough restraint. I am glad that the Minister of Transport is also in the House. He knows, more than anybody in his Party—

Mr GROOM: I rise on a point of order. The member for Torrens is completely misrepresenting my remarks. The words I used were that the Government did not exercise proper restraint and prudent control over the State's finances.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. At a suitable occasion the honourable member can make a personal explanation. The honourable member for Torrens.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: What an extraordinary try by the member for Hartley! The Minister of Transport knows very well the requests that the member for Albert Park makes on the transport portfolio.

Mr Ingerson: And others.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Yes, indeed others, as my colleague reminds me. The now Minister of Education was requesting the Hon. Harold Allison (the member for Mount Gambier) to provide more teachers. We were roundly criticised by the Minister, as member for Salisbury, for not providing more teachers. Yet, the member for Hartley says that we did not show proper restraint. Is the honourable member saying that we should not have provided an extra \$2 million after the previous Budget to put on strength another 100 teachers? Is that what the member for Hartley is saying? Is he saying that we should be sacking nurses? Yes, he is, because the whole crux of the speech by the member for Hartley—

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: And a very bad speech it was.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: —if, indeed, it could be called a speech—was that the Liberal Government did not show proper restraint. He was saying that we should be sacking teachers and nurses. The now Minister of Health—the ubiquitous Mr Cornwall—when in Opposition was always in the media requesting my colleague the member for Coles to provide more money in the health sphere. In fact, he was never out of the media requesting the then Liberal Government to provide more hospital services. Indeed, how can the member for Hartley say that the Liberal Government did not apply proper restraint?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: All right, we get no more requests for expenditure from the Opposition.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I really appreciate your protection from the Chief Secretary.

The Hon. R.K. Abbott interjecting:

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I inform the Minister of Transport that it is not a flippant matter; it is a very serious matter. The member for Hartley has just been guilty of an example of gross misrepresentation. Indeed, if I were not such a sensitive person I might take my chance to make a personal explanation, too, seeing that his feelings are so wounded on this matter. It will not do him any good in his desperate attempt to get into the Ministry—from his last speech that we heard.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! These quarrels are totally out of order.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I just did not want the member for Hartley to feel that he could get away with what he has just said.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: He will certainly be a Minister before you are again.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: The Chief Secretary has just told the House that the member for Hartley will be going into the Ministry before the next election, because he will certainly not be a Minister after the next election.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I am having trouble hearing myself.

The SPEAKER: Order! I am having a great deal of trouble hearing anyone.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: That is generally the feeling of people listening to my speeches. I am extremely grateful that the Chief Secretary has confirmed tonight in this place that there is going to be a Cabinet reshuffle, because I give a cast iron guarantee to members opposite that the member for Hartley and the Chief Secretary will not be Ministers after the next election.

It is extremely ironic that the Government has seen fit to introduce this Bill almost a year to a day after its election. Nothing sums up the way in which this Government has conducted itself before the people of South Australia better than this piece of legislation, which introduces the first new tax in this State for 10 years and which represents direct negation of everything the Premier said before the last election.

Mr Mathwin: Do you think they are proud of it?

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: It seems that they are, from the remarks of the member for Hartley. One would think that they were very proud about having to introduce this piece of legislation. I am disappointed with the member for Hartley.

Mr Mathwin: He has made no apology.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: He has made no apology. As I said, this legislation represents the very fact that the Government has negated all the promises that the Premier made before the last election relating to finance. It has been recorded publicly many times that the Premier, before the last election, gave an absolute undertaking to the people of this State that no new taxation measures would be brought before this House and that charges would not increase or be used as a form of back door taxation. Here we have this legislation before the House now, 12 months to the day since the election of this Government. The Government should not be proud of that; it is something of which it should be ashamed. As my colleague, the member for Eyre, remarked a little while ago in this place, it brings everyone in this House into disrepute. Because of the actions of the present Government and, in particular, of the Premier as a result of the gross—

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: A loss of credibility—

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Indeed, as my colleague, the member for Coles, says, it involves a loss of credibility that he has brought about. That is a very sad day for South Australia, and it is very sad in particular that this measure should be imposed on the people of South Australia. What will this measure do? It will impose the f.i.d., by the Premier's own admission, on a wide cross-section of the community in this State. This same measure has been introduced in Victoria and New South Wales, and I believe that, after the election of a Labor Government in Western Australia, it will soon be introduced in that State.

Not only do we have the same type of duty but the South Australian duty is at a greater rate. The *ad valorem* figure is .04 per cent, compared to .03 per cent interstate. We have seen what has happened in the Eastern States with the introduction of this duty. I am informed that the Victorian Government had estimated receipts of \$120 million from this duty, and I understand on information I have received tonight via a telephone call from Victoria that the sum will be closer to \$60 million.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Because people are going to Queensland.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Indeed, and Mr Bjelke-Petersen must be laughing, not only because of the results of the recent election in Queensland but also at this instance of self-destruction by South Australia. We recall what Mr

Bjelke-Petersen did in Queensland when succession duties were not removed in this State, and we noted the flood of money that went to that northern State. Mr Bjelke-Petersen will now reap the benefits again. The people of Queensland will be the main beneficiaries of this legislation, and that is very sad for the people of this State.

I merely wish to point out the effects that this legislation will have on part of the education community. Under this legislation, an educational establishment is regarded as an exempt organisation. In fact, an educational institution will have to pay the first \$20 of the f.i.d. and it will receive a refund of any duty over and above the \$20 that is paid. I telephoned a non-government school and a Government school this afternoon and questioned them about their financial affairs and what type of deposits they were likely to make.

I found that the non-government school had 20 bank accounts, with deposits of \$7 million or \$8 million in any one year being made into the main account. By my calculations, that would incur an f.i.d. of \$3 200. At the end of 12 months, that school would receive back \$3 200 less \$20. That seems to me to be a nonsense—an administrative nightmare. Imagine an institution such as a non-government school having to pay \$3 200 in duty throughout the year and then receiving it all back, less \$20, at the end of the year. If ever there was an example of administrative nonsense, I believe that that is it. On top of that, the school loses interest on that money.

Mr Ingerson: It wouldn't be reimbursed.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Of course not. The institution loses the interest on that money. That is a gross deprivation of the rights of such an institution. Non-government schools, despite the opinions of members opposite, are not wealthy institutions. Of course, the imposition of that f.i.d. on that school has an impact, but it is not just the impact of a loss of interest; it is the administration that will be required within that organisation and all the other organisations in the community that will bring about hardship. What else will happen with that non-government school? As that school pays its duty, it will also be paying staff. As the cheques go into the bank accounts of staff members, the staff will be paying that duty: double-dipping.

Mr Ingerson: Money on money.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Yes. Can any honourable member believe that this is the logical way to conduct the business of this State? I then spoke to a representative of a Government high school which has a budget of about \$500 000. Obviously, that school does not pay salaries, which are paid by the Education Department, but even on \$500 000 the school will have to pay this duty. The duty would be about \$200. It is not a matter of the \$200, although the school would receive \$180 back at the end of the year—and how ridiculous it is—but especially of the bookwork and the administration required. That is an added impost on the school staff. Incidentally, that school is to suffer a teacher displacement this year because of the Minister's new staffing formula.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: It's an opportunity to build up the Public Service, too.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: It was also an opportunity to get that in while I was making my speech. This is a ridiculous measure. I do not want to say any more about it, because my colleagues have covered almost every facet of this Bill, but I wanted to bring before the House the effects that this measure will have on just the school community. If one multiplies those two schools throughout the South Australian school community one can see what an absolute imposition it is on the people of this State.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): If the speech given tonight by the member for Hartley is an indication of the expertise that he will bring to the South Australian Cabinet during the next two years, there is little hope for the people of South Australia. One need only analyse some of the things that he has been saying to realise that. Principally, he is saying that, if there is a short-fall in the funds available to the Government to make ends meet, the only answer is to increase taxes. There was no suggestion whatsoever that one should look at the reason for the short-fall, other than the fact that, if there is a short-fall, taxes must go up. Obviously, the honourable member has never been in business for himself. Certainly, one does not have to look far down the front bench on the Government side to see that no-one else has been in business, either. In fact, one can go right through the front bench and see that the actual business experience of the South Australian Cabinet, to say the least, is minimal. How on earth we can expect the State to prosper in those circumstances is anyone's guess. The member for Hartley suggested that the only answer is to increase taxes. I suggest to the member that, first, the Government ought to get its own house in order.

Only last week I asked the Minister of Education a question relating to the rehabilitation of the small school at Cobdogla, where the school council, which had the necessary expertise, had offered to do that work for \$25 000. I was informed that that suggestion had been rejected by the Government and that all such work had to go to the Public Buildings Department, which was able to do the same job for \$68 000. The member for Hartley wants to know how on earth the Government can put things straight other than by increasing taxes. There is a small and simple example of what is happening with this Government, and it is happening time and time again, that a direction has been given, not only by the Education Department but by many other departments, that this type of work will be undertaken by the Public Buildings Department. We have seen in the past few days that the bridge construction for the O-Bahn busway will not be put out to public tender to get the best possible price available in South Australia but will go to the Department of Marine and Harbors for a figure that we have no idea of, so we have no idea of the ultimate cost.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: I think that they now see the Torrens River as a harbor.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Whether it be a harbor or not, there is no way on earth one can get a reasonably competitive price for a project if there is no competitive tendering in the first place.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: Let's face it, that action is to get the Minister off the hook because he has been incompetent in handling and planning the manpower of the Department of Marine and Harbors.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: That could well be the case. There are many similar examples of such happenings under this Government. A similar situation existed with the Minister of Water Resources increasing rates in Government irrigation areas by some 28 per cent. The only reason he could give for doing so was that the Government is collecting only 26 per cent of the total cost of operating Government irrigation areas. I would not have thought the Minister would be game to make such a statement when all other private irrigation areas in the State meet 100 per cent of their operating costs and their commitments to Loan works. This State Government has the highest irrigation charges. This is an incredible situation; in fact, the Minister has said that the Government is subsidising the Government irrigators to the tune of 74 per cent. The only subsidy being paid is that being paid by taxpayers of South Australia because of

the inefficiency of this Government. It is not being paid to the irrigators of South Australia because, quite obviously, all the other irrigation systems in this State with a lower rate structure make a profit or make ends meet.

The SPEAKER: Order! I would be pleased if the honourable member would link his remarks to the Bill before the House.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: I have no trouble at all doing that, Mr Speaker. If you took note of the comments made by the member for Hartley in his speech to this House, you would see that I am responding to them.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must link his remarks to the Bill.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: I am happy to do that, Mr Speaker, if you will give me a chance.

The SPEAKER: I hope that the honourable member is not implying that I have not given him a chance to do so.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: If I can address the point you have made, Mr Speaker, I will explain what I am trying to achieve in this debate. A statement was made by the member for Hartley that the only way to offset a Government deficit was to increase charges. I am saying that there are two ways to offset such a deficit; to get one's own house in order and reduce one's operating costs, or to increase charges.

What I am saying is that in the economic situation that exists in South Australia at this time the Government would be well advised to make sure that it puts its own house in order. It should reduce costs, and that has not been done at this stage; costs in the Government operation are completely out of hand, and the example that I am giving is the cost involved in running the Government irrigation areas as compared with the private irrigation areas that operate alongside the Government areas, and areas that have to meet 100 per cent of their costs per year or they will be out of business. They are achieving that; they are meeting 100 per cent of their total costs, and they are doing it at a lower rate structure than is the Government.

This is what this financial institutions duty is all about: it is an additional revenue-raising measure imposed because the Government cannot live within its means. We have seen an increase of something like 70 different taxes and charges in the past 12 months. Now we have a new tax altogether, purely because the Government is not capable of living within its means.

As I said, the only explanation that the Government can give for this new tax is that it needs additional revenue. It is not prepared to look at its method of operating in order to make its own operation more efficient. That is why I say that it is a disaster for South Australia when we hear a speech like the one that was just made by the member for Hartley who, we believe, will be a member of Cabinet within a very short period. If the explanation that he has given to the House tonight is an example of the type of financial wizardry we will see injected into the present Government there is little hope for South Australia.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Having gone to an election only some 12 months ago, and having had the present Government make unequivocal statements that 'there will be no new taxes; there will be no increases in existing taxes; there will be no increases in existing charges', the people must be appalled at being confronted with some 70 increases and charges within a 12-month period. It ought to be illegal for any Government or potential Government to go to the people of this country under such absolute false pretences as occurred some 12 months ago. I only hope that the people

of this State in particular will certainly not tolerate that situation in the future. As has been said, the scene was set by the present Victorian Government. We saw the method that it utilised in the Victorian State election and the explanation given immediately following that election. We saw an absolute replica of that performed here in South Australia. Never in this country have we ever seen such blatant dishonesty as was displayed by the present Government.

The Hon. G.F. Kenneally interjecting:

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Quite obviously the Chief Secretary is more than happy: he has no conscience whatsoever. He is more than happy to go along with that style of Government, because he himself made a few promises only a day or so before the election which he brushed aside immediately following the election. He has got to live with that sort of style of operation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Order! I ask the honourable member to resume his seat. One of the basic rules of Erskine May is for the Speaker to prevent quarrels. A very blatant allegation has been made by the honourable member for Chaffey. I hope that he will not pursue that line but will get back to the point.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: I can assure you, Mr Speaker, that any statements that I make in this House are perfectly true and will stand up to scrutiny at any time.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: I am not in the habit of making false statements, and the Minister of Water Resources ought to know it, because he has made claims at various times that some of my statements have not been true. When I have obtained the proof for him and slapped it on the desk in front of him, he has looked at it with no comment whatsoever, folded it up and put it in his pocket. At least it meant that the statement that the Minister made in relation to my comments was untrue.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Chaffey to resume his seat immediately. I will admit no such comment as being untrue. As I understood it, the honourable member for Chaffey had said that the honourable Chief Secretary was a man without conscience, and I drew attention to the rule in Erskine May that says I should have control and prevent quarrels within the House. The honourable member for Chaffey. I ask him to address himself to the issue at hand.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Mr Speaker, in response to the comments that you have just made, I would point out that I said that the Chief Secretary must live with his own conscience for whatever statements he makes: at least I told the truth.

The SPEAKER: The *Hansard* tape will show it, right or wrong, in the morning.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: That is fine.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Chaffey.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: If one comes back to the comments made by the member for Hartley claiming that the need for increasing the taxes of the State, and for the introduction of a new tax of this nature, arose from the previous Government's inefficiency or bad management, may I point out to the member for Hartley that in the first six months after their election there was about \$23 million to \$26 million overrun not provided for in expenditure. In other words, the Treasurer of this State did not have effective control over his Ministers and allowed that massive overrun in expenditure to occur.

For the member for Hartley to claim that that is good financial management is absolutely absurd and indicates the reason why the type of tax that we are now considering has to be imposed. If one does not keep a tight rein on one's expenditure, obviously one will have to increase existing

taxes and in fact dream up new ones, and that is exactly what has occurred in this case. The Government has taken the lead of Victoria and New South Wales and dreamt up this new tax which will affect every person in South Australia. The Leader of the Opposition has highlighted how it will affect charities, church bodies and schools, right down to the accounts of schoolchildren. If that is the way that the Government wants to operate, that is its affair.

However, by the same token one can rest assured that the people of South Australia will have the opportunity within the next two years to decide whether or not they believe that that is good prudent management. I can assure you, Mr Speaker, what the attitude of the people is, and that attitude has started to come through loud and clear in the past two or three months in relation to the massive increases that have been imposed on them, particularly by a Government which gave an absolute commitment that there would be no increases in charges or new taxes during the three years of this Government. That is just absolute blatant dishonesty, yet Government members sit there and smile and do not turn a hair, and they proceed with a new tax of this nature in light of the commitments that they gave prior to the last State election.

For anyone to merely sit there and smile is a clear indication of the absolute lack of conscience of the whole Government. There is no need for this new tax. The Leader of the Opposition has clearly indicated that there is no need for it and that, with prudent management, it could have easily been avoided. However, the Government is not prepared to enter into prudent management, and one of the reasons is that it has no business management experience, so we have the situation where the Government will continue down this path.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: Like the member for Hartley.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: As an injection into the present Cabinet, and with the business expertise that he has just displayed in this House, the position will just go from bad to worse. As I indicated earlier, we only have to look along the Government front bench and it does not need a very big piece of paper to document the business involvement and expertise of members opposite. I am not professing to be an economic expert, but I employ more people than do the Chief Secretary, the Minister of Water Resources, the Minister of Transport, the Minister for Environment and Planning, and the Premier and provide a livelihood for a number of people in the community. However, I am still not professing to be an expert as is the Government, which has never had to go out into the wide world or make ends meet by running any sort of business whatsoever.

Therefore, how on earth can one expect anything other than what we are getting from this Government? The simple fact of the matter is that it just does not have any experience running a business and trying to make ends meet out in the real world. That is just a fact of life, and there is no point in trying to cover it up, because that is the situation. The people of South Australia inherited the Government they elected, and unfortunately they will have to live with that situation for the next two years. However, we will merely see taxes continue to increase and new ones introduced such as this one. Members opposite sit there quite happily, knowing that they will receive their own incomes. They have no business to worry about themselves, and they do not have to ensure that the business keeps going and that they make ends meet. That is of no concern to them whatsoever. They have their salaries and no other outside—

That is of no concern to them whatsoever. They have their salaries and no other outside—

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope that the honourable member will get back to the Bill.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Yes, Mr Speaker. I am talking very much about the Bill. There is no way that the people of South Australia will tolerate this situation indefinitely. If the Government thinks that they will, it has a lot to learn, because South Australians just cannot afford such measures. At least income tax is based on the ability to pay: if one does not have a net income, one does not pay it. However, in this instance, one could be running a business at a loss but still have to pay the same rate of tax to the Government. That will only destroy further existing business in South Australia. No matter how much the Chief Secretary sits there and chirps away, the fact remains that with this taxation measure all the Government is doing is driving more business interests to Queensland.

That is the situation, whether the Chief Secretary wants to face up to it or not. Perhaps he cannot even understand the reason why that will be so. However, I will not go to great lengths trying to explain to him why that will be the case. I can assure members of the Government that a great deal of business will be lost by South Australia, Victoria and New South Wales to Queensland. There is no doubt that the Premier of Queensland will be laughing his head off in exactly the same way as he did when he abolished gift duties and succession duties, thereby gaining an enormous financial advantage over the other States. It was not until other States were forced into following suit that the financial drain on the Southern States was stopped. The Liberal Government stopped that financial drain to Queensland. However, the present Government has now introduced a measure that will create that flow once again. Business will go to Queensland, and again the Queensland Government will get the benefit. A further loss of jobs will result from this measure, and South Australia as a whole will suffer. Unfortunately, the Government does not have sufficient foresight in regard to what it is doing, and it will tax South Australia out of existence.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN (Davenport): The debate so far has been excellent, particularly as most of the contributions have come from this side of the House. Members have raised a number of significant points, which I shall briefly summarise. I think the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon highlighted superbly the embarrassment and dilemma in which the Premier has found himself when introducing this taxing measure. The most important point made so far concerns the fact that the major tenet of the Labor Party's election promises has been broken.

On numerous occasions it was maintained that no back-door taxes, no new taxation measures and no substantial increases in existing taxes would be introduced during the life of a Labor Government. It was also said that there would be no new taxation measures introduced during a second term before making a full investigation of the entire tax structure. That fundamental promise has been well and truly broken by the Premier. I suppose that no single issue brings the credibility of a Premier into question, more so than does an issue such as the one we are now debating.

Frankly, from what I have heard around the community, particularly over the past few weeks, people have lost faith in the credibility of our Premier. That was highlighted the other day when I walked into a hardware shop. Whilst waiting to be served, I heard a conversation between four or five of the customers and the two or three people behind the service counter in the shop. They were pointing out the extent to which the Bannon Government of South Australia has become the high tax, high charge—

Mr Groom: Did they know who you were?

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: No, the conversation was flowing well and truly before I entered the shop. All the people standing around on both sides of the counter were highlight-

ing the extent to which Government charges and taxes have gone up in this State: that is before the financial institutions duty tax is passed in this Parliament. That is the worst of the tax increases.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: It is an important point. Prior to the election the Premier promised no tax increases, and those tax promises, made only three weeks before the State election, have clearly been breached. The electorate, and certainly the Parliament, will not forget that from now until the next election, although it is probably almost two years away, I highlight the point made by the member for Torrens—that this is a most fitting piece of legislation with which to label the Government on the anniversary of its election to office. After one year it has become known as the Government of high taxes. It has become known as the Ned Kelly of South Australia—the person that has robbed the people of South Australia.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: Careful—my mother was a Kelly.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I was not trying to reflect on the member for Murray's mother or mother-in-law, whatever her maiden name was. There is no doubt that this Government, on the anniversary of its election, will, because of this tax which is now being introduced, become known as the high tax Government of this State, and the Government that has introduced the first new taxing measure for at least a decade.

The measure, which is planned to be operative from 1 December, is being introduced with far too much haste. Because of that haste there will be considerable cost penalty on a number of financial institutions which will have to bear the cost themselves because they will not have time to pass on the cost. Also such haste will muddy the introduction of the tax and make it extremely difficult for banks which, up until now, have not known how to amend their computer sheets. In fact, until this legislation is passed they will not know what amendments will be required.

If the legislation goes through the other place by the end of next week (although, I hope it does not get through at all) that is all the time we will give the financial institutions of this State—less than two weeks to programme their computers and have operating a system to impose the financial institutions duty. That is absolutely impossible to achieve. How any Government that claims to be a Government of sound administration and works in partnership with the private sector could operate on such a basis is beyond my imagination.

The next point made in the speeches delivered so far is that this tax should never have been introduced. The Premier has highlighted in three statements that he has made since becoming Premier (even as recently as May of this year) that a financial institutions duty is an unfortunate tax to impose and will have an adverse effect on this State's commerce. The Premier said that, if at all possible, he would not try to introduce that type of tax.

Mr Groom: But will you repeal it?

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Despite those three clear statements which the Premier said this afternoon—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Hartley will come to order. The honourable member for Davenport—

Mr Lewis: He's like a mosquito larva—a wriggler.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope the honourable member for Mallee will come to order as well.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Honourable members will appreciate the reason why the honourable member for Hartley is interjecting as he is, because he is trying to make

this great bid for the Ministry. He knows that a reshuffle of Cabinet is on just after Christmas.

Mr Trainer: Tell us about the shadow Cabinet.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: The Chief Secretary earlier this evening admitted that there was to be a reshuffle of Cabinet, and that the member for Hartley—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: —would be in Cabinet before long.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Ascot Park is also out of order, and I ask the honourable member for Davenport to devote his remarks to the Bill.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I certainly will, provided that the galah, cockatoo, or whatever, that sits on the back bench opposite keeps his mouth shut. The point I was making was that this tax should never have been introduced. It is a most unfortunate form of taxation. The Premier himself admitted that on three occasions; this afternoon he admitted that he had in fact made those statements. I have come to the point in listening to the arguments of wondering whether one can ever believe anything that our Premier, Mr Bannon, says in this State. He made promises before the last election which he has blatantly broken. One could say that he deliberately lied before the last election in order to win. He was going to win no matter what the cost.

Mr Trainer: He did not say that.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I have said that.

Mr Trainer: In that case you are using unparliamentary language.

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

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: We all know that the present Premier, the then Leader of the Opposition, was prepared to use whatever tactic was necessary to win Government. It was Government no matter what the cost to his credibility or to the State, and that is exactly what he has done. No measure highlights that more than the extent to which the Premier was prepared to come out with misrepresentation and what some people would call lies to achieve that objective.

My next point is that the level of tax that has been introduced, as other speakers have highlighted, particularly the Leader of the Opposition, is far too high. The tax should never have been introduced; it should never have been brought before this Parliament. Even accepting the fact that it has been introduced, the level of 4c in every \$100 is too high. We know that it is too high and that it is higher than the tax in New South Wales and Victoria; we know also the adverse effect that that will have on South Australia.

It has been admitted by financial institutions and large companies that they were flying bags of money on overnight planes to this State to carry out financial transactions here in order to avoid the tax in Victoria and New South Wales. That will obviously cease forthwith. Instead, that money will be flown into Queensland, where transactions will take place. I highlight that point because the Premier has said on numerous occasions that he wants Adelaide to be the administrative head office for national companies for the whole of Australia and, in particular, the financial centre for those companies.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Don't you?

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Yes, I do, and that is the very reason why I will oppose this Bill at the second reading stage. I can imagine no single measure that would do more damage (I am glad that the Chief Secretary has raised the point) than to introduce a financial institutions duty tax at

a level of at least 33 per cent higher than applies in Melbourne and Sydney. There is no other single measure that would damn the concept of turning South Australia into the administrative headquarters for national companies.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable Chief Secretary to order.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I find it even more disconcerting, because I believe that this State has the potential, through its high technology industry and the thrust that we initiated in that area, to develop as the computer centre for companies that operate throughout Australia. In other words, the data processing facilities of those companies could be established in Adelaide, and far more cheaply than in any other State.

There is one area of any company operation that is computerised more than any other area, and that is financial transactions. Yet we find that the concept that we are trying to achieve for this State will be destroyed by the measure before us. That is why I will vote against the Bill at the second reading stage. I challenge the Chief Secretary, who apparently supports that concept, to join me in voting against this measure, and I challenge the Government Whip to do likewise, because I have heard him make similar statements in regard to what we should be setting out to achieve in this State. But those members have not the spine nor the guts to do so.

An honourable member: Nor the brains.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to refrain from that sort of language.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I turn now to the extent to which this new taxing measure will affect churches, community agencies, voluntary groups in our community, and in particular charities. The extent to which it is a tax on those bodies, which so far have been largely completely exempt from State Government taxation, was highlighted this afternoon by the Leader of the Opposition. I find it incredible that the State Government, through this measure, is willing to tax charity bodies to the extent of up to \$20 000 for each charity group. These are the very groups that are trying to help the unemployed, those who are socially disadvantaged and those who are living below the poverty line. These are the groups that are trying to raise funds on a voluntary basis, but for what purpose now? To pay \$20 000 per organisation to the State Government through this Bill.

Mr Groom: Oh come on!

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: The honourable member is apparently disputing that. Those figures were cited this afternoon and they have not been disputed (and I stress that) by the Government in the debate this afternoon or this evening. There has been plenty of opportunity to do so. These facts were brought out in the first speech of the afternoon, which was made by the Leader of the Opposition. There have been at least 18 occasions on which a Government member could have stood up and refuted those claims, but no-one has done so.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: The member for Hartley did not refute them.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: No, he did not. This highlights the extent to which Government back-benchers do not know the impact of this legislation on community groups. It will be interesting to see what happens when they go out into the community in a month and start to cop the flak from those groups in the community when they suddenly have to pay f.i.d. to the State Government. Do not worry—I will be adding up carefully how much tax is being paid to the State Government by the groups in my district and I will highlight to the people in my district the extent to which they are paying into the coffers of the State Government

when they donate to charities. Those points have come out so far, and all of them are very pertinent. They highlight the haste involved, the lack of consultation that has taken place and the lack of thought that has gone into introducing this taxing measure, let alone the destruction of the Premier's credibility.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: That went ages ago.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: It is well and truly buried. The Premier's credibility is not only gone—it has been buried 10 feet below the ground. Perhaps on the anniversary of this Government's election we should be holding a wake for the Premier's credibility more than anything else. There are two other points that I would like to raise. Briefly, I would like to touch on the construction industry because, if ever there is an industry where financial transactions take place not once but five or six times on the one job, it is this industry. If a building costs \$1 million, the person having the building constructed eventually pays \$1 million to the principal contractor, who will pay some of that money to material suppliers, and he will pay most of it to subcontractors.

Those subcontractors, when they receive the money, like the principal contractor, will bank it and then pay their material suppliers and further subcontractors, who are likely to end up paying employees or paying for further materials. If one understands the industry, it is not hard to see that on average the \$1 million would be banked and withdrawn from the bank on at least two or three occasions, which means that the tax will be imposed on the \$1 million four or five times during the life of the job until the money received meets its final destination in paying material suppliers or employees' wages.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: And then it tends to recirculate.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Yes, it is further taxed after that. I have calculated that, for every \$1 million spent on a construction job, the State Government is taking \$1 600 in tax, based on a cycle of—

Mr Trainer interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I am interested to see the member for Ascot Park shrug his shoulder and say 'That is all'—\$1 600 to the State Government for every \$1 million of construction work. That is a significant sum, especially as it is an additional new tax on top of all other taxes. It is on top of pay-roll tax, and here is a Government that claims that it is trying to help the construction industry at present. What has it done? It cut the capital budget this year in real terms for heavy construction work and engineering work. As a Government it has imposed a withholding tax, which has increased substantially the cost of construction work since 1 September. In my talks with the industry I have been told that the average price of many contracts has increased by about 2 per cent since introduction of the withholding tax by the Federal Labor Government under Mr Hawke.

Now we find a further additional tax of \$1 600 for every \$1 million of expenditure, and it could be more than that. That is a conservative figure that I have used, but there is at least \$1 600 further tax on every \$1 million expenditure in the construction industry. This is in an industry where \$1 million is so-called nothing. Of course, that is if the job happens to get to the private sector. We find that this Government claims to be in partnership with private industry. That partnership means that we kick the private sector in the pants or slap it in its face—that is what the partnership is for—while the Government sector does the work, because this afternoon—

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope that the honourable gentle-

man will come back to the Bill. The honourable member is out of order.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I appreciate your guidance, Mr Speaker. I am on the Bill. I am pointing out that the Government is slapping the private construction industry in a number of ways, one of which is the imposition of this tax. In many ways it is very similar to the receipts tax introduced in this State in about 1968. The receipts tax was imposed on receipts received at each point.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Yes; introduced and finally withdrawn shortly afterwards because it was a disaster. If one looks at where that tax had its impact, one finds that the f.i.d. has a similar impact. I believe that this Government will cop a similar amount of flak because of its financial institutions duty to that copped about the receipts tax, the only difference being that the large financial bodies will be paying this tax and passing the cost on, whereas with the receipts tax the method of collection was slightly more cumbersome. However, the total collected will be approximately the same. I think that I am right in saying that, in 1968 terms, the receipts tax only collected \$1 million in the whole of South Australia. Here we have a new tax to be introduced which, in proportion—

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Adds \$16 for every man woman and child in the State.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Yes. This tax will be a greater financial burden on every person in this State than the receipts tax ever was. In many ways it is like the 'value added' tax that operates in Great Britain and other European countries where, every time a transaction takes place and money is exchanged, the Government grabs its little share. It is a small share of each transaction, but it is grabbed on so many transactions that it adds up to a very substantial amount. I think that the real crux of this issue comes down to the point that this Government has decided that in 1983-84 the tax income for the South Australian Government should be increased by 14 per cent. Of all the arguments put forward, even though extremely valid and important, I think that this is the most important of all, that this tax is part of a 14 per cent tax increase in this State.

I highlight this point because we are expecting a c.p.i. or inflation rate of about 7 per cent in 1983-84. In other words, this State Government has decided that the tax increase in 1983-84 should be more than twice the inflation rate or, in other terms, a 7 per cent, in real terms, increase in taxation income for the State Government. I refer members opposite (because I know that they do not often read anything, let alone any magazine of some value) to an article that appeared in the Spring, 1983 *Institute of Public Affairs Review*. These are factual figures and I challenge members opposite to dispute them. Page 121 of this review highlights the inflation rate in Australia and the contribution to that rate, or the c.p.i., by both the public and private sectors. It points out that, as at June 1983, there was a c.p.i. rate of 10.6 per cent.

The private sector contribution to that rate was 9.4 per cent and the public sector contribution 13.6 per cent. In other words, the main contributor to Australia's inflation rate, not only as at June but for some years before that, has been the Government sector. It is interesting to see, when plotting the curves in the c.p.i. and the contributions by the private and public sectors, that the blow-out in the public sector contribution has occurred with the election of Labor Governments throughout Australia. In other words, it is Labor Party philosophy to increase the prices of goods and services supplied by the Government and to increase the taxation level. This has caused this enormous blow-out in the Government's contribution to the c.p.i. after many years

of Government austerity and trying to bring inflation under control. Based on the last quarter, we now have an annual inflation rate below 10 per cent for the first time in many years. However, that will not last long—only until the introduction of Medicare, but not far beyond that. We find that we now have this huge increase in Government charges and taxes. I will not list all these increases, but the most recent of them was a 12 per cent increase in electricity charges. Now we have this new impost by the Government of a new tax. My concern is—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: The honourable member who is interjecting is interjecting out of his seat at any rate.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Davenport will be heard.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I would like to read briefly to the House a summary that this article then makes based on this contribution by Government to the inflation rate. It says:

The need to raise revenue also helps explain the large increases in Commonwealth and State budgets in taxes, excise and charges on consumer goods such as cigarettes, wine, beer and motor fuel. There is no doubt that public sector spending has 'taken off' with the Federal and most State Governments—

like the South Australian Government—

pursuing big spending policies. This will lead to further pressure on public sector prices, as Governments seek additional revenue sources. The contribution of the public sector to overall inflation is, in fact, greater than the graph suggests. Many of the price increases in the private sector result from Government policies on such matters as pay-roll taxes, energy pricing, land taxes and company tax.

Finally, the Government support for indexing wages and salaries will clearly add pressure on the price levels of all goods and services. The combined effect of automatic indexation and rising prices may put Australia, once again, on a costly wage-price inflation spiral, with the public sector leading the way.

I can think of no more apt note on which to finish this speech than this incredible danger. There is no doubt that unemployment and inflation are the two worst enemies that Australia has. The Economic Summit came to that conclusion; no-one has disputed it. Yet Labor Government policies throughout Australia, and particularly in this State with a 14 per cent increase in State tax revenue this year, are putting enormous pressure back on to that spiral (which, fortunately, due to Liberal Party policies, had been coming down), which is now going to force it back up again.

At a time when most of the developed countries throughout the world are looking at inflation rates of about half what ours is at present, here in Australia we have Government policies being implemented which will now pull us out of that downward spiral and push us back up again. It will be the most unfortunate step that could ever be taken in Australia. It will damage our employment position; it will damage our chances for economic recovery, which is going on throughout the world. I ask the Government again to assess the impact of this new taxation measure on inflation and unemployment throughout Australia. For these reasons I will oppose the legislation at the second and third readings.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Murray): I want to have a bit to say about this piece of legislation, which can be described only as disastrous. I want first to talk a little about the background of the introduction of this Bill. The introduction of this disastrous new revenue-raising measure was announced by the Treasurer in a Ministerial statement on 4 August 1983. At that point the level of duty to be applied had not been determined. It was revealed in the Budget papers tabled on 1 September that a net \$8 million

(and that excluded existing stamp duties to be abolished) was estimated to be raised during 1983-84, and \$16 million in a full year from this source. At that stage a rate of duty, exemptions and reductions of other stamp duties had not been determined.

A draft Bill was circulated amongst members of the financial community in early September. When I say 'amongst the financial community', I point out that it only went out to certain people. I know of organisations that would very much like to have had the opportunity to look at the legislation when it went out in early September.

[Midnight]

However, it is interesting to note that at that point the rate of duty had still not been determined. Of course, we know now that it was not until the final draft of the Bill was introduced on 29 October that relevant details were made public. This Bill has thrown the whole community, particularly the business community, into confusion and concern once again over the activities of the Bannon Government.

As has been said by so many of my colleagues on this side of the House, it is a totally unwarranted tax. It is a cost to the community which it can ill afford to pay at this time. Not only that, it is, as has been explained particularly by my Leader, a tremendous cost to charity and organisations that work for the under-privileged in this State. I was particularly concerned, as I know the people of South Australia will be, at the examples given by the Leader this afternoon of the specific charities that will be disadvantaged. We recognise that the money that will be fleeced from these organisations and charities could well be spent on charity work itself. I want to refer to that a little later on because a large number of charities and organisations will be affected.

Why is the Premier doing this? Why is the Bannon Government hell bent on introducing legislation that will cause the amount of confusion and concern that this legislation is causing at present? The Premier certainly has no mandate. He made no promise to introduce it. He has no mandate to introduce it, and the only reason that we can believe the Government and the Treasurer have found it necessary to introduce this legislation is the incredibly bad management on the part of the Bannon Government, whose policies we are now experiencing in this State. Because of this bad management it is necessary to introduce a tax such as this to get it out of its troubles.

Let me, along with all my colleagues, once again remind the House of the Premier's promise prior to the election when he said that there would be no increases in State taxes and State charges, and went on to say, 'We will not allow State charges like transport fares, electricity and hospital charges to be used as a form of back-door taxation.' If this is not seen as a form of back-door taxation, I do not know what is.

It is the first new taxation that we have seen in this State since 1974 and that may be something that the present Government can be proud of. I would suggest that it ought to be ashamed of it, because that is quite a length of time that the State has been able to proceed without the introduction of such a taxing measure. There is no honour and glory on the part of the present Government in introducing this taxing measure, the first since 1974. It is no wonder at all that the public of South Australia have lost faith in the Government, particularly in the credibility of the Government and that of the Premier. We have seen an incredible number of increases in State taxes and State charges in

South Australia in the 12 months that this Government has now been in control of this State.

As my colleague the member for Davenport has just said, there is no doubt at all that the taxation issue will be one of the major issues at the next State election. Let us look at some of the other increases in charges. Cigarettes have gone up by 18c a packet; the price of spirits and wine has gone up an incredible amount; insurance, beer, petrol, transport, electricity, water and sewerage, Housing Trust rents and gas prices have gone up, and so it goes on. One can only ask what further taxes and Government charges will be increased within the next few months. Perhaps it might be motor vehicle registration, drivers' licence fees, property taxes, and so it goes on.

However, we need to continue (and certainly on this side we will continue) to remind the Government and the Premier particularly about the very hollow promises he made prior to the election when he said that they would not allow State charges to be used as a form of back-door taxation. In dealing with some of those increases, I want to make particular reference to the second increase that we have seen in ETSA charges in the past 12 months. My electorate is certainly very concerned about those increases and I know that other electorates likewise are expressing considerable concern about them. As the Leader pointed out today, the Premier is obviously so sensitive about it that he issued a minute to some electorate secretaries (and I would suggest that they would be secretaries to Labor members) suggesting to them how they could answer any particular complaints received from their constituents in regard to these matters.

The SPEAKER: I hope that the honourable gentleman will not reflect on people who cannot protect themselves and yet who are technically in the employ of members of Parliament. It disturbs me somewhat.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I would suggest that, if we are talking about the Electricity Trust, the Government has been aware and has not helped the situation by increasing electricity tariffs which I suggest—

The SPEAKER: That was not the point that concerned me. I hope that the honourable gentleman will not reflect upon people in the employ of members of Parliament.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: No, I have no intention of saying any more about the concerns being experienced by electorate secretaries. The increase in electricity tariffs has made a further mockery of the Premier's election promises. It is the second rise in less than a year, despite the Premier's promise to which I referred earlier. As a result of this recent increase, it has been estimated that the Government will receive an extra \$2.7 million in a full year through its tax on the Electricity Trust.

We are told that another reason for higher power tariffs is the Premier's decision to significantly increase the interest payable by the Electricity Trust on loans outstanding to the State Government: this alone will cost the Electricity Trust more than \$12 million this financial year according to the Budget papers, and this is also to be met by electricity consumers. As I mentioned earlier, there is certainly concern in the electorate about that matter. We could also refer to the increase in gas charges. If we were in Government, we would certainly not have reintroduced the gas tax, which will result in a rise in tariffs next year particularly.

It was stated recently by the Premier that the former Liberal Government removed the tax last year as only a temporary measure and that it planned to reintroduce it. That is absolute rubbish. As my colleague the Deputy Leader and shadow Minister of Mines and Energy said, it is unfortunate that the Premier is now resorting to lies in his attempt to justify tax increases. The former Government had no plans at all to reintroduce the tax and it would not have done so.

I suggest also that the Premier completely misrepresented the means by which gas price increases awarded to the Cooper Basin producers are decided. Only a matter of days ago the Premier said that last year's increases had been negotiated by the previous Government and by the previous Minister of Mines and Energy. In fact, the price awarded was the result of arbitration under procedures established in supply contracts approved by the Dunstan Government—contracts which completely disadvantaged South Australia. This Parliament recognises that. They were contracts that the former Government was attempting to rationalise at the time of the last election. So, we have seen a further attempt on the part of the Government and the Premier to pass off to the previous Government some of the blame for the problems that the Government is experiencing at present.

While referring to some of these increases, once again I remind members of a letter to which I referred in this Parliament when we were considering the Budget. The letter to which I referred and which was handed to me recently was sent out by the present Minister of Water Resources when he was a member of the Opposition. He sent out a letter to his constituents in the Gilles electorate complaining about the increases that had occurred under the Liberal Government. I do not have that letter with me now, but I can remember quite clearly that the increases referred to by the honourable member represented a mere pittance, having regard to the increases that have occurred under the previous Government. I am just wondering how the Minister and his constituents are feeling about the increases that have occurred under the Labor Government.

Much has been said, particularly in the media, about broken promises. I would like to refer to an editorial which appeared in the *News* of 6 July. At that time the Government was considering an increase in transport charges. The editorial stated:

Imagine the uproar if the price of such daily necessities as a loaf of bread or carton of milk went up overnight by 40 per cent. There would be wholly justified rage. Yet this is what the South Australian Government proposes to do with bus, tram and train fares at the end of this month.

A Government which is party to the supposed national accord on prices and incomes restraint will increase public transport fares by an average of 47.6 per cent. There is no question of independent inquiry, of price justification or surveillance.

As of 31 July, it is a simple choice: pay, walk or stay home. The people who will bear the brunt of the increase are, meanwhile waiting to hear from the Arbitration Commission whether they may hope for a pay rise of perhaps 4 per cent.

Yet with serene aplomb the Labor Government of South Australia will impose price increases tenfold that figure. In the economic climate of 1983 we do not question the necessity for income restraint. But restraint is not a one way street.

Any price increase of 40 per cent is eyebrow-raising. Imposed on what is virtually a captive audience—public transport users are generally customers by necessity, not choice—it is plain offensive.

Less than eight months ago Mr Bannon stood before the people of this State and said that, unlike the Liberals, a Labor Government would not allow State charges such as transport fares to be used as a form of backdoor taxation.

Another lousy broken promise. But this is the first year of the Bannon Government's term.

Put up the taxes, the charges, the fares now. The voters will have forgotten by the third year when the ballot is taken again—when the empty promises are made again.

Never mind that they are struggling to make ends meet with each pay packet—if they have one.

A priority in transport policy will be to keep down fares to attract and retain passengers. That again was Mr Bannon in his policy speech. Some priority!

To retain credibility with the electorate the State Government should immediately rescind and review the public transport fares it has announced for the end of this month.

I would suggest that that puts very plainly the attitude of the majority of people in this State in regard to increases in State charges that have been experienced in recent times. It is quite incredible, when one considers that this Premier

stood before the people at the last election with high promises and supposedly with all the answers. He continued to say in this place, as the Leader of the Opposition, that he had detailed information from Treasury which suggested that the course he proposed for this State was appropriate, and that he had all the answers as far as Treasury matters were concerned. Now we are starting to recognise just how far out he was. Unfortunately, as I have said in this place before on a number of occasions, the people of this State were sucked in by hollow promises. I know that they are giving second thoughts to the situation now.

The point was made in the *News* editorial that this is only the first year of a three-year term and that, by the end of the three years, people will have forgotten about these increased charges and taxes. I suggest that that is not correct. I am quite sure that we will find that come the next election—whenever that might be—State taxation will be one of the major issues and concerns of the people in this State. Of course the Premier confessed earlier that things have changed. He said that he informed the House last December that he would not be able to keep his election promises. That was just a month after coming to Government. Of course we realise that when things are different they are never the same, but the people of this State are recognising that the Premier has not kept his promises and has not kept to what he indicated at the time of the election he would do, as Treasurer of this State, in relation to financial measures.

One of the reasons that the Premier has the problems that he now has is the number of incompetent Ministers in his Cabinet and the lack of effect they have in keeping their departments financially under control. That has been referred to by a number of my colleagues on this side of the House. We have heard this evening and have read on a number of occasions in the media that the Premier would set up a review committee to look into taxation. It has been suggested that we are likely to hear more about that in the very near future. I understand that the three people have been invited to become part of this review. I will be interested to see what are the terms of reference and just how they intend carrying out this review. Of course, more importantly, we will be looking forward to seeing some of the recommendations or results that come out of that review.

The Premier said before the last State election that this duty was not a good tax. He did not say it once but two or three times; he said he would avoid introduction of this form of taxation. He repeated that when questioned in this House and outside it, but he certainly said it publicly. As I said earlier, the Government is in big trouble. Its taxation in this State has increased by 14 per cent.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: Is that all?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The Minister of Water Resources, on walking into the Chamber and on hearing that, says, 'Is that all?' That is obviously the attitude of the present Government. If he is going to make those comments he should make them quietly. That is about as a responsible a comment as any Minister in this Government could make. We have seen an increase of 14 per cent in State taxation and the Minister of Water Resources says, 'Is that all?' That will go down really well with the community of this State. Of course, the Financial Institutions Duty Bill will impose a tax on everybody, not just a select few. It will be placed on business, organisations, charities, and our children. All these people and organisations will see these increases.

The Hon. R.G. Payne: Why don't you—

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: If the Minister does not agree with what I am saying, let him stand up when he has the opportunity to do so and explain the situation. No-one in the Government, certainly not the member for Hartley, has clarified the situation. Everyone in the community will be disadvantaged as a result of this legislation. All of these

increases to which I have referred this evening, and now this tax, will be part of what is seen as a greater burden on the community, particularly on business.

It has been said that this financial institutions duty will cost every family \$7 a year. The Leader indicated earlier in his speech on this Bill that it would be considerably higher than \$7 a year. It will be interesting to see, after the tax has been introduced, how it will affect the average person. But again I remind the House, because it is important that we continue to do so, that under a Liberal Government taxation was reduced. We said prior to the 1979 election that we would reduce taxation, and that is exactly what we did. We reduced it by 5.2 per cent, which is much more than can be said about the present Government.

In the first 12 months of the Bannon Government we have seen an increase of 14 per cent. As has been said by other members today, that proves that this Government has a greed for revenue because of mismanagement of its own financial situation. There will be considerable confusion in industry and the banking institutions. We are informed that there is a considerable need for modification of computers and other equipment by many of these organisations. What concerns me more than anything about this legislation is that we are living at a time when more than ever before we need security and optimism. We need people to be encouraged to come into this State for business purposes so that more people can be employed; that is desperately needed.

This legislation will be totally detrimental in regard to that situation. It will drive people from the State: it will encourage people to leave South Australia and to go to Queensland or to any other State. As the member for Davenport stated, the Premier of Queensland will be smiling about this tax, because there is no doubt that it will be a further incentive for people to leave this State and to go to Queensland. We recognise a situation where the community generally will be disadvantaged. So many of the organisations that work for the under-privileged will be disadvantaged particularly.

We learnt today of the problems that will be experienced by the Central Methodist Mission, for example, and we all recognise the magnificent work that the mission does for those who are less advantaged in this State. We recognise (as the Leader indicated today) the disadvantages that will accrue to some of the churches, and the Uniting Church and the Catholic Church were cited as examples. We recognise the disadvantage that this duty will impose on sporting bodies, and I could go on. Minda Home, the Home for the Aged, Red Cross, the Anti-Cancer Foundation and many more organisations will be affected.

I am sure that there will be an increase in the number of cash payments as a result of this measure, and along with that there will be further security risks or the introduction of negotiable cheques. Of course, there will eventually be a cost to the consumer: the consumer will have to pay more yet again because of this Bill. The measure will increase the cost of housing and legal aid, and the Leader in his contribution made special reference to some of those matters, but time does not permit me to repeat them. In closing, I state again that this is disastrous legislation that can only jeopardise the competitiveness of this State at a time when it can least afford it. It is just another example of the lack of credibility that the people have come to recognise in this Government and in particular the Premier of this State.

Mr EVANS (Fisher): It is the birthday of the present Government's election to attempt to govern this State. The Government's policy speech, which was delivered by the Premier, indicated that there would be no new taxes, that taxes would not be increased, and that no back-door charges would be imposed. But this is a new tax: it is the first new

tax that has been introduced in this State for about eight years. The new taxes that were introduced eight years ago were in the main taxes on cigarettes and such commodities which some believe are luxuries and which many would argue could be done without. This tax affects everyone in the community. Naturally, it affects those who have more money to transfer from one account to another to pay their debts. Quite often, those people can afford to pay such a duty, but the burden on those on lower incomes and in a lower socio-economic group will be greater. This commitment may create greater hardship than would the commitment of those with a bigger turnover. We must be concerned about that. The Opposition has argued against the Bill. I refer particularly to the Leader of the Opposition. I believe that his address was very explanatory, that it was brilliant, and that it researched the position in regard to this tax if it was applied throughout the community from A to Z.

It pointed out and highlighted in particular the effect that this tax will have on churches and charitable organisations. Today's *Advertiser* (it is 12.30 a.m. on 9 November, and perhaps we are privileged to be able to read the *Advertiser* before most residents of the State) on the first page, states:

The Premier, Mr Bannon, said last night he would amend the tax if it was found to cause distress or difficulties for these groups. He was talking about churches and charities. The paper makes the point in its report that the Opposition had highlighted the difficulty in this area to the Government, and this was the Premier's response. The Premier said only if it causes difficulties. Obviously, it will cause difficulties, even if it is just bookwork. Of course, the Government has often argued that it is there to help the underprivileged, the disadvantaged, and will do all in its power through taxes and moneys available to help those groups.

Will the Government say what churches, charitable bodies and service clubs such as Lions, Rotary, Kiwanis, Apex and the like do? What does the church do with the money it spends to help others? Churches have administration costs, and the balance of money remaining after carrying out its normal services is used to help others. The money cannot be withdrawn from the administration area because much administration is undertaken by volunteers, and the same provisions apply in respect of voluntary organisations, whether it be Red Cross, Crippled Children's Association, the multiple sclerosis organisation or the like. Such organisations have administration costs, but there is much volunteer effort. They cannot cut administration costs any more. So, if they are going to lose money—whether it be \$20, \$50 or \$20 000—it is the people who are disadvantaged in the community who lose the benefit.

If money is to be collected from organisations and the effort is made to try and distribute the money through a Government agency to help disadvantaged people through f.i.d., we lose the cost of administering the money through the Public Service of all paid personnel. The end result of every dollar collected in all probability in distributing it back to benefit people in the community who are disadvantaged may involve 25c or 30c in each dollar by the time it is eventually collected and distributed. However, if we left it with the voluntary organisations such as the churches and charitable bodies each full dollar would be spent in many cases—at least the major part of it—on people who are disadvantaged. By that method we are reducing the burden on Government, on the people, because we are encouraging volunteers to carry out such action. The Premier makes the point that, if the duty creates difficulties, he will amend the legislation in future. Why not do it now? The Opposition has put up amendments. Why hesitate? Why did the Premier not come out in the press and say, 'We, as a Government, admit that we did not research it properly. We went into producing this tax in the form of a Bill through the Parlia-

ment in haste. We did not realise at the time the effect it would have on so many charitable and church organisations. We just thought it would affect the big institutions. Now that it has been pointed out to us, we will amend it immediately and accept the amendment from the Opposition, or we will offer to take it from the Opposition and implement it.'

At least the Government should admit that. Indeed, I remember the Premier saying that he wanted a joint effort on difficult issues from both the Opposition and the Government. He wanted a consensus, to agree to work together. Here is a golden opportunity to say that the Government did not adequately research the Bill; because it did not research the effect, it will accept the amendments. But no, that is not likely to be the case. The Government will put it into operation, and if it creates difficulties will amend it. The Premier knows, as does any person who looks at this Bill, that it will cause difficulties for everybody handling money. Surely voluntary bodies are the ones that should be immediately exempted from this tax.

An interesting article appears on page 3 of today's *Advertiser*, where I read that the latest report of the Community Welfare Department tabled in this House today (I have not yet read it because the report was only tabled earlier today) states that poverty is on the rise in South Australia. The report also refers to child abuse and a few other areas. However, I will not try to tie those matters to the economic climate but will stick to the area of poverty, about which the article states:

A stark picture of a South Australian community increasingly disrupted by poverty and family breakdown was presented to State Parliament yesterday.

This sitting of Parliament has run over two days. The article continues:

The report details 'unprecedented growth' in new applications for E & WS and council rate concessions for people suffering financial hardship, people seeking budgeting advice—

That refers to advice from Government agencies. The report continues:

According to the report, applicants for E & WS and council rate concessions, an important indicator of increased financial hardship in the community, rose by 58.4 per cent compared with the previous year to 20 858. People seeking budget advice rose by 55 per cent to 3 304.

Later, the report states:

The number of transport concession cards issued rose by 35.5 per cent to 145 387.

About 100 000 households, including 90 000 pensioners, applied for electricity tariff reductions through the electricity tariff concession scheme introduced last year.

That is all I wish to quote from that article. However, this Bill will impose another tax upon the community—a tax that the Premier admits is broad-based and will pick up charities and every other section of the community.

The Government is asking the Parliament to accept this tax at a time when the people of this State are taxed to the position where there is more poverty than there has ever been before—as stated in that Community Welfare Report, up 58 per cent in one year. Can we condone an action taken by a Government that believes it can bleed the people on a continuous basis using new forms of taxation and, in particular, the sort of taxation before us tonight?

If the Liberal Party were in power and attempted to introduce this tax, a lot more would be said in emotional terms by the present Government if it was in Opposition; we have experienced this before. However, speeches from members on this side of the House on this matter have involved rational and down to earth facts about the effect that this tax will have on our community.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: They would be long on emotion and short on reality.

Mr EVANS: That is true. There are a lot of people in my area who work for the country fire service organisations whose money will have this tax levied on it. That tax may not be much, but every time they use a cheque they pay 10c, because there is a tax on that cheque. Yet when this body asked for Government assistance in many cases it was told that money was not available. So, why take money from it by way of taxes if there is no money for it to come from the Government?

Mr Groom: You should be more concerned with lump sum superannuation schemes.

Mr EVANS: I did not hear the honourable member's interjection, but if he repeats it I might answer him. The form of tax about which we are now speaking affects all sections of the community. In our community at the moment, which group is being hit the hardest by Government charges and the cost of money? It is not necessarily the unemployed; it is not necessarily the supporting mother or the pensioner. In many cases some of those people may be better off than the average tradesperson who is getting only a normal weekly wage for 40 hours (in some cases, reduced hours; not a 40-hour week) and is trying to pay off mortgages, not getting any rent concessions if renting a home, not getting any electricity charge reduction, concessional water rates, council rates or sewerage rates, or telephone or public transport concession, and not getting any free books through the education system. Those people are paying the full tote odds in every area: trying to pay off a mortgage, perhaps trying to pay off a motor car, having only the one income coming into the home. They are the people we are relying on to be the home owners and to meet the responsibility instead of placing it back on the taxpayer. They are the people who are worse off than many of the other people whom we are saying are disadvantaged and under-privileged. We need to recognise it.

We need to recognise that this is the form of tax by which, when they go to buy their homes, they will be hit for a few extra dollars. That is the difference at times between having that little bit of extra furniture in the house or being able to meet a monthly commitment. That is not much, I know, but they are taxed when they pay it; if they are paid their wages by cheque, they are taxed when they pay their wages into an account and when they draw it out to pay off any debt. It is a cruel form of tax if one thinks about it.

Let us come to the point that many have mentioned, and I wish to mention briefly: if the Queensland election had gone the way in which Mr Hawke would have liked it to go we would have found that this tax was uniform throughout Australia. We may have found that the South Australian one might not have been higher than those in the other States, and that there would have been an attempt to apply it federally and to have the Federal Government distributing it back to the States. Thank the powers that be that Joh Bjelke-Petersen won in Queensland and that that could not occur, but in Joh Bjelke-Petersen's winning we find that he is now able to offer a haven again to people. If they want to avoid this tax and are in the bigger money exchange or turnover area all they have to do is operate their accounts out of Queensland. So, we have applied a tax to the poor or average person. It is not worth their trying to shift to another State to trade off their accounts, but those who are in a big enough way can avoid the scheme. So, how broadly based is it? We have said again to those who are not in a position to use avoidance methods by going to Queensland that they have to pay full tote odds, while the others go to help Joh finance his State.

Let us consider this when we talk about taxes: at the same time as this Government applies this tax the Queensland Government collects in the vicinity of \$100 million a year

from mineral royalties. From that it is able to provide free hospitalisation, and it still has lower taxes than virtually any of the other States. It avoids a tax like this, but it can offer free hospitalisation for its people. We cannot do it because we have a Government, first, that applies this tax, but, more importantly, states that we do not want some forms of mining here. We do not want the royalties from it, but are prepared to tax the people in other areas and force some of the money deals out of the State. That is what is happening.

The Government needs to be conscious that it cannot turn away the goose that might lay the golden egg and then criticise a body like the Queensland Government for being successful when it does what it believes is best for the finances of the State because other people are doing it right throughout the world. I am talking there about mining—in particular, uranium mining—and I will say no more about that.

So we have a tax from a Government that promised that there would be no increase in charges. My district knows what water, sewerage and public transport costs are, and it is very poorly served with those sorts of service but it still has to pay full tote odds and, in the case of transport, dearer than some other areas for the same distance of travel. There are also electricity charges, and in areas such as the Hills, where in the winter time it is colder than most other parts of the State, there is an increased burden on older people who do not have a pensioner benefit card but who do not necessarily have big incomes or a lot of assets either, so electricity becomes a critical need in living a reasonably comfortable life which the people concerned expect as they are ageing.

I know that the New South Wales Premier has made the point about doing something to reduce the rates for electricity. I will say no more than that Mr Bannon has now got on the bandwagon of talking about it, but we need more than talk. State charges have become too high, and the average person cannot afford to keep on paying what the Government is asking him to pay.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: The amendment should be accepted before it leaves this House.

Mr EVANS: That is correct. I said that earlier: the amendment should be accepted before it leaves this House. In the end we will not be able to bleed enough money from those who are producing to pay for the sorts of promises that we are making to others. The Government may say, 'Well, member for Fisher, where would you make the cuts in Government?' If one were frank enough to say, for example, that one could see Government cars being used (and I am not talking about Ministerial cars) at all sorts of functions all over the weekend, and something like 22 passing one by on the way to work on any given day, delivering children at schools, and so on, perhaps there could be a tightening up in those areas. Then one would be condemned by some of the Government members who would say that we are taking away a benefit given to public servants. I do not think that was the intention behind the use of the cars: it was to save garaging for cars. If they were garaged at someone's place and it was convenient for a person to go straight to work or do some work outside of the office (he may be a field worker), they were the benefits. However, there are many areas of exploitation in that area.

Another example is the paddock full of secondhand and new vehicles in the E. and W.S. Department for example—millions of dollars worth of vehicles not wearing out but rusting out. One could go through those areas where people in offices decide to buy pieces of equipment, not disposing of any equipment which is of no more use to them but which could be of use to someone else. It is a tax that comes at a very bad time, when poverty is increasing annually

at 58 per cent and when a Government only 12 months ago promised that there would be no new tax. I thought it said that in all sincerity, and I believe most people in the community had some faith in that statement.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: No longer.

Mr EVANS: But they cannot have that faith any more. We cannot blame them for that. We cannot say that they are foolish and should not have believed the Government. We know that they did believe it in many cases, and I know that they regret it. I know that Government members regret the fact that they used that policy to try to get into Government: they thought it would be easy. However, they found that one cannot govern with borrowed money. The Government found that, as with every Government, it had to start to reduce its expenditure.

I hope this Government will take note and accept the amendments proposed by the Leader of the Opposition, representing what I believe is one of the best planned pro-

posals put to this House in a long while. I hope that in the future the Government will research Bills before it introduces them in haste because the Treasury is telling it that it is short of money. Regardless of what it does now, unless it accepts the Opposition's amendments the Government has disadvantaged many charity and church organisations through its greed in hastily trying to pick up a leeway in monetary areas instead of doing its research first. I will oppose the Bill at every stage unless it is amended.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 12.51 a.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 9 November at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 8 November 1983

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

CONTACT VISITS

64. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. What is the policy of the Government regarding contact visits in South Australian prisons?

2. What percentage of prisoners receive contact visits in Adelaide Gaol and Yatala Labour Prison, respectively?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

1. The Government's policy regarding contact visits is that they should be available for prisoners in line with the recommendations of the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules.

2. Prisoners at the Adelaide Gaol do not receive contact visits as facilities and staffing do not allow for them at the moment. However, plans are well underway to overcome these problems and contact visits are anticipated to be available by 25 December 1983. At Yatala Labour Prison 92 per cent of all prisoners have had such visits.

MEDIA RESOURCE CENTRE

66. **The Hon. D.C. BROWN** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. What financial assistance did the Government give to the Media Resource Centre during 1982-83?

2. What is the purpose of the Centre?

3. Does the Centre carry out commercial work or act as agent for commercial operations?

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

1. \$7 500 in 1982-83.

2. The South Australian Media Resource Centre is funded to provide access to equipment and production assistance for independent filmmakers. The Centre's activities can be divided into four areas:

1. the promotion and development, exhibition and distribution of independently-made Australian and overseas film;
2. training—the provision of workshops for the development of skills appropriate to any or all of the

areas associated with the production of independently—made 16 mm, super 8 and video;

3. equipment rental and production assistance—the provision of equipment for 16 mm, super 8 and some three-quarter inch video productions, and the provision of production assistance to independent filmmakers;

4. feminist film—the provision of appropriate information and skills workshops to enable women to develop filmmaking skills so that women can become involved in areas of filmmaking not traditionally open to them.

The Centre is committed to the development of independent film culture in South Australia and believes the above areas, together with the provision of adequate library resources, and an active seminar series, provide visiting filmmakers with the opportunity to screen their work and have it discussed.

3. No.

JOB CREATION SCHEMES

77. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: In relation to the \$17 500 000 allocated by the Commonwealth for job creation within South Australia, how much has been spent to date, how much has been committed but not spent, how many new jobs have been created, and what are the names of the schemes?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The attached schedules detail individual grants per project approved. In addition the following amounts have been set aside.

\$1 100 000—For workers' compensation insurance

\$500 000—For project cost over runs

\$150 000—For contingencies in respect of the Port Lincoln Aquatic Centre Project No. 605.

The aggregate amount committed as at the end of September was \$14 434 311. The total amount expended to the end of September 1983 was \$3 340 877.

The discrepancy between commitment and expenditure is explained by the fact that there is a lead time of up to three months prior to the project commencing after approval advice, together with the fact that, apart from a 25 per cent advance, grant funds are made available on a reimbursement basis. The \$14 434 million commitment is expected to result in 2 276 people obtaining employment. At the end of September (the latest month for which statistics are available) 433 people were employed on job creation projects and the number was expanding rapidly.

JOB CREATION SCHEME
Grants Committee Recommendation for Project Approvals

Sponsor	Project Title	Labour \$	Materials \$	Total Grant \$	Sponsor \$
University of Adelaide	Wind measurement radar system upgrade	3 380	—	3 380	2 575
District Council of Yorketown	Edithburgh Swimming Centre Redevelopment	136 170	28 973	165 143	64 000
Community Media Association Inc.	Graphics Printing Video Additional Staff	25 564	2 614	28 178	6 350
S.A. Organisation for Adult Community Education	Adult Community Education Conference Secretarial Staff	5 600	—	5 600	14 000
South East Community Access Radio Inc.	Radio Station Staff Training Programme	53 200	—	53 200	—
Crippled Children's Association	Safety and Accident Research	11 085	—	11 085	4 080
Crippled Children's Association	Register of Assets Establishment	20 380	—	20 380	6 000
S.A. College of Advanced Education	College Policies Procedures Handbook	9 298	—	9 298	3 050
Lower Eyre Peninsula Women's Shelter	Extension Programme for Ex Tenants	10 470	200	10 670	—
Lower Eyre Peninsula Women's Shelter	Programme Officer	10 470	1 000	11 470	—
Mount Gambier Special School	Sheltered Employment Feasibility Study	19 310	3 195	22 505	2 150

JOB CREATION SCHEME
Grants Committee Recommendation for Project Approvals

Sponsor	Project Title	Labour \$	Materials \$	Total Grant \$	Sponsor \$
Corporation of the City of Mitcham	History of Mitcham Data Update	11 450	1 000	12 450	3 000
Corporation of the City of Mitcham	Aged Needs Survey	11 440	—	11 440	6 400
Corporation of the City of Woodville	Strategy Plan Development	18 774	—	18 774	8 046
Noarlunga Family Services Board	Statistical Research	12 746	Deferred	12 746	4 653
Australian Spanish Latin American Institute Inc.	Aged Respite Care Survey	12 347	1 565	13 912	5 555
Offenders Aid and Rehabilitation Services of S.A. Inc.	Bi-Lingual Information Handbook Development	17 096	3 000	20 096	5 000
Corporation of the City of Hindmarsh	Riverland Office Research and Establish	13 988	—	13 988	—
Corporation of the City of Whyalla	Office Workers Training Scheme	—	6 700	6 700	—
	Afforestation of Ten Reserves				
		\$402 768	\$48 247	\$451 015	\$134 859
The Parks Community Centre	Landscaping Redevelopment for Low Maintenance	26 376	—	26 376	—
Whyalla Y.W.C.A.	Co-ordinator to Work with Women	9 985	1 500	11 485	2 110
Northern Suburbs Aged Housing Assoc. Inc.	Association Activities Research	13 630	1 800	15 430	4 765
Goodwill Industries	Market Hire a Plant	19 990	900	20 890	18 344
FOCUS Adelaide Festival Fringe	Computer Operator Programme Trainee	11 980	9 921	21 901	11 800
FOCUS Adelaide Festival Fringe	Education Professional Research and Implementation	18 455	834	19 289	6 219
FOCUS Adelaide Festival Fringe	Volunteer Co-ordinator	11 046	377	11 423	2 055
Corporation of the Town of Hindmarsh	Hindmarsh Heritage Study	13 350	—	13 350	5 200
FOCUS Adelaide Festival Fringe	Marketing Strategies Development and Implementation	11 980	1 367	13 347	3 372
FOCUS Adelaide Festival Fringe	Participants and Audience Survey	3 706	387	4 093	1 548
FOCUS Adelaide Festival Fringe	Festival Fringe Promotion	21 141	—	21 141	7 651
Corporation of the City of Tea Tree Gully	Emergency Home Help Service Development	8 933	—	8 933	2 233
Corporation of the City of Elizabeth	Youth Need Survey—Implementation Programmes	25 060	Deferred	25 060	8 000
		\$195 632	\$17 086	\$212 718	\$73 297
Midway Community House	Renovations Children's Activity Room	13 865	10 381	24 246	1 800
Milang and District Historical Society	Restoration Primitive Methodist Church	7 760	1 408	9 168	—
Riverland Community College	Technical Training Workshop	23 148	12 520	35 668	30 500
The Gardens Youth Project	Parafield Gardens Youth Needs Survey	24 050	1 684	25 734	1 284
Murray Bridge Sailing Club Inc.	Sailing Club Site Development Plan	50 210	26 307	76 517	29 754
District Council of Stirling	District Roads Study—Strategic Plan	9 243	—	9 243	3 962
District Council of Stirling	Mylor CFS Construction	37 790	14 460	52 250	22 775
District Council of Port Elliot and Goolwa	Middleton CFS Station	17 121	5 277	22 398	8 400
Ungarra and Districts Community Sports Club Inc.	Multi-sport Club and Changeroom Construction	57 300	30 600	87 900	64 100
District Council of Tumby Bay	Tumby Bay and Mortlock Park Construction facilities	7 640	—	7 640	10 865
District Council of Meadows	Serpentine Road Clubhouse and Toilet Construction	73 095	17 700	90 795	19 950
Red Cross Society	School Resource Material Development	9 790	—	9 790	4 140
District Council of Kingscote	Kingscote and Harriet River Erosion Protection	23 380	—	23 380	10 750
District Council of Wakefield Plains	Balaklava Town Hall Upgrading	37 900	17 730	55 630	16 320
Gerard Reserve Council Inc.	Yabbie Farm Development	219 075	214 940	434 015	102 716
Scout Assoc. of Aust. S.A. Branch	Computer based Accounts Est. System	6 426	—	6 426	9 230
Scout Assoc. of Aust. S.A. Branch	Woodhouse Campsite Building Improvements and Upgrading	15 900	—	15 900	8 602
Aust. Council for Rehabilitation of the Disabled	Acrod Convention Planning and Follow-up	13 640	2 000	15 640	5 992
District Council of Owen	Hamley and Owen Amenities Development and Landscape	18 830	5 600	24 430	7 600
Salvation Army—Ingle Farm	Youth Housing Options Research	37 944	5 700	43 644	19 740
Youth Affairs Council of S.A.	Youth Information Project	35 261	10 578	45 839	9 764
Bedford Industries Rehab. Association	Disabled Employment Training Research	24 066	1 000	25 066	5 120
District Council of Stirling	Mount Lofty Scout Hall Construction	38 940	23 876	62 816	43 600
Service to Youth Council	Research—Casual Work Bureau Establishment	9 148	639	9 787	3 588
District Council of Morgan	Reserve Beautification	15 300	—	15 300	9 500

JOB CREATION SCHEME
Grants Committee Recommendation for Project Approvals

Sponsor	Project Title	Labour \$	Materials \$	Total Grant \$	Sponsor \$
District Council of Paringa Woodville High School Council Inc	Develop Paringa Reserves Extending and Improving Recreational Areas in School Grounds	29 230	17 800	47 030	20 800
Corporation of the City of Tea Tree Gully	Tea Tree Gully Youth Information Resource Centre	63 400	29 325	92 725	21 100
Association of Community Theatres Inc.	Theatre About Us	17 230	—	17 230	6 341
District Council of Eudunda	Health Clinic and Public Conveniences	57 700	—	57 700	30 000
District Council of Willunga	Reserve Development	60 640	—	60 640	94 104
District Council of Willunga	Willunga CFS Fire Station	26 510	7 128	33 638	16 210
District Council of Willunga	Council Record Development	37 640	17 306	54 946	19 885
District Council of Murray Bridge	Council Record Development	8 950	600	9 550	7 475
District Council of Murray Bridge	Construction of Youth Club/Public Toilets	30 940	14 547	45 487	23 310
District Council of Murray Bridge Corporation of the City of Port Lincoln	Picnic and Park Shelters	41 260	5 326	46 586	19 778
Port Pirie Racing and Trotting Club	Aquatic Centre Half Mile Trotting Track Construction	552 900	422 100	975 000	644 300
Colours Inc.	Theatrical Dance Production	143 040	87 025	230 065	100 000
District Council of Meadows	Frank Smith Park Toilet Block	114 521	500	115 021	41 307
Corporation of the City of Burnside	Kensington Gardens Bowling/Tennis Club	15 192	1 459	16 651	9 010
Libraries Board of S.A.	Special Collections Projects	76 885	27 800	104 685	51 900
Libraries Board of S.A.	Public Libraries Division Projects	22 308	—	22 308	8 000
Libraries Board of S.A.	South Australian Library	116 090	—	116 090	33 000
		359 212	—	359 212	106 200
		\$1 788 948	\$630 916	\$2 419 854	\$1 262 220
Corporation of the City of Burnside	Irrigation System Replacement	13 330	7 670	21 000	9 400
Corporation of the City of Burnside	Planning Research	11 400	—	11 400	5 000
Corporation of the City of Burnside	Glenunga Oval Changerooms	63 810	41 190	105 000	45 000
Corporation of the City of Burnside	Shelter Sheds	9 290	3 710	13 000	7 000
Corporation of the City of Burnside	Renovation Town Hall Complex	42 000	—	42 000	18 000
Corporation of the City of Burnside	Burnside Hockey Club	39 790	16 210	56 000	24 000
District Council of Strathalbyn	Landscape Gardens	37 890	—	37 890	17 190
Corporation of the City of Kensington and Norwood	Community Development Officer	13 999	—	13 999	7 071
Corporation of the City of Mitcham	All Saints Tennis and Netball Clubrooms proposed Shelter, Store and Toilets at Gibb Park	30 850	4 700	35 550	19 000
Corporation of the City of Mitcham	New Clubrooms for Hawthorn Croquet Club extensions to Mitcham Football and Sturt District Cricket Club	38 680	17 700	56 380	36 800
Corporation of the City of Mitcham	Community Buildings and Tennis Courts at Nieass Reserve, Dinwood Avenue, Clarence Gardens	52 770	16 500	69 270	25 500
Corporation of the City of Kensington and Norwood	Richards Park and Thornton Street Park Developments	39 970	39 970	79 940	43 430
Corporation of the Town of Naracoorte	Wardel Crescent Reserve/Playground Development	22 440	10 910	33 350	21 220
Corporation of the Town of Naracoorte	Leicester Street Reserve	17 750	8 670	26 420	11 007
Corporation of the Town of Naracoorte	Market Square Playground and Gunning Reserve	18 440	6 150	24 590	13 205
District Council of Robe	Toilets, Clubrooms and Squash Courts	63 910	28 750	92 660	33 050
Link Incorporated	Link Newspaper—Training Programme	29 630	3 000	32 630	10 600
Corporation of the City of Tea Tree Gully	Civic Park Beautification	37 540	6 977	44 517	26 623
District Council of Mannum	Cliff Face Retaining Wall	23 260	3 234	26 494	7 212
District Council of Mannum	Tourist Walkway, Relocate Observatory and Construction Wading Pool	16 170	4 486	20 656	7 647
Quorn Lions Club	Agricultural Museum and Parkland Development	21 250	5 000	26 250	15 963
University of Adelaide	Construction and General Upgrading of Buildings at 77 Finnis Street, North Adelaide	13 618	6 475	20 093	4 800
University of Adelaide	Construction of Scientific Sampling Equipment	7 812	300	8 112	1 900
Corporation of the Town of Hindmarsh	Office Workers Training Scheme	19 402	—	19 402	16 028
Corporation of the City of Unley	Waste Management Survey and Study	8 380	—	8 380	3 590

JOB CREATION SCHEME
Grants Committee Recommendation for Project Approvals

Sponsor	Project Title	Labour \$	Materials \$	Total Grant \$	Sponsor \$
Corporation of the City of Mitcham	Project Team—Preparation of Reports and Plans for the long term development of the City of Mitcham	44 280	—	44 280	23 500
Corporation of the Town of Naracoorte	North Parklands Eastern Toilet/ Canteen and Western Toilet Block	25 510	12 855	38 365	18 750
District Council of Robe	Marina Lake Butler	20 380	—	20 380	7 180
Royal Society for the Blind S.A. Inc.	Development of Hydrotherapy and Kine-Therapy Centre	115 270	103 285	218 555	160 000
F.I.L.E.F.	Additions—New Office	17 490	12 900	30 390	5 500
Corporation of the City of Burnside	Kensington Gardens Uniting Church Service and Resource Survey	14 720	1 280	16 000	4 000
Disability Information Resource Centre		27 710	—	27 710	4 600
Corporation of the City of Tea Tree Gully	Wynn Vale community House (Co-ordinator)	7 260	340	7 600	5 492
Corporation of the City of Burnside	Parks and Reserves Study	22 120	—	22 120	9 480
Corporation of the City of Mitcham	Upgrading and improvements to Westbourne Park Institute	20 720	7 000	27 720	11 000
Corporation of the City of Mitcham	Upgrading Blackwood and District Memorial Hall	83 100	60 000	143 100	69 300
District Council of Mannum	Mannum Waterfall Reserve reclamation project	14 850	—	14 850	30 000
State Theatre Co.	Performing arts, archives and exhibitions	8 190	—	8 190	3 000
Corporation of the City of Burnside	Toilet block Perry Reserve	14 640	5 660	20 300	8 700
Corporation of the City of Salisbury	Job placement and training (special youth sub-programme)	23 510	300	23 810	—
Wattle Park Teachers Centre	Resources for teacher/parent development	42 920	—	42 920	12 320
Corporation of the City of Tea Tree Gully	Wynn Vale Community House and Tea Tree Gully Youth Club Ext.	84 610	30 326	114 936	52 072
Corporation of the City of Tea Tree Gully	Needs survey	56 749	—	56 749	24 321
Corporation of the City of Tea Tree Gully	Tea Tree Gully Athletics Centre (Inc.) clubrooms	73 900	30 740	104 640	49 000
Corporation of the City of Tea Tree Gully	Hope Valley Community Building	41 140	18 681	59 821	24 745
Corporation of the City of Tea Tree Gully	St Agnes and Modbury West Community Halls	77 370	36 235	113 605	48 595
Corporation of the City of Burnside	Library upgrade	26 789	—	26 789	11 481
Corporation of the City of Burnside	Child care options in Burnside	8 799	—	8 799	2 200
Corporation of the City of Burnside	Langman Reserve toilet block	13 770	9 700	23 470	5 500
Corporation of the City of Burnside	Hazelwood Park toilet block	13 770	9 700	23 470	5 500
Corporation of the City of Prospect	Irish Harp and Matthews Reserve development	35 980	—	35 980	31 600
Corporation of the City of Prospect	Prospect age care support service	16 380	—	16 380	4 600
Memorial Drive Tennis Club Inc.	Redevelopment of public administration and club facilities	156 681	124 450	281 131	160 000
Henley Sailing Club Inc.	Rescue boat storage and club development	49 487	27 450	76 937	40 000
Salvation Army	Redevelopment of Salvation Army operations	92 453	69 440	161 893	90 000
Corporation of the City of Noarlunga	Local history project	45 470	—	45 470	18 477
District Council of Le Hunte	Central Eyre Peninsula emergency services	68 920	—	68 920	125 000
Corporation of the City of Salisbury	Irrigation development	57 020	56 250	113 270	23 750
Corporation of the City of Glenelg	Glenelg North Community Hall and recreation facilities	44 830	34 500	79 330	32 000
Corporation of the City of Glenelg	Tourist Centre Building	128 680	120 500	249 180	104 000
History Trust of South Australia	Birdwood Mill paving	75 390	30 331	105 721	46 324
Migrant Resource Centre of S.A.	Welcoming and orientation service for migrants	8 570	—	8 570	1 600
District Council of Meadows	Cherry Gardens and Clarendon CFS	44 630	39 134	83 764	20 050
District Council Saddleworth and Auburn					
Corporation of the City of Brighton	Public conveniences—Auburn	12 080	4 110	16 190	14 000
Corporation of the City of Marion	Foreshore development	276 550	72 720	349 270	92 290
	Const. croquet clubroom, tennis courts and landscaping	46 420	27 760	74 180	27 155
Corporation of the City of Glenelg	Council services information	24 164	—	24 164	10 356
District Council of Mount Pleasant	Retaining wall, Talunga Park recreation ground	14 620	7 000	21 620	3 000
Corporation of the City of Prospect	Matthews reserve and Prospect gardens tennis facilities	25 450	—	25 450	22 300
Young Womens Christian Assoc.	Clerical worker training programme	10 950	300	11 250	878
Corporation of the City of Port Augusta	Development of parklands	111 910	24 818	136 728	34 182
Corporation of the City of Whyalla	Afforestation of ten reserves	25 210	1 218	26 428	8 282

JOB CREATION SCHEME
Grants Committee Recommendation for Project Approvals

Sponsor	Project Title	Labour \$	Materials \$	Total Grant \$	Sponsor \$
Corporation of the City of Whyalla	Sullage disposal facilities at Whyalla caravan park	26 380	10 324	36 704	9 176
Corporation of the City of Noarlunga	Foreshore beautification	48 530	12 600	61 130	23 000
Corporation of the City of Mount Gambier	Construction and installation of playground equipment	6 995	1 300	8 295	3 200
Millicent Branch National Trust S.A.	Display building for horse drawn vehicles	18 790	—	18 790	6 193
District Council Lacedpede	Rest room renovation (C.W.A.) and outdoor educational area for kindergarten	10 610	—	10 610	3 238
Corporation of the City of Henley and Grange	Planning information systems study	21 050	—	21 050	8 200
District Council of Munno Para	Development of BMX complex	40 030	20 460	60 490	36 716
University of Adelaide	Tourism and the protection of Aboriginal sites	12 411	—	12 411	2 550
University of Adelaide	Production of video films for teaching	7 791	400	8 191	1 900
University of Adelaide	Music collection cataloguing project	56 228	—	56 228	11 600
West Beach Trust	Marineland chalet development	416 900	296 275	713 175	295 000
Corporation of the City of Campbelltown	Engineering computer programme	12 420	—	12 420	5 310
Corporation of the City of Campbelltown	Toilets, changerooms and tennis clubrooms	38 160	9 000	47 160	12 650
Corporation of the City of Campbelltown	Thorndon Park—public toilet block and picnic area	29 750	14 500	44 250	11 700
Corporation of the City of Campbelltown	Campbelltown town planning	8 190	—	8 190	3 510
Kuitpo Colony Inc.	Redevelopment of Kuitpo colony	499 820	335 000	834 820	315 000
T.E.A.S.A.	Tertiary Counselling for Girls	5 639	600	6 239	1 640
T.E.A.S.A.	Tertiary Information Handbook for Aboriginal People	5 639	600	6 239	1 640
C.C. Unley	Soutar Park Reserve	28 790	23 050	51 840	13 100
C.C. Unley	Henry Codd Reserve	23 340	14 165	37 505	19 620
C.C. Mitcham	Eden Hills CFS	36 130	20 000	56 130	13 700
C.T. Hindmarsh	Sam Johnson Reserve	87 020	59 000	146 020	135 000
D.C. Victor Harbor	Tourist and Recreation Infrastructure Development	221 000	30 520	251 520	99 620
C.C. Noarlunga	Christies Beach Bowling Club	100 865	25 653	126 518	69 853
C.C. Enfield	Morphett Vale Riding Club	71 740	26 985	98 725	33 000
Campbelltown Children's Centre	Repair and Restoration 'Sunnybrae Farm'	5 200	264	5 464	1 366
D.C. Mount Remarkable	Toy Library Support Project	38 400	—	38 400	19 700
Apex Club of Quorn Inc.	Walking Trail and Playground Creation	8 990	—	8 990	4 902
South Port Surf Life Saving Club	Extension of Apex Park	93 330	—	93 330	48 000
Koonibba Aboriginal Com.	Rebuilding South Port Club-Rooms	35 840	6 550	42 390	6 000
D.C. Meadows	Re-Afforestation—Koonibba Community Information System Development	5 250	—	5 250	4 500
Kapunda Historical Society	Museum Storage Building	13 150	3 500	16 650	6 100
C.C. Whyalla	Schulz Reserve, Underground Auto W/System	35 700	12 460	48 160	12 040
C.C. Whyalla	Bradford Reserve, Underground Auto W/System	21 570	8 086	29 656	7 414
C.C. Whyalla	Multi-purpose Changerooms and Public Toilets	52 780	19 444	72 224	18 056
C.C. Noarlunga	Redevelopment Pt Noarlunga Caravan Park	62 820	34 650	97 470	30 000
C.C. Noarlunga	Morphett Vale Bowling club	82 880	10 982	93 862	44 363
C.C. Salisbury	St Kilda Development	169 040	95 250	264 290	138 750
C.C. Salisbury	Riding Club Construction	63 690	15 000	78 690	17 000
C.C. Salisbury	Parafield Gardens Community Centre	159 020	43 500	202 520	117 500
C.C. Salisbury	Walkley Park Development	72 840	21 750	94 590	29 250
C.C. Salisbury	Para Hills Paddocks Upgrading	66 400	22 500	88 900	22 500
C.C. Salisbury	Dry Creek Linear Park Development	101 750	38 625	140 375	72 875
Southern Metropolitan Organisation S.A. (No. 4) Inc.	Economic Development Project	29 430	—	29 430	9 800
S.A. Chapter of Disabled Peoples' International Inc.	Into S.A. Streets—A Handbook for the Disabled	19 070	5 000	24 070	—
D.C. Central Yorke Peninsula	Ardrossan Cliff Development Near Jetty	38 519	8 240	46 750	38 660
C.T. Wallaroo	Fencing	10 649	—	10 649	17 136
C.T. Wallaroo	Indexation Cemetery Registers	4 180	—	4 180	250
D.C. Burra Burra	Conservation and Adaptation Paxton Square Cottages	125 809	13 614	139 423	119 500
C.C. Payneham	Payneham Community Centre	133 424	45 580	179 004	89 241
C.T. Renmark	Renmark Public Library	108 600	57 460	166 060	110 000

JOB CREATION SCHEME
Grants Committee Recommendation for Project Approvals

Sponsor	Project Title	Labour \$	Materials \$	Total Grant \$	Sponsor \$
Toc H Aust. (S.A.) Ltd	Installation of New Septic Tank and Effluent Drains Installation of New Ceiling Panels to Dining Room	21 900	5 000	26 900	2 050
C.T. Renmark	Playground Development—'Olivewood' Subdivision	10 960	—	10 960	11 500
Mature Unemployed Co-op Help	M.U.C.H. Co-Ordinator for Job Creation and Job Creation Programme	10 290	Deferred	10 290	—
Uniting Church Whyalla Parish	Lighthouse Cottages Restoration	28 140	6 100	34 240	15 275
C.C. Pt Lincoln	Concrete Tennis Courts	45 540	15 734	61 274	18 436
W.E.A. of S.A. Inc.	W.E.A. Community Education	235 960	150 000	385 960	600 000
C.C. Whyalla	Community Development Project	33 553	—	33 553	9 577
D.C. Murat Bay	Ceduna Foreshore Railing Replacement	11 000	4 186	15 186	4 267
C.C. Salisbury	Community Facilities Planning Study	19 530	—	19 530	9 500
D.C. Kadina	Walleroo Mines—Upgrade Tourist Area	13 200	—	13 200	11 860
C.T. Gawler	Dead Man's Pass—Establish Passive Reserve	8 575	—	8 575	12 435
C.T. Gawler	Clonlea Park—Establish Recreation Park	31 850	—	31 850	63 506
C.T. Gawler	Light Square—Establish Formal Park	3 675	—	3 675	4 933
C.C. Enfield	Recreation Resources Survey	9 530	—	9 530	4 050
C.C. Enfield	Youth Needs Survey	15 680	—	15 680	4 300
C.C. Enfield	Community Information Services Brochures	15 680	—	15 680	7 250
C.C. Enfield	Yatala Reserve—Establish Formal Park Garden	123 240	—	123 240	103 000
The Parks Community Centre	Landscaping Redevelopment for Low Maintenance	30 802	—	30 802	14 000
National Parks and Wildlife Service	Mt Remarkable National Park Walking Trail	39 236	—	39 236	9 808
C.C. Enfield	Establish Services for the Elderly	5 880	350	6 230	8 130
D.C. Kanyaka-Quorn	Archive Clerk	5 615	—	5 615	1 100
Jubilee Sailing Ship Inc.	'One and All'	105 783	27 800	133 583	286 400
Jubilee Sailing Ship Inc.	Market Unit	18 000	—	18 000	26 000
C.C. Port Pirie	Memorial Park Redevelopment	68 340	39 536	107 876	38 000
C.C. Port Pirie	Relocation of S.E.S. Headquarters	13 590	7 092	20 682	9 300
C.C. Port Pirie	Irrigation Systems for Sports Ground	7 000	7 000	14 000	8 300

TECHNOLOGY CENTRES

91. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: In response to the Premier's announcement on 8 March 1983 concerning technology centres at high schools, which schools are intended to be designated as technology centres, what particular facilities will be provided and what is the estimated cost?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: A great deal of consideration is being given to the concept of technology centres in high schools, the form these might take, the courses necessary and the resource implications. A sum of \$250 000 has been allocated in the present budget for technology high schools. The development of new courses in this area and the selection and training of appropriate staff, are important precursors to the successful introduction of an important new venture. Past experience in the development and introduction of new courses has indicated that an adequate lead time is necessary. A project team working on behalf of the Director-General of Education through the Director of Curriculum has been established to report on the issues by 31 October.

The preliminary terms of reference are as follows:

1. to report on possible ways of introducing high technology into secondary schools from the beginning of the 1984 school year.
2. to present options for the expenditure of the \$250 000 earmarked in the Education Department's 1983-84 budget for high technology programmes for secondary schools.
3. to advise on the appropriate courses, staffing, equipment, facilities and inservice education of teachers required for these programmes in 1984 and beyond.

4. to advise on funding to maintain and expand the programmes.
5. to ensure that the programmes are accessible in relation to the needs of girls, country teachers and disadvantaged students.
6. to present options for the location of high technology programmes in schools, educational centres, mobile centres or other suitable venues.
7. to advise on needed curriculum development in courses, about, with and in technology and the impact of technology on society.
8. to liaise with existing committees, other Government departments and educational institutions and organisations.
9. to provide a preliminary report on the expenditure of \$250 000 in this financial year to the Director-General of Education no later than 31 October 1983.

SPECIAL BRANCH

99. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Labour: What action does the Minister intend to take on his own motion before the last A.L.P. convention to regularly examine and cull Special Branch files, prevent surveillance of the trade union movement and generally oppose ASIO operations in South Australia?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I refer the honourable member to the answer provided by my colleague the Attorney-General in response to a question from the Hon. K.T. Griffin, in

the Legislative Council of 25 August 1983, in which the Attorney-General indicates he is responsible for the preparation of the submission to the Hope Royal Commission.

PUBLIC SECTOR DEBT

124. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: With respect to the new arrangements for interest on outstanding State debt, what are:

- (a) the names of all departments and authorities affected by this change;
- (b) the current outstandings for each department or authority;
- (c) the amounts of principal outstanding at the various rates of interest on which the funds were supplied originally; and,
- (d) the estimated additional servicing costs for each department or authority?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: A full discussion of the restructuring of public sector debt and interest rate arrangements is contained in attachment V of the financial statement of the Premier and Treasurer. Details of the proposals for each department and statutory authority have been conveyed to each Minister and statutory authority concerned. Consultation is currently taking place with them. Until such consultations are completed and final decisions are taken, the Government views it as being inappropriate to release details for each particular department and statutory authority.

GOVERNMENT CHARGES

126. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. What have been the respective increases in Government (including statutory authorities) charges, fares, fines or any other revenue measure introduced since 6 November 1982, and by what amount and percentage has each item been increased?

2. What is the estimated increase in revenue to be derived during 1983-84 and 1984-85 for each of these items?

3. What is the estimated impact of such measures (in total) on the consumer price index for Adelaide in 1983-84?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In relation to questions 1 and 2 the information the honourable member seeks can be obtained by using the Parliamentary Library as all Government charges, fines and fares are either gazetted or announced in the media. The taxation measures the Government has taken were fully outlined in the Budget papers for 1983-84. The Budget papers also contain information concerning the estimated increase for revenue to be derived during 1983-84 and in a full year. With respect to question 3 the effect on the c.p.i. in total is expected to be an increase of about three quarters of one percentage point.

POLICE RADAR

132. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. What makes and models of radar units does the South Australian Police Force have, what are their respective degrees of accuracy and how often are they tested for accuracy?

2. How many motorists were charged with speeding offences during the past 12 months and, of those charged, how many were convicted and what was the total amount of penalties paid in fines?

3. How many prosecutions were not proceeded with and for what reason?

4. What is the policy regarding location of units on roadside kerbs and not hidden behind trees, shrubs, fences, etc., and what are the reasons for that policy?

5. Has the Government given consideration to placing warning signs of radar ahead and, if not, why not?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

1. The South Australian Police Force has two types of radar units those are:

(a)

Make:	Fairey Speed Radar
Models:	F382A and F382B
Accuracy:	± 1%
Testing:	Each unit is tested at the commencement and conclusion of operation at each speed detection location. A calibration check is also done after each offending motorist's speed is recorded.

(b)

Make:	Muni-Quip hand-held Radar
Model:	T3
Accuracy:	± ½ km/h
Testing:	Not yet in use. However, each unit will be tested at the commencement and conclusion of each tour of duty. A calibration check will also be done after each offending motorist's speed is recorded.

2. The information requested is not available at this time. The majority of speeding offences during the financial year ended 30 June 1983 have been expiated by payment of the statutory fee indicated on the traffic infringement notice issued at the time when the offence is committed. Final processing of those traffic infringement notices un-expiated at 30 June 1983 and analysis of the outcome of further action taken has yet to be completed.

3. The information requested is not available at this time. Refer to Part 2 of question.

4. (a) The policy regarding the positioning of the Fairey unit conforms with the manufacturer's specifications. The efficient operation of the unit prohibits its placement in a hidden position whereby obstructions may interfere with the correct functioning of the radar beam.

(b) The Muni-Quip unit will be operated in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications which require the operator to be standing in a stationary position.

5. Yes: however, the Government considers that placing warning signs ahead of radar units would minimise the effectiveness of units deployed to monitor and control driver behaviour, which is a major causation factor of road accidents.

JOB CREATION FUND

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

1. When did the Government receive its first allocation of job creation funds from the Commonwealth Government?

2. Was the money invested on the short-term money market pending allocation?

3. When was the first grant made from the fund and how much was granted and to whom?

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

1. The Commonwealth's Wage Pause Programme is composed of three elements—welfare housing, assistance to the young unemployed and assistance to older unemployed and others disadvantaged in the job market. The State received its first allocation of funds for the welfare housing element on 21 February 1983. The first payment from the Commonwealth in relation to the other two elements was received by the State on 28 February 1983.

2. Yes. Under the guidelines originally proposed by the Commonwealth and agreed to by the States the funds were to be made available to the States in equal monthly instalments during the 12-month period ending on 31 December 1983. The Commonwealth chose to finance the programme in this fashion even though it was known, as is always the case with the establishment of a new activity, that lead times would be involved in the preparation of project pro-

posals in accord with the funding guidelines. In these circumstances, prudent financial management required the use of the money in this way while preparatory work was completed.

3. The first announcements under the wage pause programme were made in May 1983, and involved those projects and sponsors listed in the following schedules.

JOB CREATION SCHEME
Grants Committee Recommendations for Approval
Schedule I

Project No.	Sponsor	Project Title	Labour \$	Grant Material \$	Total \$	Sponsor Contribution \$
16	D.C. Kadina	Walleroo Mines—Upgrade tourist area	13 200	—	13 200	11 860
17	C.T. Gawler	Dead Man's Pass. Establish passive reserve	8 575	—	8 575	12 435
18	C.T. Gawler	Clonlea Park. Establish recreation park	31 850	—	31 850	63 506
19	C.T. Gawler	Light Square. Establish formal park	3 675	—	3 675	4 933
25	C.C. Enfield	Recreation Resources Survey	9 530	—	9 530	4 050
26	C.C. Enfield	Youth Needs Survey	15 680	—	15 680	4 300
27	C.C. Enfield	Community Information Service Brochures	15 680	—	15 680	7 250
28	C.C. Enfield	Yatala Reserve. Establish formal park garden	123 240	—	123 240	103 000
30	The Parks Community Centre	Landscaping. Redevelopment for low maintenance	30 802	—	30 802	14 000
43	National Parks & Wildlife Service	Mt Remarkable National Park walking trail	39 236	—	39 236	9 808
223	C.C. Enfield	Establish services for the elderly	5 880	350	6 230	8 130
370	D.C. Kanyaka-Quorn	Archive clerk	5 615	—	5 615	1 100
TOTAL			302 963	350	303 313	244 372

Schedule II

16	D.C. Burra Burra	Conservation and Adaptation Paxton Square Cottages	125 809	13 614	139 423	119 500
20	C.C. Payneham	Payneham Community Centre	133 424	45 580	179 004	89 241
51	Jubilee Sailing Ship Inc.	'One and All'	105 783	27 800	133 583	286 400
53	C.C. Port Pirie	Memorial Park redevelopment	68 340	39 536	107 876	38 000
55	C.C. Port Pirie	Relocation of S.E.S. headquarters	13 590	7 092	20 682	9P0
57	C.C. Port Pirie	Irrigation systems for sports grounds	7 000	7 000	14 000	8 300
85	Adelaide Central Mission (Goodwill Division)	Plant Nursery for Handicapped	10 640	—	10 640	8 004
104	Southern Metropolitan Organisation (S.A. No. 4) Inc.	Economic Development Project	29 430	—	29 430	9 800
105	S.A. Chapter of Disabled People's International Inc.	Into S.A. Streets—A handbook for the disabled	19 070	5 000	24 070	—
139	D.C. Central Yorke Peninsula	Ardrossan Cliff Development near jetty	38 510	8 240	46 750	36 236
216	C.T. Wallaroo	Fencing	10 649	—	10 649	17 136
247	Jubilee Sailing Ship Inc.	Market Unit	18 000	—	18 000	26 000
374	C.T. Wallaroo	Indexation Cemetery Registers	4 180	—	4 180	250
			584 425	153 862	738 287	648 167

Schedule III

29	C.C. Renmark	Renmark Public Library	108 600	57 460	166 060	110 000
82	Toc H. Aust. (S.A.) Ltd	Installation of new septic tank and effluent drains installation of new ceiling panels to dining room	21 900	5 000	26 900	2 050
87	C.C. Renmark	Playground development—'Olivewood' subdivision	10 960	—	10 960	11 500
107	Mature Unemployed Co-op help	M.U.C.H. co-ordinator for job creation and job creation programme	10 290	deferred	10 290	—
108	Uniting Church, Whyalla Parish	Lighthouse cottages restoration	28 140	6 100	34 240	15 275
224	C.C. Port Lincoln	Concrete tennis courts	45 540	15 734	61 274	18 436
263	W.E.A. of South Australia Inc.	W.E.A. Community Education	235 960	150 000	385 960	600 000
274	C.C. Whyalla	Community development project	33 553	—	33 553	9 577
297	D.C. Murat Bay	Ceduna foreshore railing replacement	11 000	4 186	15 186	4 267
430	C.C. Salisbury	Community facilities planning study	19 530	—	19 530	9 500
			525 473	238 480	763 953	780 605

YATALA LABOUR PRISON

162. **Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. Has the application period closed for the position of manager at the Yatala Labour Prison and, if so:
 - (a) what was the closing date;
 - (b) how widely was the position advertised; and
 - (c) how many applications were received,
 and, if not, when will the period close and how widely is the position being advertised?
2. Who will comprise the team to select the successful candidate and when is it anticipated that a decision will be made and announced?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.
 - (a) 10 August 1983.
 - (b) The position was advertised locally, interstate, and overseas.
 - (c) 13.
2. A selection team has not been constituted as it is intended that the Public Service Board will be requested to re-advertise the position.

CORPORAL PUNISHMENT

163. **Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. When was corporal punishment last used in South Australia?
2. For what offences was it ordered?
3. What was the frequency of its use from 1950 to when it ceased?
4. What was the frequency of reoffending by those receiving corporal punishment?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

1. The last recorded use of corporal punishment in correctional institutions in South Australia was in 1964.
2. Corporal punishment was ordered most commonly for sexual offences and, in some cases, robbery.
3. Department of Correctional Services Annual Reports, and individual records indicate that corporal punishment was administered to 15 individuals in the period 1950 to 1964.
4. Because of the gap of approximately 20 years, information on re-offending is limited. No information is available on offences committed interstate. There is a sample of seven persons to whom corporal punishment was administered and individual information available. Of this sample the following statistics apply:

No further prison experience	3
Further prison experience	2
Frequent further imprisonment	2
Total	<u>7</u>

PARLIAMENT HOUSE

164. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Public Works:

1. Has a recent study been undertaken into the general condition of Parliament House and, if not, why not?

2. Has minor surface and structural cracking of walls occurred over the past year or so and, if so, why?

3. What is the current estimated cost of repairs and repainting and when will they be undertaken?

4. Are minor flooding problems, need for repainting and the general condition of Parliament House causing concern to staff and the Government and, if so, what action can be taken to reduce the impact of maintenance costs?

5. When were major renovations last completed?

6. How much has been spent on repairs, maintenance and repainting of Parliament House in each of the past five financial years?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The replies are as follows:

1. In October 1981 a study was undertaken as part of the State-wide heritage assessment of historic buildings. Further detailed studies have been conducted in specific areas.

2. Several areas of minor cracking were noted and reported in the October 1981 survey, primarily near the perimeter walls. Minor surfaces (plaster) cracks as in the House of Assembly columns are generally caused by long-term drying out and resultant shrinkage of the plaster. The structural cracking observed inside is very minor and of no cause for concern. Much has been caused by concrete shrinkage or thermal stresses. It is also possible that a minor contributing factor is footing movement due to long-term soil moisture changes. Some surface cracking and minor deterioration of the external facade has occurred and it is intended that a detailed inspection and repair work will be undertaken in the near future.

3. A sum of \$97 000 has been allocated for external repairs and painting with the work scheduled to commence in the first quarter of 1984.

4. The Government and officers of my Department are aware of the maintenance requirements of Parliament House. Selected maintenance work as indicated in the answer to Question 3 is being undertaken and any further major maintenance programmes will be undertaken to the availability of funds.

5. 1974.

6. 1978-79, \$10 516; 1979-80, \$19 850; 1980-81, \$30 509; 1981-82, \$44 067; 1982-83, \$64 185.

STOLEN MOTOR VEHICLES

165. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. How many motor vehicles were stolen in South Australia during the year ended 30 June 1983, what was their estimated value, how many were recovered and how many persons were apprehended and charged with stealing those vehicles?

2. How do such statistics compare with those of the previous four years?

3. How many stolen motor vehicles have subsequently been sold in South Australia before the new purchasers were aware the vehicle was stolen?

4. What action does the Police Department propose to take to create a greater community awareness of motor vehicle theft prevention?

5. Does the Police Department have a special squad which investigates motor vehicle thefts and, if so, how many persons are attached to this squad and, if not, why not?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

1. In 1983, 5 365 motor vehicles, valued at \$12.7 million, were stolen. Of these, 5 175 were recovered. 1 034 persons were apprehended. Records are not maintained regarding the number of apprehended persons who are ultimately charged and it is not economically feasible to obtain this information. However, the great majority of persons apprehended are charged.

2.

Year	No. Stolen	Estimated Value (\$M)	No. Recovered	Persons Apprehended
1978-79	6 492	10.9	5 800	1 228
1979-80	5 850	10.8	5 156	1 387
1980-81	5 802	10.8	5 122	1 142
1981-82	5 584	11.4	4 852	1 009
1982-83	5 635	12.7	5 175	1 034

3. Records are not kept to identify this information.

4. The Police Department has compiled a pamphlet entitled 'STOP CRIME'—Home & Personal Security' which contains advice on car protection. The pamphlet is available to the public from the Department's Crime Prevention Unit and police stations. In addition, the Crime Prevention Unit provides an information and advisory service on vehicle security to members of the public. In conjunction with a service organisation, the Police Department is also currently involved in developing a community programme which, when finally refined, is likely to contain a component relative to vehicle theft prevention.

5. There is no special squad whose sole function is the investigation of motor vehicle thefts. Instead, responsibility for this type of investigation is assigned to a decentralised group of detectives from each of the metropolitan C.I.B. districts. The activities of this group are co-ordinated from a central special crime squad. This method of operation allows greater flexibility of operation and gives the opportunity for a broader perspective of the investigation of this type of offence than is afforded by a centrally located special squad. In all, there are 16 personnel whose specialist services can be drawn on in the investigation of these offences.

PUBLIC FINANCE BORROWINGS

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

1. What was the average interest rate on public finance borrowings for 1982-83?

2. What action is being taken to curb this impact on the Budget and has any relief been offered by the Commonwealth Government?

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

1. Public finance borrowings take a number of forms but principally they fall into three groups, viz.:

- (i) borrowings undertaken by the Commonwealth on behalf of the States, pursuant to the financial agreement (and subject to an aggregate annual limit determined by Loan Council);
- (ii) direct loans from the Commonwealth, often on a concessional basis; and
- (iii) borrowings by State statutory authorities, pursuant to the gentlemen's agreement (and subject to limits—other than for electricity authorities—determined by Loan Council).

With respect to the gross volume of debt allocated to South Australia in 1982-83 under (i), the average annual interest cost was 13.7 per cent. With respect to direct loans

from the Commonwealth to the State in 1982-83, the average annual interest cost was 2.8 per cent. With respect to statutory authority borrowings, the average annual interest cost was 15.7 per cent.

2. There is little State Governments can do to influence the interest rate at which the Commonwealth borrows on their behalf and from which a significant part of the States' interest burden arises. These loans accounted for a less than usual proportion of this State's borrowings in 1982-83 because the State chose to nominate a significant portion (\$25 million) of its Loan Council programme for welfare housing and thus shifted that part of its debt from group (i) to group (ii) thereby substantially reducing its overall interest costs (for 1983-84, South Australia's whole Loan Council borrowing programme has been nominated for welfare housing purposes and thus no debt of the group (i) kind will be allocated to the State this year). The State's policy of nominating as much as possible of its Loan Council programme for welfare housing purposes has made a significant contribution to lowering the overall interest costs on its total public sector debt.

With respect to the State's semi-government debt, Treasury officers are continually monitoring the cost of borrowing to ensure that loan raisings made by the South Australian Financing Authority are made at optimum times and in the most cost-effective forms. Some proposals for non-traditional means of fund-raising, which may possibly prove more cost effective than traditional means, are currently being examined by Treasury officers. No relief has been offered by the Commonwealth specifically in relation to the burden of interest costs on the State Budget (although as noted above, the Commonwealth's offer to the States to nominate part or all of their Loan Council borrowing programme for welfare housing has the potential for States to reduce the overall interest costs on their total debt).

HOSPITALS FUND

170. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: Is the Government considering legislation to amend the appropriate Acts to abolish the Hospitals Fund Account at Treasury and pay the moneys now collected to general revenue and, if not, why not?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Government is reviewing the basis of a number of deposit accounts, including the Hospitals Fund. The matter is not receiving any special priority and no decision has yet been taken about the Hospitals Fund.

COMMUNITY WELFARE ACTIVITIES

175. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare:

1. Have the activities of the Department for Community Welfare increased during the past 12 months and, if so, in what areas?

2. Are staff levels satisfactory and are sufficient social workers now employed?

3. What is the client work-load per social worker?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFT: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes; electricity concessions; child protection; substitute child care; young offenders; emergency financial assistance; budget advice; and general counselling.

2. (a) Community Welfare demands are increasing and staff levels are under constant review.

(b) The Department's establishment has been increased and the total needs are under review.

3. This varies according to local situation and distance.

YATALA LABOUR PRISON

176. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:
1. When will the Yatala Labour Prison industries complex be commissioned?
 2. What is the reason for the delay since the completion of the complex in April 1982?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

1. It can be anticipated that the Yatala Labour Prison industries complex will be fully commissioned in early 1984.
2. Difficulties in obtaining barbed taped wire (man barrier) for installation to the top of the complex walls, and the failure of the former Government to provide adequate funds in the 1982 Budget for the purchase of electronic surveillance equipment and the necessary staff requirements, have been the prime reasons for the delay.

CORRESPONDENCE SCHOOL

187. **Mr INGERSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: In relation to the primary social studies course of the Correspondence School which was revamped for metric in the period 1978-81—

- (a) when was a person appointed to develop a completely new course;
- (b) what progress has been made since then; and
- (c) when is it anticipated that the new course will be completed?

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

- (a) in 1979, a teacher was appointed to mark correspondence lessons and was instructed to begin researching and planning sections of a new social studies course following current curriculum guidelines.
- (b) Since then, the existing course has been modified to accommodate the change from imperial to metric measure and much of the factual information has been updated. New social studies programmes have been written in year 1 and year 6.
- (c) The writing of new courses in year 2 and year 7 will commence in 1984, and be completed in 1985. Social studies for years 3, 4 and 5 will be re-written in 1986, 1987 and 1988.

RED ALERT FIRE DAYS

190. **The Hon. D.C. BROWN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy:

1. Has ETSA considered turning off the power to selected districts during extreme red-alert days and, if so, what will be the future policy of ETSA on this issue?
2. Will ETSA undertake to discuss with representatives of any selected district the implications of such a policy before deciding to adopt it?
3. Does the Country Fire Service support the practice of shutting off the power on such days?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The replies are as follows:

1. & 2. Because inquests into the Ash Wednesday bushfires are in progress or yet to be held, it would not be appropriate for the Electricity Trust to comment at this stage on matters which may be considered in due course by the Coroner. However, the suggestion that power be turned off on days of high fire risk is not a new one and was examined by the board of inquiry into the 1977 bushfires in Victoria. In a section of its report the board deals with the matter at some length and concludes:

After weighing the conflicting factors and arguments, the board ultimately concludes that the turning off of power on days of danger should not be recommended.

I understand that part III of the question will be answered by the Minister of Agriculture.

CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

193. **The Hon. D.C. BROWN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. What financial allocation has been made in 1983-84 for the purchase of capital equipment in the Engineering and Water Supply Department?
2. What individual items of capital equipment will be purchased during 1983-84?

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

1. \$5.537m.
- 2.

	\$
Light motor vehicles	1 622 100
Other motor vehicles	860 000
Machines	790 000
Mobile radios	30 000
Other major plant	124 000
Minor plant	1 456 000
Computing equipment	569 000
Office systems	93 000
Provision for unspecified items less than \$1 500	8 900
Total	5 553 000
Less planned carryover to 1984-85	16 000
	\$5 537 000

INDUSTRY TRAINING COMMITTEES

195. **The Hon. D.C. BROWN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Labour:

1. Is the Minister aware that there are no Industry Training Committees (as approved by the national Training Council) in South Australia in the following industries:

- (a) metal and engineering;
- (b) electrical and electronic;
- (c) maritime; and
- (d) retail?

2. Will the Minister take immediate action in conjunction with the local industries to establish such committees and to apply for financial assistance from the National Training Council?

The Hon. D.J. WRIGHT: 'Yes, I am aware that there are no Industry Training Committees for the industry sectors mentioned. I am also aware that there are a number of other significant industry sectors where no committees have been established under the auspices of the National Training Council. While the establishment of such committees is primarily the responsibility of the Federal Minister and the Commonwealth Department of Employment and Industrial Relations, it is also of much concern to me. As the honourable member would be aware, the Industrial and Commercial Training Commission is the key advisory body on training matters at the State level. Under the training act the Commission is empowered to recommend the establishment of Training Advisory Committees for industries or industry sectors.

A number of committees have been established as a result of the recommendations of the Commission. In order to avoid duplication and waste of resources, these committees have been integrated, where practical, with the Industry Training Committees set up under the auspices of the

National Training Council. It is understood that this policy was embraced by the honourable member when he was involved in the establishment of the Building and Construction Industry Advisory Committee. This policy will be continued in the near future when joint committees covering the plastics/ rubber, and tourism/hospitality areas are established. In addition, discussions between the Commission, the Commonwealth department and employer and employee organisations have also taken place in respect to other industry sectors including printing, agriculture, fishing, clothing, footwear and textiles, food processing, road transport, and wool producing.

Recognising that no industry training committees exist at the State level in such key areas as metals engineering, electrical/electronics, motor vehicle retail and repair, business and finance etc., the Training Commission initiated discussions earlier this year with the Department of Technical and Further Education with a view to establishing joint advisory committees in these vital areas. The prime reason for linking with TAFE is that it is the major provider of vocational education and training in South Australia and that it already has an established network of curriculum advisory committees relating to a range of industry sectors. To avoid duplication and waste of resources, it is again seen as important that joint committees be established.

In June, the Training Commission and TAFE jointly sponsored an industry seminar on this matter. Almost 100 senior people from the manufacturing and service sides of these industry sectors attended and voiced strong support for the proposed action. Subsequently discussion papers outlining the proposed establishment of committees covering metals engineering, electrical/electronics, and motor vehicle retail and repair were widely circulated to relevant employer and employee organisations in both the public and private sectors. Again there has been almost universal support for

the proposals and the proposed membership of the committees.

The Commission and the Director-General of TAFE have agreed on guidelines for the operation of these joint committees and I expect to shortly receive final recommendations from the Commission. The regional office of the Department of Employment and Industrial Relations has been kept informed throughout the discussions. It is hoped that by forming these additional training advisory committees at the State level we will provide the basis for recognition by the National Training Council just as we have ensured recognition at the State level of those committees previously established under the auspices of the National Training Council.

With regard to the maritime industry, the honourable member may not be aware that a national committee has been established, and is considered adequate in view of the single maritime training facility in Australia. As such, no maritime industry training committees have been established at the State level in South Australia or any other State.

ROAD FUNDS

197. **The Hon. D.C. BROWN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What specific State and Federal Government funds will be available for road construction during 1983-84?

2. For each source of funds, what money will be spent on national, urban and rural arterial roads, and urban and rural local roads during 1983-84 and how does this compare with 1982-83?

3. What money will be available in each classification for road maintenance as opposed to road construction for 1983-84, what is the source of this money and how does it compare with 1982-83?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I refer to the following table.

HIGHWAYS DEPARTMENT						
Construction and Maintenance Expenditure (\$'000)						
	1982-83			1983-84		
	Total Expenditure	Federal Funds	State Funds	Total Expenditure	Federal Funds	State Funds
National Highways—Construction	27 236	32 756	255	36 662	42 649	—
National Highways—Maintenance	5 775			5 987		
Urban Arterial—Construction	27 941	29 372	11 432	34 886	38 287	17 080
Rural Arterial—Construction	12 863			20 481		
Urban Arterial—Maintenance	8 833	—	8 833	9 981	—	9 981
Rural Arterial—Maintenance	19 194	—	19 194	21 258	—	21 258
Urban Local—Construction	3 470	13 728	3 474	6 186	18 496	4 428
Urban Local—Maintenance	248			233		
Rural Local—Construction	5 819	7 665		8 202		
Rural Local—Maintenance	7 665			8 303		
Total	119 044	75 856	43 188	152 179	99 432	52 747

Federal funds include funds received from the Australian Bicentennial Road Development Fund.

Note: The Federal Government provides funds for the following groups of expenditure:

- (1) Construction and maintenance of National Highways.
- (2) Construction of Arterial Roads.
- (3) Construction and maintenance of Local Roads.

Consequently, it is not possible to identify an urban/rural segregation for Federal funds associated with Arterial and Local Roads. Similarly, it is not possible to provide a construction/maintenance segregation for National Highways and Local Roads.

ROAD CHARGES

198. **Hon. D.C. BROWN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Is the State Government considering introducing a road users charge on the heavy transport industry and, if so, what form would this charge take and when will it be introduced?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: No.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

199. **Hon. B.C. EASTICK** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. How many companies have made application for assistance from the South Australian Development Corporation in each financial year and this year to date since its commencement in 1971, and how many approvals have been granted?

2. What sum has been guaranteed in respect of the successful applications in each report period and how many were, or what amount of guarantee was, still current at 30 September 1983?

3. What supported companies have entered into receivership or liquidation and what loss was incurred by the State in each case?

4. How many of the supported companies have had directors appointed by the Corporation or, alternatively, had senior management appointments from or representing the Corporation?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The time and effort required to formulate a response to the honourable member's question is not considered warranted. It should be noted that the South Australian Development Corporation was wound up in December 1981.

PERPETUAL LEASES

201. **Mr GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning:

1. What is the Government's policy in relation to landholders who currently hold land under miscellaneous lease and wish to convert to perpetual lease?

2. What is the policy for people who hold land under miscellaneous lease in a pastoral area and wish to convert to pastoral lease?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. Since September 1980, it has been policy to not issue perpetual leases other than upon the subdivision of existing perpetual leases. However, where a commitment had previously been given to the granting of a perpetual lease on surrender of a miscellaneous lease, that commitment has been honoured.

2. The opportunity is available for the holders of miscellaneous leases issued over pastoral lands to apply to convert such tenure to pastoral leases issued under the provisions of the Pastoral Act. Few, if any, applications have been received in the past, but any application would be treated on its merits.

BUSHFIRE RELIEF APPEALS

210. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. Further to Question on Notice No. 223 of last session concerning Bushfire Relief Appeals money:

(a) how much money has been distributed and how much, if any, remains in trust;

(b) if money is being held by the Government, under what conditions will it be held and distributed; and

(c) what are the numbers of recipients and total amounts disbursed for:

- (i) persons suffering total house destruction;
- (ii) persons suffering loss of other property;
- (iii) grief payments;
- (iv) pain and suffering grants; and
- (v) other categories?

2. Have any Government departments or authorities received any money from the Bushfire Relief Appeal?

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

1. (a) At 31 October 1983, \$11 793 303.17 has been distributed. Approximately \$7 897 remains. The exact amount will not be known until October and November interest has been calculated and several small late donations are received.

(b) The final distribution of remaining moneys will be decided at a meeting of the Bushfire Relief Advisory Committee scheduled to be held in early November.

- (c)
 - (i) 252—Total amount \$1 042 845.
 - (ii) Summary of details not available. Estimated 4 000 including dependants. Total amount \$8 318 923.
 - (iii) 46—Total amount \$698 000.
 - (iv) 66—Total amount \$780 600.
 - (v) Summary of details not available (includes emergency assistance). Total amount—\$952 935.

2. No, excepting an amount of \$1 430 paid to CFS headquarters in accordance with the specific wishes of several donors.

NATURAL DISASTER COSTS

214. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: Further to Question on Notice No. 227 of last session, what are the updated figures for 1982-83 (final) and 1983-84 (estimated) of natural disaster costs in the categories shown in the reply of 31 May 1983?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The reply is as follows:

NATURAL DISASTER COSTS				
	Individuals	1982-83	Government	1983-84
	\$m	Firms \$m	\$m	\$m
Drought				
Loans to primary producers	23.8	—	—	2.3
Transport concessions, etc.	2.5	—	—	0.9
Loans to small businesses	—	1.2	—	0.3
Frost				
Loans to primary producers	1.2	—	—	—
Bushfire				
Loans to primary producers	3.2	—	—	2.5
Fencing	1.2	—	—	1.4
Transport concessions, etc.	0.1	—	—	0.1
Loans for housing	0.5	—	—	0.3
Restoration of public assets	—	—	3.0	1.6
Loans to small businesses	—	—	—	0.2
Personal hardship	0.1	—	—	0.1
Loans for community facilities	—	—	—	—
Flood				
Loans to primary producers	0.2	—	—	0.1
Loans to small businesses	—	—	—	—
Restoration of public assets	—	—	1.9	1.1
Personal hardship	0.2	—	—	0.3
	33.0	1.2	4.9	11.2

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HOUSING TRUST

215. Mr BAKER (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing: With respect to the South Australian Housing Trust additions to the stock of dwellings for rental purposes, what are the numbers being purchased/built by suburb or locality for 1983-84 and 1984-85, respectively?

The Hon. T.M. HEMMINGS: The following schedule lists programmed additions to rental stock in 1983-84 by local government area in the greater metropolitan area and by town in country areas. Additions to stock by purchase are listed in detail where purchase has already been completed. Proposed purchases for the remainder of 1983-84 are indicated by region only.

Although the programme as detailed indicates additions to stock of more than 3 200 units experience indicates there will certainly be some short-fall in the building programme as a result of delays in the planning process or on-site difficulties in building. The location and number of these shortfalls cannot be predicted.

SCHEDULE OF ANTICIPATED ADDITIONS TO SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HOUSING TRUST RENTAL STOCK BETWEEN 1 JULY 1983 AND 30 JUNE 1984

	Build	Purchase	Total
1. Greater Metropolitan Area			
Adelaide		2	2
Brighton	30	1	31
Burnside		4	4
Campbelltown	79	1	80
Elizabeth	164		164
Enfield	248	12	260
Happy Valley	13		13
Henley and Grange	47		47
Hindmarsh	181		181
Munno Para	18		18
Kensington and Norwood	5	14	19
Marion	126	21	147
Mitcham	12	3	15
Noarlunga	346	2	348
Payneham	35	2	37
Port Adelaide	105	8	113
Prospect	18		18
Salisbury	337	10	347
St Peters	42		42
Tea Tree Gully	125	5	130
Thebarton	17	4	21
Unley	24	1	25
Walkerville	24	18	42
West Torrens	79	3	82
Woodville	214	5	219
Total Metropolitan	2 289	116	2 405
2. Country Areas			
Angaston	11	1	12
Ardrossan	2		2
Balaklava	2		2
Baramba	11	1	12
Beachport	1		1
Berri	36	1	37
Blyth	4		4
Bordertown	2		2
Ceduna	15		15
Clare	21	1	22
Cleve	2		2
Cummins	2		2
Elliston	4		4
Gawler	12	1	13
Goolwa	6		6
Kadina	10		10
Kapunda	6	1	7
Kimba	4		4
Kingscote	2	2	4
Kingston	5		5
Lobethal	4		4
Lock	5		5
Loxton	14		14
McLaren Vale	5		5
Maitland	2		2
Meadows	6	1	7
Meningie			
Moonta	8		8
Murray Bridge	52	2	54

SCHEDULE OF ANTICIPATED ADDITIONS TO SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HOUSING TRUST RENTAL STOCK BETWEEN 1 JULY 1983 AND 30 JUNE 1984

	Build	Purchase	Total
Mount Barker	36		36
Mount Gambier	130		130
Nairne	3		3
Naracoorte	5		5
Nuriootpa	8		8
Orroroo	1		1
Paringa	1		1
Port Augusta	53		53
Port Lincoln	67	7	74
Port Pirie	6		6
Quorn	6		6
Renmark	22		22
Robe	4		4
Strathalbyn	13		13
Streaky Bay	1		1
Tanunda	2		2
Waikerie	6		6
Walleroo	8		8
Whyalla	24		24
Woodside	6		6
Wudinna	6		6
Total Country	662	18	680
Yet to be Purchased	Metro		
	South	80	
		48	
	Metro		
	North	128	
Total Additions to Stock Metropolitan and Country	2 951	262	3 213

Programmes for 1984-85 cannot yet be finalised because of uncertainties of funding and availability of subdivided land in some locations.

HIGH RATABLE PROPERTY

216. Mr BAKER (on notice) asked the Premier: Further to the answer to Question on Notice No. 93, when will this matter be considered?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In due course.

PRIVATE COMPANIES

217. Mr BAKER (on notice) asked the Premier: Further to the answer to Question on Notice No. 95, when will this matter be considered?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In due course.

STATE CHARGES

218. Mr BAKER (on notice) asked the Premier: Further to the answer to Question on Notice No. 96, when will this matter be considered?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In due course.

GOVERNMENT TAKE-OVERS

219. Mr BAKER (on notice) asked the Premier: Further to the answer to Question on Notice No. 97, when will this matter be considered?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In due course.

LIGHTBURN PROPERTY

220. Mr BAKER (on notice) asked the Premier: With respect to the Lightburn property, what moneys have been

provided/promised by way of State Government grants or interest free loans to Mr Varghese; were such moneys provided/promised to assist with the purchase of the property or the future development of the enterprise, and what conditions were imposed in respect of the granting of such moneys?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The South Australian Government has provided, as a special incentive to facilitate the acquisition of the Lightburn Group by Mr P.M. Varghese, the following loans:

- (a) A \$100 000 99-year long-term interest-free loan;
- (b) A \$200 000 seven-year interest-free loan.

The loans were provided to the Lightburn Group rather than to Mr Varghese. The conditions applying to the loans are detailed, but in outline are as follows:

1. The loans are to be applied as part of the settlement whereby Mr P.M. Varghese acquires controlling interests in Lightburn Finance Limited and Lightburn & Co. Limited.
2. Repayment of the \$200 000 seven-year loan is personally guaranteed by Mr P.M. Varghese.
3. Total loans are repayable in the event of the company transferring its operations interstate or ceasing manufacturing activity in South Australia.
4. An immediate review of management is being implemented with the objective of identifying skills, knowledge and techniques required to improve the management of the Lightburn Companies and is to be completed within two months of acquisition by Mr Varghese.

DRIVING LICENCE MEDICAL EXAMINATIONS

225. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary, representing the Minister of Health: Further to Question on Notice No. 126 of last Session, what reply has the Minister received concerning rebates for medical examinations associated with driving licences for people over 70?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: In August 1983, the Commonwealth Minister for Health advised the South Australian Minister of Health that he was examining the matter and would advise his decision as soon as possible. A further formal approach has now been made to the Commonwealth Minister to ascertain what progress has been made in the review.

BUDGET ESTIMATES QUESTIONS

226. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: What time limits will be imposed on all Ministers for answering questions raised during the Budget Estimates Committees?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: All questions will be answered at the earliest possible time.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS DUTY

227. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: Which institutions have indicated difficulties in respect of upgrading their accounting/computer facilities to meet the introduction of the new institutions duty on 1 December 1983?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: During the Government's consultation with financial institutions prior to the introduction of the Financial Institutions Duty Bill into Parliament, several institutions indicated that some difficulties would be involved in developing the appropriate accounting system to facilitate collection of the duty. Indeed, it was in awareness

of the likelihood that institutions would need time to modify their procedures that the Government initiated a full consultation process with the affected institutions. At the outset of these discussions the institutions were provided with a draft version of the Bill to assist them in preparing for the introduction of the duty. Because institutions indicated some problems in adjusting their accounting procedures for the duty, the Government decided to introduce transitional provisions into the legislation. These allow for financial institutions to estimate their duty liability for three months with an extension to six months if the Tax Commissioner regards it as reasonable. An accurate return to cover the period of estimation would be required after that period has elapsed.

LIVING ARTS CENTRE

229. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. What plans have been formulated for the establishment of a Living Arts Centre in D. & J. Fowler site, North Terrace?

2. How much money has been allocated and from which budget lines will it be drawn?

3. How much money has been expended to date in respect of purchase, design plans and other works?

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

1. A steering committee has been conducting a feasibility study on the Living Arts Centre for some time, and is expected to produce a final report in the very near future.

2. No funds have been allocated for the project itself to date.

3. No funds have been expended on purchase or design plans to date. \$3 000 has been allocated from a Public Buildings Department line and \$2 000 from an Arts Department line to cover certain consultancy costs in the preparation of the feasibility report.

BRITISH AEROSPACE AUSTRALIA LIMITED

230. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: With respect to the proposed movement of British Aerospace Australia Ltd to Technology Park, will there be any change in the total employment of the company and, if so, what will that change be?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The movement of British Aerospace Australia Ltd to Technology Park Adelaide has been necessitated in part due to a significant increase in the level of the company's activities which has resulted in an increase of nearly 20 per cent in employment over the last 12 months. The move is intended to increase the efficiency of the company and assist in securing expanded contracts. Initially there could be a further increase in employment in the highly skilled engineering type areas of the company. In due course it is anticipated that the successes achieved in those areas will flow through to other areas to increase total employment in the company.

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

233. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: When will answers be forthcoming on Questions on Notice Nos 77, 124 and 126?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Replies to Questions on Notice Nos. 77, 124 and 126 have now been given.