

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 1 May 1984

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

City of Adelaide Development Control Act Amendment,
Local Government Act Amendment, 1984,
Ombudsman Act Amendment,
Regional Cultural Centres Act Amendment,
Urban Land Trust Act Amendment.

PETITION: PORNOGRAPHIC MATERIAL

A petition signed by 215 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to withdraw pornographic material from prisons was presented by the Hon. B.C. Eastick.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: TEACHERS

Petitions signed by 18 members of the school community of Port Broughton Area School and 13 members of the school community of Murray Bridge Special School praying that the House urge the Government to convert all contract teaching positions to permanent positions; establish a permanent pool of relieving staff; improve the conditions of contract teachers; and improve the rights and conditions of permanent teachers placed in temporary vacancies were presented by the Hon. D.C. Wotton and Mr Olsen.

Petitions received.

PETITION: PORT LINCOLN ABATTOIR

A petition signed by 37 residents of Eyre Peninsula praying that the house urge the Government to initiate immediate action to guarantee the continual operation of the SAMCOR Abattoir at Port Lincoln as a service works was presented by Mr Blacker.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that written answers to questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 274, 308, 335, 339, 397 to 417, 421, 423, 443, 445, 448, 452 to 454, 467, 470, 473, 474, 477, 478, 481, 482, 485, and 491; and I direct that the following written answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

STRATA TITLE REGULATIONS

In reply to Mr **MAYES** (20 March).

The **Hon. G.J. CRAFTER**: I am advised by my colleague the Attorney-General that the provisions of the Real Property Act concerning strata titles are under review by the Attorney-General's Department in conjunction with the office of the

Registrar-General. It is expected that a number of proposals will be ready for Cabinet consideration by May or June. Comprehensive amendments to the strata provisions will then be prepared for introduction to Parliament.

VIDEO PORNOGRAPHY AND VIOLENCE

In reply to Mrs **APPLEBY** (10 April).

The **Hon. G.J. CRAFTER**: I am advised by my colleague the Attorney-General that, at the recent meeting of Commonwealth and State Censorship Ministers, the Attorney-General argued for the implementation of a compulsory system of classification of videos. As a result, the Commonwealth Attorney-General agreed to recommend to Federal Cabinet that a compulsory system of videos be introduced for those States that wished to participate. Most States had been prepared to accept South Australia's proposal for a compulsory system. Officers will now prepare in consultation with the Chief Censor, Ms Strickland, detailed proposals for the introduction of the compulsory scheme. The meeting also discussed standards for videotapes and the Attorney-General expressed concern to the Chief Film Censor over the classification of videos and films dealing with violence and sexual violence. The meeting concluded that the Film Classification Board should devote more attention to violence when classifying films and videos.

Videos involving child pornography, bestiality, detailed and gratuitous depiction of acts of significant cruelty and explicit and gratuitous depiction of sexual violence against non-consenting persons, instruction manuals for terrorist type weapons and acts, and abuse of hard drugs, will be refused classification and subject to prosecution under the new guidelines.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: MARALINGA TESTS

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer)**: I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON**: I wish to inform the House of the latest developments in our inquiries with regard to nuclear weapons testing at Maralinga during the 1950s and 1960s. The House will be aware that this matter has been an issue of continuing concern, occasional speculation and public unrest for some time. In 1979, the South Australian Government was pleased that the Commonwealth and the United Kingdom Governments had removed a quantity of plutonium from Maralinga, and conducted extensive cleaning up and maintenance of the areas that were used in the atomic weapons testing.

On 8 March 1984, I wrote to the Prime Minister informing him that the South Australian Government had initiated a study into the effects on the Aboriginal population of atomic weapons testing. The aim of the study is to determine whether or not Aboriginal people have suffered radiation illness, including cancer, as a result of exposure to bomb blasts at Maralinga and Emu Junction. To this end the study will be conducted in three stages: a record of oral history; a review of all literature and other evidence available including State and Commonwealth department files; and an epidemiological study.

The second stage of the study requires it to undertake a comprehensive search of all relevant Commonwealth Government files relating to the atomic tests and actions taken during and following the tests. I asked the Prime Minister whether he would allow the inquiry access to all Commonwealth files and reports on this matter.

In his reply of 18 April, the Prime Minister suggested that, as a first step, officials of the South Australian Government should contact a senior officer of the Commonwealth Department of Resources and Energy (Mr W.G. McGregor) for discussion to enable the Commonwealth to determine the nature of the information we are seeking. I have directed that these discussions take place. However, following further claims in the United Kingdom and in Australia on 13 March about alleged negligence involving defence personnel at Maralinga, I asked the Commonwealth Government and the British High Commissioner to Australia a series of questions. I received from the British High Commissioner, on 16 March, a reply which satisfied some but not all of the questions that had arisen. There are still matters which require resolution and until this is done I would expect there to be continuing public disquiet over claims of negligence during the Maralinga tests.

As a result, yesterday I wrote to and telexed the British Prime Minister (Mrs Thatcher). I have repeated my requests that the British Government release all relevant documentation relating to the Maralinga tests, and the policies and practices then employed concerning the protection of personnel and local inhabitants. We are also seeking the location and a detailed audit of any radioactive equipment that may have been buried by British forces in the area and that had not previously been accounted for. I have informed Mrs Thatcher that, if hazardous material remains in the area, the onus is on the British Government to remove it safely, as was the case in 1979. I am also seeking further information as to the nature of tests undertaken at Maralinga in the 1960s.

I have also written to the Leader of the Opposition in Britain (Mr Neil Kinnock) asking him to pursue this matter through the House of Commons. South Australia's Agent-General in London (Mr John Rundle) will shortly deliver a facsimile of my letter to Mr Kinnock so that he can begin the inquiries that he has agreed to pursue in this matter.

There are, however, other questions that the South Australian Government believes must be answered or resolved relating to the Maralinga tests, as follows:

(1) It is clear that, whilst there is a reasonable amount of documentation and published evidence about the tests conducted from 1953 until 1957, there appears to be much less detail about experiments conducted after 1957 and apparently until 1967. I will therefore press both the Commonwealth and British Governments for further details about these experiments conducted in our own State.

(2) The South Australian Government is also seeking information as to the nature and extent of health precautions taken for people at Maralinga during the period of the tests in the 1950s and in the experiments conducted in the 1960s.

(3) I am also seeking details of the arrangements that were made to ensure that the area in the proximity of the tests or experiments was properly cleared of personnel and unauthorised persons, and what health monitoring procedures were carried out following these tests and experiments.

(4) I will also inquire of the Commonwealth what arrangements were made following each test or experiment to police the area to avoid the entry of unauthorised persons.

(5) The South Australian Government is seeking categorical assurance from the Commonwealth and the British Governments that all areas of harmful radiation or other pollution resulting from the tests or experiments were clearly and publicly identified with warnings and proper barriers to entry.

These questions are clearly ones that a responsible State Government must address in the interests of the public of South Australia and particularly of people who may have been involved in, or affected by, activities at Maralinga. The way in which these questions are resolved is basically

the responsibility of the Commonwealth and United Kingdom Governments. I am aware that there is a great amount of material referring to these activities that might be confidential or classified. However, I believe it is entirely proper to question and call for satisfactory responses to the questions I have outlined. They are fundamental questions concerning public health.

I can inform the House that I have commissioned the most intense scrutiny of all official files, papers and documents located in South Australian Government departments and offices. I am afraid that examination has not been able to satisfy me on the questions I have raised. There are clearly gaps in those files. It is apparent that standards of health monitoring and reporting may at times have been less than would have been acceptable today.

I feel that I must advise the House that the Health Commission's study on the impact of Maralinga and Emu Junction testing on tribal Aborigines has encountered some degree of difficulty in obtaining full access to all relevant documents in the possession of the Commonwealth. The Director of the study, Dr Len Smith, advised the Minister of Health of these difficulties yesterday. In part it appears that these difficulties have been the result of the need to obtain clearance from the United Kingdom Government for access to classified material.

I have spoken to Senator Walsh about this matter this morning. He has promised continued high level co-operation with the South Australian Government, and I am confident that obstacles that have been encountered will be overcome. I must stress that the attitude of the Commonwealth Government is most welcome, because it is committed to open access to as much information as possible.

In conclusion, I must say that I have been disappointed about the extent to which South Australian Governments, during and after the tests, were informed about what was happening and indeed, the extent to which South Australian Governments during that period took an interest in matters of concern to their own citizens. I have now directed senior State Government officials to immediately meet with Commonwealth officers to convey my concerns, and pursue all avenues necessary to find answers to the questions we have raised in the public interest.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

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 proposed—

- i. Construction of a 275/66 kv Substation, Parafield Gardens.
- ii. Development at the Renmark High School.
- iii. Relocation of the Warriapendi Alternative School to the Richmond Junior Primary School.
- iv. Construction of Police Complex at Novar Gardens.
- v. Development at the Waikerie High School.
- vi. Erection of Classrooms at Northfield High School.
- vii. Construction of a Training Tower at Northfield.
- viii. Borrow Pit, Hundred of Cannawigara.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

Road Traffic Act, 1961—Regulations—Traffic Prohibition—

- i. Mitcham.
- ii. Noarlunga.
- iii. Woodville.
- iv. Clearways, Flashing Lights and Powers of Board.

- By the Minister of Education (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—
Pursuant to Statute—
- i. Seeds Act, 1979—Regulations—Labelling of Seed Packages.
- By the Minister of Tourism (Hon. G.F. Keneally)—
Pursuant to Statute—
- i. South Australian Health Commission—Report, 1982-83.
- By the Minister of Local Government (Hon. G.F. Keneally)—
Pursuant to Statute—
- i. Dog Control Act, 1979—Regulations—Registration Areas.
 - ii. Local Government Act, 1934—Rules—Local Government Superannuation Scheme.
 - iii. District Council of Robe—By-law No. 25—Controlling the Foreshore.
- By Hon. G.F. Keneally, for the Minister of Mines and Energy (Hon. R.G. Payne)—
Pursuant to Statute—
- i. Mining Act, 1971—Regulations—Registrar's Office, Mintabie Opalfield.
- By the Minister of Community Welfare (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—
Pursuant to Statute—
- i. Building Societies, Registrar of—Report, 1982-83.
 - ii. Credit Unions, Registrar of—Report, 1982-83.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: HEALTH COMMISSION DOCUMENTS

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Tourism): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: On behalf of the Minister of Health, I table a number of documents relating to the commissioning by the South Australian Health Commission of a report entitled 'Community Attitudes towards Drugs and Related Matters', which was laid on the table of this House on 12 April 1984.

NO-CONFIDENCE MOTION: MINISTER OF HEALTH

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That so much of Standing Orders be suspended as to enable me to move a motion without notice.

The SPEAKER: I have counted the House and, there being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House, I accept the motion. Is it seconded?

Opposition members: Yes, Sir.

Motion carried.

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

That the time allowed for this debate be two hours.

Motion carried.

Mr OLSEN: I move:

That, because the Minister of Health has persistently and deliberately misled Parliament about an ANOP market research questionnaire the Minister commissioned at taxpayers' expense last year, this House has no confidence in the Minister and calls on him to resign forthwith; and, if he refuses to do so, calls on the Premier to sack him forthwith.

Mr Speaker, on the last day this House sat, the Premier, with the sanctimonious 'holier than thou' pretence he always adopts whenever he is in trouble, quoted the Bible to suggest this was trivial, and was not an important matter. What hypocrisy from a person with his publicly professed lack of belief! Of course, the Premier was attempting to belittle the importance of this matter in the hope that it would go away over the Easter break. But it has not.

The persistence of the Opposition and the scatter-gun tactics of the Minister of Health have made sure of that. And I warn the Premier that this matter still will not go away if the Government uses its numbers today to keep the Minister in office. Next time it will be the Premier in the gun as well, if the Minister is not held accountable for his deliberate and persistent misleading of this Parliament. The full truth will be revealed in due course, but we know enough of it already to convict the Minister.

As well as the facts already established following my disclosure of the questionnaire 12 days ago, I will be asking the House to consider new information this afternoon. In particular, I will present to the House information from a person employed by ANOP who helped to conduct this survey. This information has been backed up by discussions we have had with other market research companies and former clients of ANOP. All of it completely refutes the attempts by Mr Cameron, of ANOP, to get the Minister off the hook. I will also reveal to the House that the Opposition has obtained official quotations from two South Australian market research companies showing that taxpayers are being taken for a ride in having to meet the full cost of this survey, no matter how one believes it was done.

As well, my disclosure of the questionnaire establishes 15 separate instances in which Parliament has been misled over this matter by the Minister, the Premier or the Attorney-General. The Premier and the Attorney-General presumably accepted the Minister's word. But, if the Premier continues to condone the Minister's behaviour, the Premier will be equally guilty in the deliberate misleading of this House.

Since 9 August last year, the Opposition has asked 54 specific questions about the ANOP market research poll commissioned by the Minister of Health and undertaken between 27 August and 4 September last year. In six of those questions, asked on five different sitting days, the Government was asked to produce the full questionnaire used in the poll. The Premier and the Minister of Health refused, even though that questionnaire was commissioned at taxpayers' expense, giving this Parliament the right to know everything about it. We now have that questionnaire because I was able to obtain what the Government tried to conceal.

The content of this questionnaire demonstrates beyond any shadow of a doubt why the Premier and the Minister did not want the truth revealed. Almost half of it is of a Party-political nature. Party-political questions have been asked as part of a survey commissioned at a cost of \$32 000 to the taxpayers. The Government claims that it did not pay for the Party-political questions. I will prove that the Government could have obtained the information of a non-political nature for much less than it has paid to ANOP. I will also give chapter and verse on the misleading statements made to this House and another place.

I will give 15 specific instances in which Parliament has been denied the truth—15 reasons why this motion must be carried—and I will expose the explanation given by Mr Rod Cameron, of ANOP, for what it is—a hollow sham, concocted courtesy of a close friend of the ALP in the interests of self and Party survival, rather than the truth. I have no doubt that, in his reply, the Premier will raise his voice in high dudgeon and proclaim this whole matter to be trivial and a beat up. The House now is used to this Premier's asserting that only he has the right to determine what is important and what is not. That is his usual response to anything which embarrasses the Government.

The House has also seen this Premier give his Ministers free licence to fudge their answers in Parliament; to encourage union officials to participate in illegal bans; to give unfair advantage and Government licences to companies with which they have private business advantage and dealings.

It has taken only 18 months for the credibility and honesty of this Government to be fully exposed for what they are: non-existent. It is a Government devoid of any scruples—determined only to tough it out at all costs. And the cost in this case is very high—a denial of the right of this Parliament to truthful answers to legitimate questions; a denial by the Government of its responsibility to give truthful answers; a denial of Parliamentary democracy itself.

The principle is the same whether we are debating \$32 000 worth of taxpayers' funds or \$32 million. No doubt, the Premier will say in his reply that the economy, the State's finances and many other matters are much more important than is the subject of this debate. It is true that there are many other vital matters which this Parliament should be debating, but what is the point in the Opposition's raising them while we have on the Government benches a Premier and a Minister prepared to completely ignore their responsibility to deal with and to debate any publicly relevant matter frankly, openly and honestly?

Let me also suggest to the Premier that in his reply he should not attempt to weary the House with passionate and emotive statements about the motives of the Minister of Health. I do not doubt (and I genuinely believe) the sincerity of the Minister's attitude about drug related matters. He has had a bitter personal experience and I acknowledge that. As a father, I appreciate and share his very real concerns about the effects of drugs on young people.

However, those private motives cannot in any way excuse the Minister from his public responsibilities to this Parliament, and while the Minister has attempted, since this matter arose, to represent himself as a one man campaigner against the illegal drug trade, let me remind the House of the reality rather than this legend the Minister has sought to create about himself.

In a statement on 1 December 1982, almost 18 months ago, I indicated how much work the former Liberal Government had done on this issue and the fact that legislation was being drawn up at the time of the last State election to increase significantly penalties for drug traffickers and other related offences. Since that time, there has been a bipartisan approach to most drug related matters in South Australia. So let us not confuse what this ANOP survey attempted to ascertain in relation to law reform with what was concealed—deliberately concealed from this Parliament—about the other Party-political objectives of the survey.

While the Minister of Health has been able to enact legislation because of the determination of all Parties in this Parliament to support drug law reform, there is a side to his character which is more relevant to this debate, because it is responsible for the serious trouble he and the Premier are in. The Minister is a political monster in the sense that he continually hurls personal abuse and spits venomous insults at anyone and anything when he thinks he can get away with it. He tries to frighten, intimidate and belittle people who in any way dispute his actions or his own point of view. He does not debate questions of policy when he is in a corner; he simply tries to claw his way out with personal abuse of those who will not agree with him.

It is exactly this temperament, this style, this determination to get his own way, and hang the consequences, which have now got him into trouble of a kind which he does not deserve to survive politically. Instead of truthful replies to questions about this matter, all the Minister has been prepared to give Parliament is more abuse; instead of information, feigned indignation; instead of behaving responsibly, he has acted recklessly. Let me illustrate what I mean; let me repeat some of the insults heaped on members in another place for seeking and exposing the truth:

You're a blithering idiot.

Stop being so bloody stupid and infantile.

He is a goose.

You have been on the magic mushrooms, John.

They really are the pits, this lot.

He does not normally play the politics of the beat up and the gutter or the disgusting type of politics that Rob the blob and Leigh the flea want to play in this place.

They are some (but by no means all) of the insults which have come from the mouth of the Minister of Health in recent days when he has given answers on this matter. They were the rantings of a desperate man, uttered under Parliamentary privilege, as he sought to evade the truth. When I was prepared to put up outside Parliament, to nail the Minister for what he is, he has cried foul. He has asked for an apology. He said that I had caused him considerable damage, distress. Apparently, what is fair game for him should be off limits for me, but all I did was to act responsibly in the public interest. I do not regret what I have said, outside this Parliament, about the Minister. It was nothing more than he deserved—and it is the truth.

At the same time, I did not personally abuse the Minister in the way that he has done to many South Australians unable to answer for themselves in the way I now can. I dealt with the facts. I merely labelled him (and in this House I must use substitute words for 'liar') a teller of untruths and a participant in a deliberate cover up. Shortly, I will come to the compelling proof of this case—a case which I am confident will stand up in any court to which the Minister cares to take it.

But before I do so, let us for just one minute accept the Minister's version: that he did not know that Party-political questions had been asked in this survey. He asserts this and claims he is therefore absolved of any responsibility. Honourable members will recall that a previous Labor Government alleged that a former Police Commissioner (Mr Salisbury) had failed in his duty to find out what the Police Special Branch was doing, after questions were asked of Mr Salisbury by the Government and in this House. For that alleged failure of duty, Mr Salisbury was sacked. Let me now repeat to the House that the Opposition has asked 54 specific questions about this ANOP survey. It has been alleging since 10 April that Party-political questions were asked.

A whole series of questions was asked by us during the following five sitting days in both Houses, alleging what has now been proved—seeking to find out what the Government tried to conceal. Did the Minister try to find out—if he did not know? Did he become concerned after the first questions were asked? Did he ring up Mr Cameron of ANOP and ask what the questionnaire contained so that Parliament could be given the truth, if he did not already know it? Apparently he did not. All Parliament got was more abuse, more evasions, more untruths. For this, the Minister must accept the full responsibility, even if it is believed that he did not know the full content of the questionnaire when he was first asked about it.

Just as a former Labor Government claimed Mr Salisbury was guilty because he did not seek to inform himself about Special Branch when he was asked about it, so this Minister also is guilty according to standards set—not by me but by a former Labor Administration. Once I released the questionnaire and proved that Parliament had not been told the truth, the Minister should have offered his resignation. Failing that, the Premier should have demanded it or sacked him. That scenario should have applied, as I say, even if the Minister's version of the truth was acceptable and plausible, but it is not. The Opposition completely rejects the excuses the Minister has put up and maintains instead that he has known for much longer than he has been prepared to admit that questions of a Party-political nature were included in the questionnaire. That is not difficult to demonstrate. I take the House back first to Question Time in

another place on 9 August last year. The Minister was asked which questions would be included in the ANOP survey on drug related matters. He replied in part:

I specifically asked Mr Cameron, the principal of ANOP, to devise a programme for my consideration. At this stage, it has not hit my desk, although it will later this week. I will then consider it.

The Minister also said:

I am unable to say what questions will be asked, because the proposal and its costing have not yet come to my desk.

Accepted at face value, this was an indication by the Minister that he would be seeing all the questions to be asked, before he agreed to pay for the survey, as indeed it was his responsibility to do.

After the questionnaire was completed, the Minister made a further public statement indicating that he had been aware of all the questions asked. He was reported in the *Advertiser* on 24 October last year as saying:

It was not just a soap powder survey with a few extra questions tacked on the end. The questionnaire was to produce a complete social planning approach to alcohol, hard and soft drugs, prescriptions, drug abuse and illicit drugs.

I submit from both these statements that the Minister intended the Parliament to believe, and the Parliament was entitled to believe, that the Minister did in fact have an intimate knowledge of all the questions asked. The Minister has sought to pretend otherwise only since the Party-political content of the survey has been revealed. The cover-up had its origins two days after that statement in the *Advertiser* when on 26 October, in another place, Mr Lucas asked a series of questions about the results to all the questions asked. Mr Lucas did not receive a reply for almost five months. It came in a letter from the Leader of the Government in another place, dated 20 March this year. Mr Sumner informed Mr Lucas that the Government would not release the questionnaire, and no reason was given for this refusal. To the question, 'Will the Minister provide a copy of the results to all questions asked?' Mr Sumner replied:

The design of the questionnaire is the province of ANOP.

That was an evasive answer, completely irrelevant to the question. Mr Lucas also asked:

Did the ANOP company conduct research for any other body at the time of conducting this study?

The reply was curious, to say the least:

Not to the knowledge of the Minister of Health.

As I have pointed out, Mr Lucas waited five months for a reply to this question. Why, in all that time, did the Minister not ask ANOP whether in fact other questions had been asked? He was prepared to be categorical about not releasing the questionnaire, but not about the other questions asked. Obviously, the Minister had something to hide.

Mr Lucas pursued the matter on 10 April, asking the Minister why he would not provide Parliament with a copy of the questionnaire. He also asked whether it included a question about approval of the performance of the Minister. The Minister, in his reply, said, referring to both the questionnaire and the results of the survey:

They are available, not only to the Health Promotion Services Unit but also to every member of Parliament and to every member of the public in South Australia. The results of that ANOP survey have been published.

Here, the misleading and the cover-up were taken up in earnest. The Minister wanted the House to accept that the report on the survey he had tabled in Parliament outlined all the questions asked. But, in fact, the questionnaire was not included in the report, nor were all the answers to all the questions asked; so this answer was completely misleading in that respect. It was also deliberately misleading in that the Minister did not admit to the personal approval question even though he had been specifically asked by Mr Lucas

whether it had been included, and the Minister knew that it had been.

In convicting the Minister on this answer, I come back to the Salisbury affair and the report of the Royal Commission (headed by Her Honour Judge Mitchell) into his dismissal—a report that the Labor Party accepted in full. At several places in her report, Her Honour found that Mr Salisbury had to take responsibility for giving the Dunstan Government answers that were inaccurate by omission. And she said at paragraph 84 of her report:

The fact is that answers can be rendered untrue by being incomplete.

According to this standard, which the Labor Party used to sack Mr Salisbury, the Minister of Health stands guilty not only once but several times over. In relation to the survey questionnaire, the Opposition asked four further questions seeking its release: on 12 and 18 April in this House and 18 April in another place. Ultimately, the persistence of the Opposition obtained, outside Parliament, what the Government refused to produce to the House.

I turn now to further questions about the information obtained during the survey in relation to the Minister of Health. The Minister's ego got the better of him on 11 April when he finally admitted, in response to further Opposition questions, what he had refused to reveal the day before: that a personal approval question was asked. The Minister maintained, however, that this was not improper because it had been specifically agreed with ANOP that the question would be extra to the official survey, and asked at no cost. Even if this explanation is accepted, it is setting a very dubious precedent to say the least. It was a Party-political question to obtain information to benefit the ALP and, in a personal sense, the Minister. It was able to be asked only because the Minister had commissioned a survey at public expense. To obtain that information in the normal way would have cost the ALP money.

The Opposition believes that any market research of a Party-political nature must not only be divorced but must be seen to be divorced from any market research funded by the taxpayers. Accordingly, we believe that the Minister was grossly irresponsible in having a personal approval rating question attached to a publicly funded survey.

At the same time, we would not have pursued this matter in the way we have done if this was all that occurred. A reassurance from the Premier that publicly funded research would not be used in this way again would have been sufficient. But the Premier was not even prepared to do that. The manner of the Minister's continually abusive and evasive replies to our questions suggested still more was involved than the Minister was prepared to admit. In finally conceding that a personal approval question was asked, the Minister explained in another place on 11 April:

At that point, Mr Cameron said, 'What about a personal approval rating? Would you like us to add on one more question concerning a personal approval rating?'

The Minister laboured this point. He also said:

At the end of the day, Rod Cameron said, 'Do you want us to put in an extra question about Ministerial approval?' I said, 'All right, why not?'

I ask the House to note that the Minister here was admitting to only one question about himself. In other answers by the Minister that day and on 17 and 18 April, and by the Attorney-General on 12 April, the Government led another place further to believe that only one such question was asked. In fact, there were three. The questionnaire also contains one question about whether the respondents knew the name of the State Minister of Health. That is completely separate from his personal approval rating. Another question asked why people were either satisfied or dissatisfied with the Minister's performance—a significant extension to the

simple question of whether they were satisfied or dissatisfied. The Minister's answers on this point were not only misleading—they were deliberately so, because at least one journalist was told by a member of the Minister's staff that the additional questions were asked, but the Minister refused to reveal this to Parliament.

Also, on 18 April in another place, Mr Burdett asked the Minister specifically whether a question had been included in the survey about reasons for the respondents approving or disapproving of the Minister's performance. The Minister, by clear implication in his reply, denied that such a question had been asked.

Mr Speaker, I have now shown beyond doubt that, in answering questions in this Parliament about whether or not the survey sought information about the performance of the Minister, Mr Cornwall first of all gave a deliberately untrue answer, then consistently admitted to only one such question when there were three, and there is no doubt that he knew there were three.

I now turn to the voting intention questions. On 11 April, Mr Lucas asked the Minister whether a voting intention question had been included. The Minister replied:

I certainly did not commission a poll that asked about voting intentions on Saturdays, Sundays, Wednesdays or any other days.

A further six questions on this specific aspect of the survey were asked by the Opposition on 12, 17 and 18 April. Notably, on 12 April, the member for Torrens asked the Premier specifically whether the survey had sought voter intention information. The Premier, in his reply, did not admit that it had. Instead, and typically, he evaded giving an unequivocal answer, saying merely:

I am not aware of the full range of questions that may or may not have been asked as part of the survey.

But the Premier was forced to admit that a voting intention question had been asked after Miss Marie Hartwig, a respondent to the survey, made a public statement on 17 April and signed a statutory declaration the following day. Miss Hartwig's revelation forced the Premier to tell this House on 18 April—the last day of sitting:

It is clear that some form of voting preference question must have been asked, if one examines the document that was tabled.

Mr Speaker, that was what we had been asking the Government for a week to confirm and explain. But then the Premier added:

No information was given about specific voting intentions.

That statement was completely untrue. So, as soon as he confessed to one deception, the Premier perpetrated another, hoping all the time, no doubt, that the questionnaire would never see the light of day. In another place, the Minister also finally admitted on 18 April:

The question of State voting intentions is there, and has been there for more than four months for all South Australians to see.

That was a flat contradiction of the Minister's earlier statements to which I have referred. By this time, the suspicions of the Opposition had increased, because Miss Hartwig's declaration also stated that other questions of a blatant Party-political nature had been asked, including approval or disapproval of the Premier's performance, voting at the last State election, whether this voting intention has now changed and, if so, why, and what good and bad things the State Government had done. It is interesting to note that the documentation just tabled before the Parliament proves that this Parliament has been misled. The documentation tabled by the Minister of Tourism, on behalf of the Minister in another place, contains a letter from Mr Cameron to the Minister of Health dated 11 August 1983. Referring to matters to be surveyed, I quote from Mr Cameron's letter tabled in this Parliament prior to the commencement of this motion:

Minister's and Premier's performance appraisal and reasons—

And at page 3 the document states:

Government performance—

Assessment of Government performance in drug areas and other areas for comparative purposes.

Adjudged appropriateness of general Government approach to drugs and related areas.

View regarding Government policies relating to availability, users, penalties.

Minister's and Premier's profile, performance appraisal and reasons.

That was in the documentation that had been tabled in this Parliament at the start of the question. By the tabling of that documentation, every word that I have spoken and commented on in this House on this motion has now been proved without doubt. This Minister of Health has lied to Parliament, as subsequently the Premier, Attorney-General, and indeed the whole Cabinet, have been lying to this Parliament about the ANOP survey poll. That is quite clearly established beyond doubt. Also, there is no doubt that this motion should be carried in this Parliament. Failure to carry it would be an abdication of responsibility by the Premier, the Minister and the Government: it would be a total watering down of the Westminster democratic system as we know it.

It is quite clear that the Opposition was seeking answers to confirm and explain the voting intention, and that has now been established beyond doubt. I remind the House that the Premier said that no information was given about specific voting intentions: that statement is completely untrue, and proved so by the documentation now tabled. After confessing to one deception, this Premier has been party to perpetrating others. I referred to Miss Hartwig and her declaration, which was the basis for further intensive questioning by the Opposition because it clearly indicated that the answers given in both Houses were not truthful. The Premier did not think that her statement could be verified. He told this House in 18 April:

I cannot question the validity of Miss Hartwig's statement, her recall or whatever, and I do not know that that is really possible.

Nor did the Premier intend to try. In the *Advertiser* that same day, when asked whether he would inquire further into the matter in view of Miss Hartwig's revelations, the Premier had replied—'Not really, why should I bother.' So much for the upholding of the traditions of the Westminster system that Ministers of the day should always be open, frank, and truthful to Parliament. All the Premier needed to do to check Miss Hartwig's statement was to ask Mr Cameron for the questionnaire, or at least get the letter of 11 August off the file from Mr Cameron that proved the point, if he did not already have the relevant information about it. All the Premier needed to do was to check that statement: it was a basic responsibility as Leader of the Government.

Finally, I obtained and was able to release the full questionnaire on 19 April. It was a devastating and damning revelation for the Minister of Health. It showed that 11 of the 26 questions were of a blatant Party political nature, totally unrelated to drug matters. In other words, the Minister concealed eleven twenty-sixths of the truth. This Parliament was not told the whole truth and nothing but the truth. It exposed and confirmed what we had long suspected: that there had been a deliberate and persistent attempt by the Government to withhold information from the Parliament.

Honourable members should note that I make this accusation irrespective of whether or not the political questions were included in the cost of the survey or to whom the political information was made available. I will deal fully with those points in a moment. The intention of most of our questions had been simple and clear: to ascertain whether or not these Party-political questions had been asked. The

Government, speaking through the Premier and the Minister of Health, with some help from the Attorney-General, concealed the full ambit of the political questions. They claimed they did not know, but even if we accept that, and I do not, they took no action to find out. It is documented now that they did know. That was a grave evasion of responsibility.

Nothing can be plainer than the fact that all of the statements I have cited were misleading. They were all made before I obtained the questionnaire. They were all made in the hope that the questionnaire would remain concealed from this Parliament. They all prevented Parliament and the public from learning the full truth. Faced with the irrefutable evidence of these deceptions when the questionnaire was revealed, what did the Minister and the Premier do? The Minister read the riot act to the media, and threatened to issue writs all over this town. Not content to prevent the Parliament knowing the truth, he wanted public debate about this matter stopped as well.

And all the Premier has done in the past 12 days, since I released this comprehensive evidence of a cover-up and a scandal, is to invite the media to ring Rod Cameron of ANOP. While the Government is relying completely on Mr Cameron to get itself off the hook (although it seems to me he has put the Government back on the hook with the statement that has been tabled), he cannot be regarded as a disinterested, impartial person in this matter. Nor does his story stand up to even the slightest scrutiny. Mr Cameron owes his start in the polling business and his continuing livelihood to the Australian Labor Party. He has been polling for the Australian Labor Party in South Australia for at least 10 years, and in that time he has become much more than a pollster. He is, as well, a confidant of senior Federal Ministers, and a key strategist in devising campaigns at both the Federal and State levels for the Labor Party. It is important for the House to recognise these aspects of Mr Cameron's background when it considers whether or not his explanation stands up.

I believe that his word is open to grave doubt and serious challenge to the extent that it is impossible to accept. Let us look further into how Mr Cameron has reacted to the revelation of Party-political questions in this taxpayer funded poll. While the questions were being evaded in this Parliament, Mr Cameron refused to discuss the matter with the media, and immediately after I released the questionnaire on 19 April, Mr Cameron told the *News* that the survey had been commissioned by Dr Cornwall and his Department and any questions relating to it should be directed to them.

However, later that day the Premier's office contacted the *News* with the suggestion that Mr Cameron's latest comments should be sought. This time, no doubt after a plea from a desperate Premier, Mr Cameron was more expansive, saying that the Party-political questions asked were standard practice, the Government had no idea about their inclusion and the results had not been passed on to anybody. There is the credibility of Mr Cameron decimated by the tabling of the documents put forward by the Minister of Health this afternoon. His own case has been decimated by his own actions and words in that correspondence. I will deal with each of these points in turn.

The Opposition has spoken to one of the people employed by ANOP to conduct this survey. That person has also worked on other polls for ANOP. The Opposition has been shown evidence to prove these credentials. The person has informed us that Party-political questions of this type are not and never have been standard practice in ANOP survey work, supposedly of a non-Party political nature conducted for a specific client as opposed to an omnibus type survey. So not only has this survey improperly included questions of a Party-political nature, but the asking of them meant

that the Government did not receive full value from the use of taxpayers' funds to ask the drug related questions.

The Opposition has also discussed Mr Cameron's explanation with other market research companies—especially his contention that blatantly Party-political questions are used as standard practice to ease respondents into answering questions about matters supposedly having absolutely nothing to do with Party politics. Their reaction has been one of total disbelief, to the point of derision. This is supported as well by the experience of another survey undertaken for the Health Commission and commissioned by the former Liberal Government.

That survey was a very comprehensive assessment of public attitudes to smoking, and has formed the basis for the present Government's anti-smoking campaign. It was undertaken jointly by the Commission and the Bureau of Statistics. There were no Party-political questions in that survey. Some questions were asked of a general social nature to ascertain the background of the respondents, their socio-economic status, and general attitudes to health matters. However, Party politics did not enter that survey in any way, yet it was a fully effective survey and the results have been taken up by the present Government. So much then for Mr Cameron's explanation that Party-political questions are standard practice to ease respondents into surveys such as this.

In relation to the Minister's knowledge of these Party-political questions, I have already shown that, until this controversy blew up, Dr Cornwall was making statements suggesting that he had knowledge of all the questions asked. It was his responsibility to obtain that knowledge before authorising the use of taxpayers' funds for the project. The voting intention question, which the Minister and the Premier finally were forced to admit they knew was asked as part of the survey, is No. 2 (a) in the questionnaire. The question about the Minister's approval rating, which they also have admitted to knowing about, is number 13 (a).

In other words, what Parliament is asked to believe is that the Government knew about question 2 (a), one of six parts of question 8 relating to public concerns about drugs and drug laws, questions 10, 11 and 13, and questions 14 to 26 inclusive, but that it did not know about, nor did it pay for, questions 1, 2 (b), 3 to 7 inclusive, five of the six parts of question 8 relating to the Government's performance in education, developing mineral deposits, State taxes and charges, crime, law and order, and improving hospitals, or questions 9, 12 and 13 (b), which were the questions of a Party-political nature. That is an interesting and certainly a novel explanation, but an absolutely unbelievable one. The fact is that the survey was fully integrated. One question followed another in logical sequence, making it impossible to separate Party-political questions from the rest for the purposes of showing it to the Minister for approval, and for costing it.

As further proof of my contention that taxpayers have paid for the Party-political questions as well as the others, I have obtained costings from two reputable Adelaide market research companies. These costings are for asking only the drug related questions in the survey. They are based on the cost of developing the questions, organising and selecting start points, attending briefing sessions, the conducting of the research, computer analysis, presentation of results, and report writing. One costing is for \$22 000, which, incidentally, is \$10 000 or 30 per cent less than the ANOP charge. The other costing is for \$18 000. Mind you, those costings are from South Australian companies and not companies based in Sydney. The costing for \$18 000 is \$14 000 or almost 45 per cent less than the amount paid by the Government for the survey.

It should be borne in mind that the Government did not call tenders for the letting of the contract: it gave it to Mr Cameron from ANOP. The South Australian companies were not even able to get to first base in regard to this survey. These costings were provided by the Market Research Society of Australia, South Australian Branch. In its letter, which I have here, that professional society also expresses the view that public funded research studies should be competitively priced and tendered, and that it would like to see preference given to members of the society in South Australia. I can well understand that. From a taxpayer's point of view I would like it to do so, because it seems that it can be done more cheaply in South Australia.

Of course, the survey was undertaken by a company based in Sydney. It was not put out to tender. One could well ask why it was not put out to tender, although it seems to me fairly obvious why that did not occur. In these circumstances, and because of Mr Cameron's close political association with the ALP, he had an enormous obligation to be entirely circumspect in his work. He should not have exposed this project to even the remotest suggestion of a Party-political exercise. But what did Mr Cameron do? Almost half the questions were of a blatant Party-political nature. Mr Cameron thinks he can satisfy this Parliament with his explanation about the Party politics in this survey. What he says may be acceptable to the ALP and its fellow travelling friends on the gravy train, where anything seems to go, whether it relates to improper and unauthorised disclosure of information about national security, or to the use of taxpayers' funds, but it has not washed, and will not wash, with the people of South Australia whose taxes have been wasted.

The Premier was completely naive in thinking that the public would buy what Mr Cameron and the Minister of Health have said. If the Government genuinely did not know about the Party-political questions, why did not the Premier publicly castigate Mr Cameron's foolishness and indiscretion for allowing Party politics to be linked so directly with a taxpayer funded survey? We know why the Premier did not publicly castigate Mr Cameron: it was because the Government knew about it, it knew about the questions before the survey was undertaken. The record shows that, as does the letter from Mr Cameron. The Premier did not do so because he and Mr Cameron were in it together, and we have proved that that is the case. Finally, I point out that Mr Cameron asks us to believe that the information of a Party-political nature was not passed on to the ALP. That suggestion is utterly fantastic and unbelievable. How could anyone suggest that?

As I have pointed out, Mr Cameron is an ALP strategist and confidant as well as a pollster. He sits in on meetings at which Party-political strategies are developed at Federal and State levels. The information he obtained from this survey would have been very valuable to him in that capacity, and the taxpayers of this State paid for it. That information has not been left to gather dust in Mr Cameron's pigeonhole, as the Premier now well knows. The agitation of Mr Schacht adds weight to that. The Premier now knows the problems the ALP and his Government will face when the extent to which this information, obtained at taxpayers' expense, has done the Party-political round as shown. That is why the Premier cannot sack the Minister of Health, and why he refuses to act in this matter. It is as simple as that. So they both intend to tough it out, and no political penalty will be payable.

That means that all Ministers will be given *carte blanche* to mislead this Parliament and to use taxpayers' funds to undertake ALP Party-political market research. Those are the consequences if the Government uses its numbers to defeat or amend this motion. It will be a sorry day for this

Parliament. The Government will finally turn its back on all the conventions of Ministerial accountability to this Parliament. I warn the Premier, if this is the intention of the Government. It is not a result that will satisfy the Opposition, the public or the media of this State. The full truth will come out eventually. We have seen a further snippet of that truth in documents tabled in this Parliament today: absolutely conclusive, cast iron proof of what we have been saying for several weeks and what the Minister of Health has been denying in another place, substantiated by the then Premier in this place and the Attorney-General in another place. Clearly, three Ministers of this Government have misled and told substantive untruths (I would use the word 'lie' if I were able to, but not being able to I use that word). They have deliberately misled and told untruths to this Parliament, deliberately setting out to deceive the public of South Australia. That is not hearsay: it is documented evidence tabled in this Parliament which substantiates the case the Opposition puts forward.

The Premier clearly must act in this matter. He must take action to ensure that this sort of conduct is not condoned by the Parliament, that the traditions of the Westminster system, namely, Ministerial honesty, accountability, frankness and openness in answers to questions, are at all times paramount. The Premier can do that by sacking the Minister of Health if he refuses to resign. The only honourable course of action that man has, after these documents have been tabled in this Parliament, is to resign and, if he does not resign, the Premier of this State has a duty and a responsibility to sack him. The Premier is the Leader of this Government, the custodian of Parliamentary democracy in this State. It is squarely in his lap to ensure that those traditions of honesty and frankness in this Parliament are maintained, and he will be judged by his actions on this matter. The Premier's action must be to seek the resignation of the Minister of Health, and, failing that, the Premier must take decisive action for once and sack him.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): The Leader of the Opposition finished with some high flown and noble sentiments. I guess one must take them at face value and say that, yes, indeed there are certain traditions in this place, there are standards to be upheld and there is a Westminster tradition. I do not think anything that has been put before this place, today or in the past, or on all the previous occasions when a number of my Ministers have been treated similarly, when the same sort of calls have been made for me to sack them or for them to resign, has been any further evidence, any further case other than that which rests on the politics of the matter, because that is what we are dealing with here. The Opposition has announced with a great flourish a mid-term campaign, and at the weekend we had a fairly expensive media advertisement setting out the so-called new economic policies that the Opposition is trying to deliver. Some pretty tired old cliches they were, too.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Premier to resume his seat. The Leader of the Opposition was heard in silence, and I ask that the Premier be heard in silence. I have made clear before to the Parliament that while I am Speaker I regard these motions as serious and to be treated accordingly. Honourable members who interject can expect the appropriate action. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: We have got this business out of the way, and the Opposition has returned to this place today, not with its new economic policies or its commentaries on other events of the day but in fact getting back to pure politics. We have had the innuendo, the allegations, the carping criticism, which unfortunately has characterised this

Opposition; that deep seated resentment on the part of members of the Opposition that we occupy these benches because we were voted here by the people. The feeling, probably common in most conservative Parties, that they have some divine right to occupy these benches, sees this Opposition, as is so often the case, laying hands on every single weapon it can, every piece of innuendo, every piece of slander, putting the worst interpretation on anything that is said, going through the kind of forensic exercise that we have been subjected to today, analysing and weighing each word and each answer. Questions asked, I would suggest, particularly referring to Mr Lucas in another place, under the guise of seeking information, with members saying that they do not have such information, were couched in such a way as to try to lay traps, false trails, to be used later if it were possible.

That is what has been happening over the past few months and I can assure members opposite or any member in this place that we could all indulge in that little game if we wanted to. We could all twist and turn and ask questions in particular ways to seek specific answers, we could all put all the worst possible complexions and interpretations on those answers, and some flimsy case could be erected. But it is not on that basis that Governments should be judged, it is not on that basis that the performance of Ministers should be analysed, it is certainly not on that basis that I, as Leader of this Government, will ask any of my Ministers to step down or resign, nor will I sack them in the event that they do not do so.

The Minister of Health, of course, has become a particular target of the Opposition, and I thought it was interesting and revealing to read some reference in the press today to the number of times the Minister of Health has been singled out for specific attention by members of the Opposition, specific attacks. I must admit that, if we are on to allegations of hypocrisy, I was not too impressed with the Leader of the Opposition's purported sympathy and understanding of the Minister of Health's personal involvement and experience with that dreadful issue of drug abuse in our society. I would like to believe that what he said was said in sincerity, but certainly most of the rest of his remarks, before and after that passage of his speech, did not give me very much hope that those words were sincere. On the contrary, the way in which the Opposition has tackled this Minister consistently over time makes quite clear that he is seen as a target that they must use every weapon they can find to hit.

I can understand that to an extent because the Minister of Health is what one might call (indeed, I think he calls himself) a high profile politician. He is aggressive and he does pursue the priorities in his portfolio in a direct and straightforward manner. He does put noses out of joint on occasions, and on occasions he has made mistakes, and he has been the first to say—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON:—'Yes, there was a mistake made.' I refer to the Adelaide Children's Hospital, where a notorious incident occurred involving a confrontation (an engineered confrontation) between the Minister of Health and one of the staff, in which that member of the staff was making specific allegations about problems of services within the Hospital. The Minister responded to that. He took up, on the basis of the advice he received from the Commission and from the Hospital Board, the case as he thought it was. In fact, following that confrontation, following the public discussion around it, the Minister discovered, and indeed the Board and the Health Commission were prepared to agree, that there were problems and deficiencies at the Adelaide Children's Hospital. The Minister acted instantly to fix that up. He moved, and funds were allocated. He

came straight to Cabinet and said that there was a problem about which something had to be done and he would like to be authorised to do it. That is his style.

Mr Lewis: What about Dr—

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: He is aggressive, he is abrasive.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mallee will be warned if he continues to defy the Speaker's ruling.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Minister of Health is aggressive and abrasive. He is in charge of an area of Government that is probably the second largest in respect of Government spending so, naturally, if changes are to be made there and things are to be done in that field, vigour is obviously needed and, in the course of the exercise of that vigour, there will obviously be people who feel disaffected or put out by what is said or done or by the stirring required to prompt them into action. So, there is no way in which the Minister of Health, who is doing his job in the current difficult period, can be popular all round, and, with the high profile Minister we have, that is clear. Therefore, he is a good target for the Opposition, and he gives as good as he gets. However, sometimes the attacks on him go too far and for too long, and in this instance we have such a classic example.

Let us look at what has been put before us today: an issue which has been questioned and explored in this place and which I would have thought had been dealt with satisfactorily. Nothing that the Leader of the Opposition has produced today alters the fundamental position and the fundamental statements made. There is nothing in the Leader's speech to suggest that the Minister of Health should resign. Many allegations have been made against the Minister, but the vital issue that we must look at here is what information the Government received as the result of the commissioning of a report on the attitude of the community towards drugs. That is what the questions have been about, and that is the subject of the motion. The answer to the question is simple and straightforward: the Government commanded a report that would serve as a basis of a strategy for addressing one of the most serious problems facing our community today, a problem which is especially pressing among our young people and which, if not addressed, could seriously undermine the viability of our society.

The Government is trying to act in this area, after many years of rhetoric and very little concrete action by the previous Government, on what is needed to understand community attitudes in depth and to understand what the public concerns are, where they lie, and what the public would see as acceptable solutions to be implemented by any Government. That was the basis on which that survey was commissioned. The report to the Government was commissioned through the Health Commission. It was prepared and presented and then tabled in Parliament, in contrast to many other surveys and inquiries conducted by Government. It is unusual for such surveys to be made a matter of open public debate.

That is one of the ironies of this whole affair. Right from the time when the Minister of Health suggested that such a survey should be commissioned, he has been completely frank about the course and development of that survey. He has laid it out. For instance, he insisted, when the Select Committee inquiring into random breath testing wished to have access to that report before it had been tabled in the House, that it be sent to the committee, and he obtained Cabinet approval for its release. That is the truth of the Minister's handling of the matter. Apart from the game played in another place by the Hon. Mr Lucas, using whatever inside information he may or may not have thought he had, the Minister of Health, from the time of initiating the survey and right through, has laid these results out for

public and the House, as his brief demanded. In doing that, he has gone beyond what has been done in most other similar situations.

We have had the matter of the questionnaire raised, and the Leader of the Opposition in his motion refers specifically to it. A person came forward and said that she had been the subject of questions. There was nothing quoted by the Leader in relation to my replies that showed that they were wrong. I could not test the validity of that person's knowledge of the survey. Indeed, when the Opposition subsequently produced what purported to be the full questionnaire, the lady in question remembered questions that were not in the questionnaire and indicated her attitude both towards the Minister and towards the subject matter of the questions.

Be that as it may, the Minister of Health was not aware of what was in the questionnaire, nor was any other member of the Government. That has been stated from the outset, and that is a fact. Further, what the Government received was contained in the report which was laid before both Houses and which contains that information. That is where the matter rests. I refer to the documents tabled today. In fact, one of them is a note to the Minister of Health from the Chairman of the Health Commission, setting out the sequence of events as he sees them. That note states:

I have set out below my understanding of the sequence of events in respect to market research into drug attitudes:

Following discussion with you, ANOP provided you with a proposal and offer to undertake a survey by questionnaire;

You sought advice from the Commission on the proposal and offer which was reviewed by Mr Cowley, Director of the Health Promotion Services.

Mr Lewis: When was that note sent?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is dated yesterday and it sets out the Chairman's understanding of how events transpired.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: If members opposite wish to traduce Professor Andrews in this place, that is fine. However, this minute relates his understanding of the position and it should be treated with the respect due to a minute from a senior officer of the Government. The note continues:

Mr Cowley advised that:

A basic attitude survey was needed.

The survey was satisfactory and adequate to meet this need.

It was not appropriate or the practice of the Health Promotion Service to seek tenders for survey work of this kind.

On the understanding that it was an interview administered questionnaire.

It was recommended that the ANOP offer be accepted and this was approved on behalf of the South Australian Health Commission on 19 August 1983 as a matter of course. This sequence of events followed the normal Commission practice for the conduct of market research.

Where the Commission has used questionnaires in its market research surveys it has not been the practice to make these surveys public.

The minute from Mr Cowley is especially appropriate. It is dated 17 August 1983, and in it Mr Cowley, who is in charge of the Health Promotion Unit, whose job it is to look at these surveys, and who had the proposal from ANOP referred to him through the Health Commission, after it had gone directly from the Minister's desk to the Commission, states:

1. The South Australian Health Commission has a number of requirements in relation to research and planning in the area of drug intervention in South Australia. These are:

- (i) We need a basic attitude survey concerning beliefs and understanding of all drugs (excluding tobacco, for which we already have such a survey).
- (ii) We need assistance in planning major priorities for interventions as a result of such a survey.
- (iii) We will subsequently need market research, particularly in the area of testing of relevant materials and commercials for intervention programmes.

2. The survey described in the submission adequately fulfils the first of these steps.

3. At the present time, it is not feasible for the research staff in Health Promotion Services to carry out such a survey due to other major commitments for the South Australian Health Commission, and therefore it would need to be contracted out. I believe that the proposal put forward by ANOP is a satisfactory one and is appropriate to fulfil the first part of the needs of the South Australian Health Commission as outlined above, and therefore in line with our normal policy, the job will not need to go to tender.

Much has been made of that as an example of nefarious, underhand dealings on the part of the Minister. Mr Cowley's minute continues:

4. The cost is acceptable for this size of survey over this number of questions, provided that it is an administered survey by interviewers rather than a self-completed survey.

5. I recommend that ANOP is contracted to carry out the survey described in their proposal subject to some further discussion on sample size, which may need to be slightly increased.

That minute, dated 17 August 1983, is shown as approved by the Chairman of the Health Commission on 19 August and noted by the Director of Corporate Finance and Administration on the same day. A telex that has been tabled was sent by the Chairman of the Health Commission (not by the Minister of Health), based on the advice of his officers, to Mr Cameron, of ANOP, authorising him to commence the survey. The Government did not demand to know the methodology or the contents of the questionnaire, nor did the Health Commission. The Commission acted on the basis of the proposal forwarded to it. Members of the Commission exercised their professional judgment and proceeded to commission the survey on the basis of the reasons given. They are the facts. That is the basis on which the Minister has been responding to questions about this survey.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I expect better from the honourable member for Torrens.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I made clear that throughout the Minister has made absolutely no secret of his desire to commission this survey and the way in which it should be done as a matter of urgency. There was no question that, if we were to produce legislation such as the Controlled Substances Bill and act on matters of wide concern to this community needing urgent attention (matters which had been neglected—and here I would acknowledge the Minister's very personal involvement and concern about this area, and it is a pity that the broader community is not so ready to do so), this survey was necessary as part of that process, and that is endorsed clearly by the minute that I have just read to this House.

In fact, the Minister announced that such a survey should be commissioned and that steps would be taken to do so, and this was stated as early as 20 June in the *Adelaide News*. It was clearly stated there that this would happen, and so that survey was commissioned. The Minister told Parliament on 9 August that ANOP had been approached to put forward a proposal. There is no question that he attempted to hide the involvement of ANOP. It has been noticeable that we on this side are not trying to denigrate some of the so-called market researchers (unnamed, but perhaps some could be named) because they may or may not have done work for the Liberal Party in the past. We are prepared to accept them as professionals.

Mr Olsen: It's the Market Research Society.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am sorry, I was under the impression that it was from companies: that puts a somewhat different gloss on it.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Indeed it does, because it is not a commercial quote at all: it is a view from a society. That certainly puts a different complexion on what I thought were firm quotes obtained for particular types of work. Now

it seems that it is the Market Research Society's estimate of what might or might not be the case—very different indeed!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable Leader and his Deputy to show an example.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: We do not seek to denigrate the professional skills of particular pollsters because of who their clients are. All political parties undertake surveys at particular times. Those pollsters, those survey experts, those market researchers carry out their work using the methodology that best suits them to fulfil their brief, and that is where the matter begins and ends as far as the questionnaire itself is concerned. It would not have made sense for the Minister to attempt to substitute his personal views on what should or should not be in the survey. He outlined in broad terms what the Government and the Health Commission felt it needed. It was up to the market survey organisation to turn that into concrete terms and, more importantly, return the information that was necessary—the accurate, factual reported information, which came to us in a large comprehensive volume, and which was published to Parliament and to the public at large. That was their brief, that was what the Government paid for and that is what the Government received. To say that the Minister should have sat down and gone through each question and answer in detail based on the past practices that occurred in this area is nonsense.

There have been other surveys taken at other times. Perhaps in some cases there was close Ministerial surveillance, perhaps in others there was not, but really the kind of allegations that have been made based on the innuendoes and the starting point that the Minister is a crook (that is where all this starts from with the members opposite: he is deemed totally guilty, black and dishonest before he opens his mouth), it is still totally unreasonable to believe that the Minister had to scrutinise each and every aspect of it. He commissioned through the Health Commission a report, and he got the report he asked for—the broad outline of the proposed research certainly, but he did not request, see or receive detailed questionnaires or detailed responses to each and every one of those questions, except the ones that were published.

So, that really is where we come to a halt on this matter. We cannot take it any further. We are left with a belief, an allegation, by those opposite which is to place the worst and most malicious gloss on this whole affair, and having done that members opposite sit back and say, 'You discharge the onus of proof.' That is not on and, as I have pointed out, it was quite clear that proper procedures were followed, procedures which were normal and in which the Minister behaved in a totally proper manner. Nothing he said in Parliament and no answer he has given to the trick questions asked—the trap questions erected—by the Opposition can get over that. I will not go into the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition about someone who is not in this place to defend himself. His comments are there on the public record, and that is where it should end.

Concerning surveys, there is no doubt that the technique of surveying public attitudes provides a valuable tool for Governments to ensure that their programmes are cost effective and that they are relevant to the problems that they are addressing. The previous Government conducted a number of surveys in all departments, some quite clearly involving questions which could be deemed to be political. For example, the former Minister for the Environment, the member for Murray, commissioned a survey in 1980 on the environment, and as part of that survey people were asked to rank a number of issues in order of importance which gave the Government information on such matters

as the level of Government spending, unemployment, energy, education and health.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: As they related to the environment.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, just as the questions here were to be posed as they related to drugs.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: This is interesting, because another question asked (and this is on the environment) was whether respondents had been active in the anti-nuclear movement or whether they were opposed to it. This was at a time when the Roxby Downs debate was at its height and the Government was funding this survey in order to ask questions of that kind. Interestingly as well, in that same survey people were asked whether they belonged to particular political Parties or groups. The Department of the Environment also made use of the McGregor Omnibus Survey which contained political questions. The Health Commission and the Department of Tourism similarly made use of Omnibus surveys. The Minister of Mines and Energy under the previous Government even participated in a national research programme conducted by the same ANOP which is being introduced at the moment, a survey commissioned by the Fraser Government.

I will not criticise any of these surveys: I believe that all of them were valuable in their own way and provide important information. I simply make the point that if one wished one could use them for political point scoring. One could find evidence in the files of Ministers directing that certain questions be included, and Ministers directing that the emphasis of questions be changed so that the result gave evidence of how the Government was perceived and not the department.

I will not get into that sort of argument. Indeed, I am concerned that this exercise by the Opposition may lessen the confidence of the public and Government administrators in what is a very valuable tool. It seems apparent that there are a number of approaches to the question of surveys by Government agencies, both during the term of this Government and during previous Administrations. I would like to table just a sample list, not exhaustive, of surveys undertaken by various departments under the previous Government. I simply place that on the record. Again, I stress that I do not criticise that activity, which is a very useful and valuable adjunct to what in fact we should be doing in Government.

I concede that there has been enough doubt cast around this whole area and enough political point-scoring and carry-on by the Opposition. I guess this will go on until everyone gets tired of it, Ministers are sacked, heads roll, and so on. I believe that we have all learnt something from this experience. Certainly, as far as my Government is concerned, it is reviewing the practice that has been undertaken in relation to the commissioning of surveys, involvement or non-involvement of Ministers and departments, and the type of questions involved. Some form of standardised procedure should be introduced.

It was certainly not introduced in the time of our predecessors. But I think that at the very least, arising out of what has happened on this occasion, we should formulate some guidelines. In fact, today I have published just such a series of guidelines which I would expect all Ministers, all departments, and statutory authorities to observe in the case of their polling and market survey assessments. In doing that, I am not in any way conceding that in this instance there has been any wrongdoing by the Minister of Health, wrong procedures adopted or wrong answers given to Parliament. I believe the record stands for itself, and all those documents have been tabled. I have sketched exactly how they came about. I have quoted the minutes from the Health Commission and made quite clear what the record is in relation to this area. But I do concede that we should

formalise these procedures in order to ensure that these matters are conducted according to a formula and guidelines that are laid down. I have asked that in future the following guidelines be observed:

(1) All proposals for the use of Government funds to commission market research surveys are to be referred to the State Statistical Priorities Committee.

Mr Olsen: It's a bandaid.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Leader describes it as a bandaid. That is absolute nonsense. Having sat in a Government that had a totally irregular and haphazard way of dealing with this matter, department by department, and having raised this issue as a matter of grave public concern, he dismisses this as a kind of bandaid. That is nonsense, and it amazes me. It is a procedure that will ensure that we have guidelines strictly laid down which will be implemented. The guidelines continue:

(2) All proposals referred to the committee must include the written brief to be given to the consultants with all relevant details of timing, cost, methodology and form of report.

(3) The Statistical Priorities Committee will ascertain whether the survey proposed duplicates work already commissioned or about to be commissioned by other agencies, or whether it may be more cost effective to combine it with other proposals.

(4) Normal procedures for the commissioning of consultants and survey work are to be observed. In normal circumstances agencies are to obtain proposals from at least three appropriately qualified and experienced individuals or firms. However, if for validated reasons of urgency or requirements to use special expertise this is not appropriate or possible, the head of the agency concerned must certify accordingly, stating the reasons, before entering into any arrangement with a particular individual or organisation.

(5) Individuals or organisations commissioned to undertake surveys must provide to the commissioning agency the questionnaire to be used in the survey before the survey takes place—

that did not happen on this occasion—

Details of the questions on which the survey is based must also be included in the final report of the consultant.

Those guidelines, I think in the best of all possible worlds, probably should have been used in relation to this survey. However, I repeat that nothing improper was done by the Minister in relation to this survey. Indeed, he made public what was happening at all stages, and unlike nearly all of these instances the information was placed before the Parliament and before the people. The tragedy of this whole debate is that it has obscured the fundamental and important work that was done in relation to the survey in terms of the information the Government received and what it paid for. It has also, I believe, obscured the extremely valuable pioneering work we are doing in trying to combat drug abuse.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The member opposite, Minister of Health for three years, is talking about drugs—talking and doing nothing. Something is now done: we have a Controlled Substances Act, and we are actively taking a role in combating the drug menace in our community. The Minister of Health, for all his aggression and all his combativeness—indeed, perhaps because of those very qualities—is making sure that something is happening in this area. I commend him for that. I am certainly not going to dispense with the services of such a valuable Minister on the basis of such extraordinary allegations.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Before I call the Deputy Leader, I point out that the deep importance of this debate was stressed at the commencement, and I hope that honourable members will act accordingly.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Let me at the very outset set to rest the red herring that the Premier is seeking to lay across the trail in this no-confidence motion: at no stage has the Opposition

claimed that surveys do not play a part in the political process. What we do claim is that the Government had a survey commissioned which asked a series of blatant political questions and that it sought to cover that up. Let me state quite categorically that in office the Liberal Government used surveys, and I have scanned the list, but at no time did we engage in the Party-political surveying which has been part of the scene now uncovered. Let us lay that to rest, for the media and anyone else who has been listening to what the Premier has said in the last few minutes.

None of the Ministers in the Liberal Government sought to cover up what was in those surveys, nor did they lie to Parliament. Let us dispose of that matter at the start. The Premier has admitted by putting out guidelines that he has at least been severely embarrassed as a result of this exercise. But, it goes much deeper than that. We know it and he knows it. I have seldom seen him look more uncomfortable than he has looked during the last couple of Parliamentary sittings. His discomfiture has been quite clear and the Deputy Premier, too, was looking most discomfited on the last day of sitting when this matter was raised.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: My word they have. Why would they be in the Attorney-General's room listening to every word Dr Cornwall was saying when he was being questioned in another place? They have been very worried indeed about this matter. There is no doubt that this has been a cover-up; they know it, and now the Premier is a party to it. He does not even know what was tabled in this House today. If ever they have proved that they do not know what they are about, these documents do. Either the Minister of Health or the Premier does not know what was tabled or someone is setting out to scuttle them.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: The Minister of Health would have known: he received a letter from Mr Cameron.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: He said he did not, a week or two ago. Let me quote from a document, tabled as late as today, dated 11 August 1983. It is interesting to note that the address in this letter has been typed in afterwards. I do not know the significance of that. It is a photostat, and the address to Dr Cornwall is typed in afterwards. However, it was tabled as a document purported to be accurate. Signed by Rodney Cameron, the Managing Director of ANOP, the letter states:

Dear Dr Cornwall,
Drug related attitude survey in South Australia.

The letter goes on to set out the following details of the survey:

The study will provide the Government with information as to South Australian community levels of knowledge and acceptance of drugs and their adjudged effects. Some measures of Government performance related to the broad area under study will also be included so as to assist in defining community expectation . . .

Later, under the heading 'Government performance', the letter quite clearly states:

Minister's and Premier's profile, performance appraisal and reasons:

Why have the Minister of Health and the Premier been proclaiming loudly and clearly, in this and in another place during the later stages of this debate, that they did not know there was any political content in the survey when the letter stated quite clearly (in August last year) that that was what it was all about? They have obviously forgotten what was in the letter directed to the Minister, although that was typed in after, and did not know what was tabled today, because it gives the lie to what they have been saying for the past two or three weeks.

The Premier said earlier that he would run through some of the achievements of the Minister of Health, but then he thought better of it. I do not blame him for having second

thoughts about that, but I have no hesitation at all in drawing attention to some of the Minister of Health's activities which have led to this final fiasco, this final misleading of the Parliament by the Minister and, by implication, now and by association, the Premier and the rest of his Government.

Let me quickly remind the House of some of the exploits of the then shadow Minister for Environment and Planning (I think), but he could not keep his sticky fingers out of health, because the newspaper files are so full that one has to make a fairly small selection of the available material. They are so full of the good doctor from another place that one can deal with only a minute part of the documentary evidence. This was part of his record, and only a small part in Opposition. He attacked the Medical Board of South Australia for the conduct of its affairs on 23 September 1981. This is when the Liberal Government was in office, and I well remember the spirited defence of these people, who had been criticised in many cases in a most cowardly fashion by the Minister of Health—very ably, too, I might say because subsequently most of these allegations were proved to be quite scurrilous and completely untrue.

He alleged corruption of the Board of the Lyell McEwin Hospital over staff appointments on 10 February 1982. He alleged corruption by ophthalmologists in regard to costs and fees on 11 November 1981. He alleged collusion by Lloyd Johns, the Director of the Country Fire Services, over evidence by a witness to a coronial inquiry on a Horsnell Gully fire in 1980, and I remember that one well. He was making all sorts of exaggerated statements about koala colonies being wiped out and the like. They were most exaggerated claims that the then shadow Minister made, and the RSPCA conducted a survey of all that area devastated by fire and found evidence that one rat and one rabbit had been burned. I recall that well—so much for the allegations.

However, more seriously he alleged collusion by the Director of the Country Fire Services. He is quite uninhibited in the way he has attacked people. He alleged incompetence by Laurence Niell and Partners, nationally respected hospital consultants, over a report to the Royal Adelaide Hospital on 26 August 1981. He accused an Adelaide ophthalmologist of 'incompetence, negligence, and alcoholism' on 12 November 1981. However, he has learned a lot since then, and I will quote soon some of his exploits as Minister. He accused Mr Mervyn Smith, an eminent Adelaide surgeon, of 'covering up for a colleague to the detriment of a patient.' That is a most scurrilous accusation. I know Mr Smith, who was on the university council for a period when I was; he is a most honourable and respected citizen, attacked by the now Minister. When asked if he wanted to make the allegation outside Parliament, the Minister of Health replied, 'Of course I would not say it outside; don't be such a bloody fool!'

Mr Ashenden: He is a lovely gentleman.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Is he not? This is the Minister whom the Premier has to go to bat for today. He reflected on the administration of the Flinders Medical Centre, and accused the hospital of a cover-up on 9 May 1981. That is not a complete list—far from it. That is only a random selection of the insults and the track record of this most despised (I would say) member of this Parliament. I can recount to the House, too (and I do not know whether this is public knowledge), that one of the reasons we were successful in getting the Roxby Downs indenture through the Upper House of this Parliament was that Norm Foster (who is a trade union member and a man for whom I have high regard because he is a dinkum Aussie) acted according to his lights and crossed the floor because of his absolute hatred and the way in which he despised John Cornwall. He served on a Select Committee of the Upper House into

uranium with the Hon. Dr Cornwall. He had seen the unscrupulous way in which he operated, and despised and hated the Hon. Dr Cornwall.

One reason why he crossed the floor was that in no way would he align himself with the way in which that man operated within the Labor Party. I know that for a fact, because I saw a good deal of Norm Foster during those weeks, at a time when the Labor Party was doing its best to scuttle the Roxby Downs project: now it clutches it to its bosom. Then it was a mirage in the desert, but now it is as though it is its achievement. However, Norm Foster had such disgust for the now Minister of Health that that was one of the prime reasons I believe why he crossed the floor. He served with him on a Select Committee, he knew the facts, and was not prepared to operate in the way that Dr Cornwall operated.

Dr Cornwall was made Minister of Health when the Bannon Government was elected, and the Premier went in for a bit of gloating in relation to this in his opening remarks. He said that the Liberals say that they have a divine right to govern, but the Labor Party has been there for all but three years since I have been a member of this Parliament, so its members are the ones who think that they have a divine right to govern. However, newspapers have been full of insults and attacks on the citizens, organisations, and boards of this State by this Minister. It is interesting to go back to the early files and to the early days when this Labor candidate was just getting up and running.

I refer to headlines such as 'Call for Government probe into South Australian trotting,' which came from Largs Bay veterinarian surgeon, Dr John Cornwall, part owner of two horses and Labor candidate for the Legislative Council, when he attacked the South Australian Trotting Club. However, one comment must have stuck in his throat, because I am sure that it would not apply now. The article states:

SA Trotting Club president, Mr R.J. Phillips, when asked to comment said last night: 'Who is Dr Cornwall—I do not know the gentleman. I have not heard of the suggestion and therefore I cannot comment ...'

I think that that must have stung the Minister, because he had not been heard of. He has been heard of now, but I think that it is in a way in which any other member of this House or indeed the other place would hide their head in shame if they had the sort of publicity that this Minister has had. Let me give a few quotes. He took on the Board of the hospital at Port Augusta in a most insulting fashion. The *Transcontinental* (the local paper, and the member for Stuart will no doubt be familiar with the facts) referred to it. Banner headlines are usually associated with people who want to do and say outrageous things, and this Minister gets more than his fair share. The article, headed 'Minister blasts Board', states:

During a heated meeting he said, 'You have got a medical mafia running rampant in the town and you've got the worst hospital care in the State and arguably in Australia ...'

Dr D.S. Grewal said, 'The feuds were no more than in any other hospital. How do the feuds affect the care here? I would like to know. Substantiate it, what are the facts?'

Of course, the facts never saw the light of the day. The article continues:

Dr Goel said he had been in Port Augusta for 10 years and would like to know where the complaints were coming from. The Minister did not give specific examples of complaints.

Nurses from the hospital were afraid to go shopping down the street, I am told, because of the insults of this Minister. They were incensed at his description of their hospital, as the comments have been proved to be grossly exaggerated and largely untrue. In fact, it led to a statement by the Australian Medical Association in these terms:

Doctors give the 'all-clear' to Augusta. Eleven members of the Port Augusta hospital board resigned earlier this year following

allegations. These brought clashes between the board and the Health Minister. Doctor Southwood said the problems at the hospital were now mainly resolved, and many of the staff were being reappointed. He said the trouble-torn Port Augusta hospital has been given a clean bill of health by the Australian Medical Association.

The Minister had a row with Mayor Bill Jones. The newspaper report was replete with large photographs, which are quite interesting. They show an agitated, indeed, out of control Dr Cornwall and a puzzled group of spectators wondering just what they had struck. There is a large photograph showing the clash between Dr Cornwall and Mr Jones. The article states:

The Mayor and the Health Minister, Dr Cornwall, clashed publicly at Pirie Plaza, and further heated exchanges between the pair followed at an emergency meeting of the local board of health. During his speech at the opening Dr Cornwall became involved in a running slanging match with Mr Jones and several others whom he described as 'Jones's stooges'. After the speech Dr Cornwall told Mr Jones he was 'the most irresponsible person in public life in South Australia'.

Then there was the clash with the Julia Farr Centre. I know some of the board members and the Chairman personally, and I know what distress the incident caused to those people when the good doctor, the Minister of Health, was up and running. An article in the *Advertiser* stated:

The Minister of Health, Dr Cornwall, told Parliament yesterday the centre's board 'has not been able to come to grips with its responsibilities for good management and patient care'. The centre's President, Mr R.A. Ringwood, later denied Dr Cornwall's allegations and said, 'I regret and deny any suggestion that the board has failed to come to grips with its responsibility to ensure the best possible care of residents.'

So, again a responsible group of citizens was under attack by this quite uninhibited, ruthless, scandalmongering Minister. Later, he took on the Flinders Medical Centre. A newspaper article stated:

Doctors in South Australia do not have to 'start playing God,' the Health Minister, Dr Cornwall, said today. And it was not likely to happen in the foreseeable future. He was commenting on claims by Dr G.D. Phillips, intensive care director at Flinders Medical Centre.

The doctor was quite properly seeking to ensure the interests of patients and drawing to their attention a problem, but what did Dr Phillips get for his trouble? He received abuse. Then there was the celebrated case of the clash between Dr Cornwall and Dr Dutton at the Adelaide Children's Hospital, when the Minister was at his insulting best again. A newspaper article entitled 'Cornwall in heated confrontation' stated:

In the exchange, Dr Cornwall called Dr Dutton 'an unhappy malcontent' and a 'maverick' who had acted 'irresponsibly' in calling the 'alleged crises' at the hospital to public attention. Dr Cornwall arrived at the hospital about 2 p.m. to meet members of the hospital's board, and after walking through the main entrance, asked, 'Well, where are all these crises?' Dr Dutton then stepped forward, introduced himself, and shook hands with Dr Cornwall. Pointing to a copy of yesterday's *News* headlined 'Dr attacks Health Minister' Dr Cornwall said, 'Is this responsible? No, this is not responsible.' Dr Dutton said he did not want to politicise the issue. Dr Cornwall said, 'Did you try to contact me about this issue? Did you try to contact my department? If you say you did then you are telling lies.'

What sort of attack is that on a doctor seeking to ensure the safety of children in the Adelaide Children's Hospital? I will not take up any more time citing these incidents. In any event, the Minister of Health had to back down. An inquiry was instituted, and what Dr Dutton had said was largely proved to be correct. More recently, we know of the Minister's track record in relation to Medicare. A headline in a newspaper stated, 'Cornwall calls surgeon "scurrilous fool"'. The article stated:

A stinging attack on the medical profession and the singling out of an Adelaide surgeon for personal criticism were made by the South Australian Minister of Health, Dr Cornwall, at a news conference yesterday. Dr Cornwall called surgeon Dr P.A. Humble

'a scurrilous fool' and 'a liar' after reading out parts of the surgeon's letter to a Murray Bridge patient cancelling an operation.

The Hon. H. Allison: Dr Humble is one of the nicest fellows—a tremendous fellow.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I know. The Minister's venom is widespread; it knows no bounds. He does not care whom he attacks. If anyone seeks to put a counter point of view to that put by the veterinarian in another place that person cops it thick, hard, and fast. His venom knows no bounds. The newspaper article to which I referred further stated:

He also produced a letter the Royal Australasian College of Radiologists wrote to its members, urging them not to sign Medicare contracts, and said South Australia and other parts of Australia were being 'held to ransom by the doctor robber barons of the late 20th century'. A television reporter said, 'I remember a situation like this before when you abused and named a doctor at the Adelaide Children's Hospital in anger and then had to back down and apologise next day. Did you call Dr Humble to ask why he is not going ahead with the operation?' Dr Cornwall said, 'I am the Minister of Health; I do not go around phoning doctors.'

He just goes around and abuses them up hill and down dale, calling them scurrilous fools and liars. That is the Minister's track record. That is the background, and as I have said, it goes on and on. One of the headlines was 'Man who makes Muhammad Ali look meek. What makes our Health Minister tick?' The article stated, in part:

He cites as an example, the Adelaide Children's Hospital, the scene of his most recent televised brawl...

That aptly sums up the Minister's penchant for brawling with public citizens who are not able to defend themselves.

Mr Meier: People will want to pay to see his public fights!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, soon it will be better than the wrestling. Under a headline 'Cornwall and Arnold well and truly on outer', the *Sunday Mail* carried an article referring to those matters, and it went on to analyse the Minister's behaviour. Time precludes me from referring to these matters any further.

I now come to the question canvassed so ably by the Leader. I remind the House of the sequence of events. Why have the Government and the Minister been so evasive in answering questions if it was believed there was nothing to hide? Why did the Government not get the survey and produce it? The Government is asking us to believe that throughout all the questioning in regard to this matter over the period of the past six or eight months it has not appraised itself on the contents of the survey. I put to members of the House that that defies belief. In answer to a question last year the Minister said:

I am unable to say what questions will be asked because the proposal and its costing have not yet come to my desk.

The clear message was that the information would come to the Minister, after which he would provide clear answers to questions that had been asked. The *Advertiser* reported as follows:

It was not just a soap powder survey with a few extra questions tacked on the end. The questionnaire was to produce a complete social planning approach to control hard and soft drugs, prescription drug abuse, and illicit drugs.

As was revealed today in letters tabled before the House, even at that stage the proposal referred to the Minister's and the Government's approval rating and record. Obviously, the Government did not know what it was tabling today. That backs up what the Minister said previously: that he did not know at that stage but that in due course he would be provided with details of the survey. We are being asked to believe that all the prevarication and side stepping and the gradual release of little bits of information over the past three weeks is not a cover-up. The Premier made a great deal about the sorts of question being asked in order to lay a trap for this poor Minister, being beset on all sides by these wolves who were laying traps for him.

However, they were plain questions requiring plain answers, and if the Minister and in particular the Government had nothing to hide, the obvious and sensible thing to do would have been to obtain the survey and say, 'Here it is.' That would have been the end of the matter. However, they knew that there was something to hide and that it was a political survey. The correspondence of last year has shown that to be the case.

What about the role of Mr Cameron in all of this? I was going to say that it was puzzling, but I do not believe it is puzzling because for him to say that the Government did not know anything about these political questions indicates that he did not know that that letter was to be tabled in the House today, because the letter I quoted is signed by Rodney Cameron.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: Have you got the right one?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I had the original, although there are plenty of copies around now. He obviously did not know that this was on file. In his letter to Dr Cornwall on 11 August last year Mr Cameron said:

The Government's performance, and the Minister's and Premier's profile, performance appraisal, and reasons.

He is trying to get us to believe today that he kept that to himself. That is Cameron, the friend of the Labor Party who went to bat to help scuttle David Combe when the Labor Party decided he was expendable: it was either Combe or the Federal ALP, so Cameron, the pollster, went in to bat for the Government, because it pays for the surveys. We all know what his associations are, and it is nonsense for him to say now and for the Premier to tell the media to ring Mr Cameron who will tell the right story. Is he trying to suggest that there has been no conversation between him and Mr Cameron and that Mr Cameron did not tell the Government there were any political questions in the survey when the letter he signed tells the Government that there were political questions in it? That indicates the veracity of what he is saying at the moment.

Mr Cameron is also asking us to believe, and we know this is patently untrue, that political questions make up half the questions in a normal survey. None of the surveys commissioned by the former Liberal Government were blatantly political questions of this type designed to advantage the Liberal Party, as these questions were designed to give information of use to the Labor Party, and yet we are being asked to believe that Mr Cameron put these questions in to make this survey easier to conduct. One of the pollsters, who has come clean in relation to this, says that it makes the job infinitely more difficult because the public gets cagey when asked about political attitudes.

Mr Cameron is asking us to believe that this is normal procedure, but we know that that is not the case. We know it is not the case with ANOP, his own polling organisation. It certainly was never the case when the Liberal Party commissioned a poll when we required information to make decisions in relation to the administration of the State. His story is obviously fabricated. He has long been in collusion I suspect and believe with the Government and the Premier, who is now deeply implicated in this whole cover-up, and to suggest that a series of guidelines, when they have been found out, is going to remedy the situation is of course naive.

Let me sum up by saying that the Premier referred to a number of documents tabled today, but he did not refer to the most relevant one, the letter from Mr Cameron to the Minister dated 11 August last year that proves quite conclusively that the Minister knew from that date that it was Mr Cameron's intention to ask political questions and, what is more, Cameron himself knew, although he is saying now that he did not. Despite what he is saying now in looking after his mates and going to bat for them, so much for

Cameron's credibility. The point I make is that he knew they knew because he sent the letter. In the letter he referred to political questions relating to the Minister's performance, the Premier's performance, and areas of Government performance other than drug related matters. This letter makes a nonsense of everything the Minister and the Premier have said about this matter. I do not believe they knew the letter was on the file that was tabled today, because it completely explodes what they have been saying for the last few months.

The Premier this afternoon tried to drag Health Commission officers into the matter. Our dispute is not with them, it is with the Minister, who is responsible for telling this Parliament the truth, and not his officers. In his letter Mr Cameron said that the survey would cover the Minister's and the Premier's profiles, appraisal performance and reasons. They are condemned doubly, finally and irrevocably as a result of what they laid before this House today. The Minister should be sacked in view of his track record and in view of this latest appalling misleading of the House in relation to this survey.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Tourism): If one needed to know how shallow the case of the Opposition was one had only to listen to the last half an hour, of which 22 minutes were taken up with a personal and vicious attack on the Minister of Health, seven minutes were taken up with an attack upon Mr Cameron and the ANOP, and only about a minute of the 30 minutes allowed the honourable member was taken up with the issue before this House. The Deputy Leader would not have been reduced to that if he had had a case to which he was committed. I take up two points while the Deputy Leader is still in the Chamber.

First, he said that when the Opposition was in Government and it commissioned surveys it always made the results of the surveys available to the Parliament and to the public. That is not the case. The then Minister for the Environment had to have a survey extracted from him under great pressure for over three months of questioning before he made available to the House information that he was able to ascertain as the result of a survey. It was only the community and the Opposition that extracted that information.

More particularly, and I think this is a matter of which the Leader and the Deputy Leader ought to be aware, I have a copy of an ANOP poll commissioned by the Tasmanian Government into the Tasmanian education system. The survey was commissioned by the honourable member's colleagues in Tasmania, who obviously are very good friends with ANOP and Mr Cameron, and who obviously used that very good company in their market research but do not share the views of the bigoted members of the Opposition about Mr Cameron and his organisation, because they used ANOP because ANOP is about as good an organisation as one could get in Australia to do this type of work. I do not have the questionnaire that ANOP used when it was commissioned by the Tasmanian Government, but one or two interesting statements were made as a result of that questionnaire. On page 4 it is stated that the Tasmanian community generally is reasonably satisfied with the State Government's performance. How could that conclusion be reached unless questions were asked about the performance of the Tasmanian Government?

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Which Government?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: It is the current Tasmanian Government. Unless the questions are asked about the performance of the Premier and the responsible Minister, it is difficult to gauge how a Government is performing. The report states:

The State Government's perceived performance in this area compares well with that in other areas of decision making. . . To place the Tasmanian community's perceptions of the State Gov-

ernment's performance in the area of education in perspective, survey respondents were asked to assess how well the Tasmanian State Government had performed in several areas. The results are presented in Table 1, and indicate that a majority of the Tasmanian community is reasonably satisfied with the State Government's performance in education, and that the Government's perceived performance in this area compares well with its assessed performance in other areas of decision making.

How could ANOP reach that conclusion unless it asked politically motivated questions? It is the only way that that information could be ascertained. So much for the Leader and the Deputy Leader saying that this is not the *modus operandi* of ANOP. Quite obviously it is.

The other strong point the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Opposition believe they have to bash the Government over the head with was the document I tabled today. It concerns a letter sent to the Minister of Health by Rodney Cameron. The Leader and the Deputy Leader are at it again, selectively quoting from that document. That is what Mr Cameron said in a general tender to the Minister. The document was subsequently forwarded to the Minister's Department so that it might assess the need and verify that the questionnaire was essential and that the cost was reasonable. It is not normal in such instances to make the information public. As the Premier has pointed out, that is a problem. The Minister of Health does most things in public and he is bashed about the head as a result. Members of the Opposition and the community seek open government and, when they get it, they criticise it. The Minister of Health could have kept all this secret and he would not have been subject to the sort of attack he has been subjected to from Opposition members. On page 2 of his letter to the Minister, Mr Cameron states:

The study is designed to cover both general and specific aspects of drug related attitudes. The listing below presents a suggested set of question areas to fit into an envisaged 25 minute (average) questionnaire.

No questions are set out for the Minister. The letter merely sets out the general areas in respect of which questions would be asked, and no specific questionnaire is included in the letter. The letter states that questions are to be asked on general issues, and attitudes, basic knowledge, usage (such as attitudes towards drugs and users, perceived dangers, and specific matters), Government performance, demographics for analysis, and target group definition. 'Specific matters' include attitudes towards drug information, usage and abuse in school curriculums (primary and secondary); attitudes towards availability of certain drug areas; attitudes towards drink driving and penalties; attitudes towards marijuana legislation; and attitudes towards suggestion of lighter marijuana penalties in association with heavier penalties for harder drugs, and towards the suggestion that small personal usage of marijuana be decriminalised in association with tougher penalties for dealing.

That is what the statement in the letter means and it cannot be read in any other context except by busybodies who are trying to put a wrong interpretation on it. It is easy for people with a reasonable understanding of the English language to know what it means. However, the Opposition is consistent in its attitude, over the last six months or so, of trying to find something wrong in any Government submission so that it can initiate a no-confidence motion or an urgency motion against the Government. The Government was aware of the contents of the letter when it was tabled. It was tabled so that Opposition members, whom we consider to be intelligent people, might see that it was given to the Minister and the Health Commission before the survey was commissioned.

The letter states that the cost of the survey would be \$32 000. We need to lay to rest the scurrilous suggestions by the Leader and his Deputy that ANOP and Mr Cameron

are an extension to the Australian Labor Party. Indeed, ANOP and Mr Cameron work for the Liberal Party, and I have quoted from a report that they furnished for the Liberal Party in Tasmania. Members should ask whether or not the Government and the Minister of Health had access to the questionnaire before the survey was taken and whether, after the survey, the Government had access to any information other than that provided in the report. The answer to both questions is 'No'.

Opposition members have provided no evidence to prove otherwise, nor can they provide it. The Government is telling the truth but the Opposition does not wish to accept such statements as the truth. However, the Opposition must accept it as the truth unless its members can prove otherwise. The Opposition is trying to place the onus of truth on the Government, whereas it should be placed on the Opposition. Opposition members wish to reflect on the integrity of Ministers, especially on that of the Minister of Health.

The questionnaire was not available to the Minister, to the Government or to the Australian Labor Party prior to the survey. Indeed, we would not have access to it today unless Mr Lucas had made it available. Subsequent to the survey, no information has been made available to the Government, members of the Government or the Australian Labor Party as to the results of the survey, except in respect to the question agreed by the Minister of Health to be included. The cost of the survey to the State Government was to be \$32 000 whether or not the question agreed by the Minister of Health to be included was included. Not even one cent extra has been spent on the survey as the result of the inclusion of that question.

Opposition members seem to be hell bent on attacking the integrity of the Minister of Health. The contribution of the Deputy Leader in this debate has been no more than a total denigration of a member of Parliament. The Deputy Leader just wanted to smear the Minister, and he did not support his Leader in any way. The speeches of Opposition members show the hypocrisy engaged in by Opposition members generally in this matter.

The SPEAKER: Order! The time allowed for the debate has expired.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (18)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, Ashenden, Baker, Blacker, D.C. Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Ingerson, Lewis, Meier, Olsen (teller), Oswald, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (20)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon (teller), M.J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs Peterson, Slater, Trainer, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Becker, Evans, Mathwin, and Rodda. Noes—Messrs Mayes, Payne, Plunkett, and Whitten.

Majority of 2 for the Noes.
Motion thus negated.

INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2), 1984

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1972. Read a first time.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill proposes an amendment to the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1972, designed to enable proceedings part-heard by the former Industrial Magistrate Mr B. Shillabeer to be continued and completed by him notwithstanding that he has ceased to hold office as an industrial magistrate. Mr Shillabeer was appointed an industrial magistrate on 24 March, 1983. At that time he held the office of Industrial Registrar under the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1972. Mr Shillabeer's appointment as an industrial magistrate was made on a temporary basis only to enable him to exercise the powers and functions of that office (industrial magistrate) on such occasions as may be required or directed by the President of the Industrial Court of South Australia.

With the passage of the Magistrates Act, 1983, and the Statutes Amendment (Magistrates) Act, 1983, the Government sought the Crown Solicitor's advice on the question of whether Mr Shillabeer could continue in the dual role of Industrial Registrar and industrial magistrate. The Crown Solicitor advised that the transitional provisions of the new legislation provide that all industrial magistrates appointed under the existing legislation shall be deemed to have been appointed under the new provisions and that, although Mr Shillabeer is not legally qualified and would not be eligible for appointment under the new provisions, the deeming provision would nevertheless apply to him.

However, the Crown Solicitor went on to advise that Mr Shillabeer could not hold the office of Industrial Registrar under the Public Service Act, 1967, and the office of Industrial Magistrate under the provisions of the Statutes Amendment (Magistrates) Act, 1983, at the same time. A decision therefore was required as to whether Mr Shillabeer was to continue to act exclusively as a magistrate or exclusively as a Registrar. The Government decided on the latter alternative and on 30 March withdrew Mr Shillabeer's commission as an industrial magistrate.

Unfortunately, at the time of withdrawal of Mr Shillabeer's commission, two matters had been part-heard by him. Both matters involved applications pursuant to section 15 (1) (d) of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act. One had proceeded for only one day and the other for four days hearing. In addition, a third matter could also conceivably require further hearing. That was an application pursuant to section 15 (1) (e) in which, after several days of hearing the merits, a jurisdictional point was raised by the respondent. This point was upheld by Mr Shillabeer and the proceedings were discontinued. It is possible, but unlikely, that these proceedings might revive as a result of challenge to the jurisdictional ruling. It is estimated that the cost incurred by the parties to the two matters that appear certain to proceed would total \$4 000 to \$5 000. Although the Government at first considered that the matters would need to be reheard by another magistrate (with the Government reimbursing the parties for all or part of their costs to date), it is now considered that in view of the inconvenience to all concerned the better course would be to amend the Act to enable Mr Shillabeer to continue and complete the proceedings.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 2 of the second schedule to the principal Act which contains transitional provisions relating to the offices of industrial magistrates as they were affected by the new legislative scheme for the appointment and conditions of office of industrial magistrates set out in that schedule. The clause inserts a new subsection providing that a person who held office as an industrial magistrate before the commencement of the schedule may, notwithstanding that he has ceased to hold that office, continue and complete any proceedings part-

heard by him as if the Statutes Amendment (Magistrates) Act, 1983, had not been enacted and he had not ceased to hold that office.

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

HIGHWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill amends the principal Act by increasing the contribution made from the Highways Fund to the Police Department for road safety services from 12 per centum or motor registration fees to a percentage fixed by the Minister or, where the Minister has not fixed a percentage, to 15.4 per centum of those fees. The amendment is to have effect from July 1983.

When the contribution was first introduced in 1971 it represented about 75 per cent of the costs incurred by the Police Department for road safety services at that time. When the Act was amended in 1983 to provide for the current 12 per cent contribution, Parliament was informed that it was desirable to restore the contribution over the next few years to approximately 75 per cent of police costs. The increase in the contribution from 12 per cent to 15.4 per cent from 1 July 1983, will provide a total contribution of \$8 million which represents 66 per cent of police costs.

The contribution made from the Highways Fund to the Police Department should be adjusted annually if the real level of the contribution is to be maintained having regard to the fact that registration fees are not always adjusted annually to keep pace with inflation and the level of fuel tax has a bearing on the level of registration fees. Therefore, rather than amend the Act yearly which is cumbersome, it is considered that the Minister should determine the contribution payable from time to time as required and publish the determination in the *Government Gazette*.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the Act from the first day of July 1983. Clause 3 amends section 32 of the principal Act. Paragraph (a) makes a consequential change. Paragraph (b) inserts two new subsections. Subsection (2) defines the "prescribed percentage" and subsection (3) empowers the Minister to prescribe the percentage by publication of a notice in the *Government Gazette* and to vary or revoke the percentage by the same means.

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: PORT LINCOLN ABATTOIR

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Education): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank members of the House and in doing so convey my apologies that this state-

ment was not made at the beginning of the business of the day. It was brought into the Chamber only after Ministers had been asked whether they had statements or papers to lay on. The statement concerns the SAMCOR works at Port Lincoln. The Government has decided to support a proposal made by the SAMCOR Board to close its Port Lincoln abattoir. It is the Board's intention to cease operations in mid 1984, which is the low period in terms of number of slaughterings. It will also allow a period of time for employees to seek alternative work or be considered by other Government agencies for redeployment. The closure date proposed is 30 June.

The recommendation by the Board and its endorsement by government essentially is a question of economics. A Government report in 1979 recommended that the abattoir be given five years to rectify its position and attain an acceptable level of profitability. Despite the considerable efforts of the SAMCOR Board, the Port Lincoln abattoir has continued to lose money. It is anticipated that the loss in 1983-84 will be close to \$1 million. Over recent years losses have ranged between \$500 000 and \$1.3 million. The cumulative loss over the past 10 years is in excess of \$9 million. In addition, to continue to meet the standards necessary to operate as an export abattoir a minimum of \$200 000 will need to be spent on maintenance within a year. Given the overall age and condition of the abattoir, maintenance costs will continue to escalate.

A significant number of meat processing plants have closed in recent years throughout Australia. The basic reason has been a decline in slaughterings due largely to the decline in stock number. Numbers of cattle in particular have been affected by a fall in profitability of export markets. The cattle population in Australia has declined from 33 million in 1976 to 23 million in 1983 and slaughterings have dropped from 13 million in 1978 to 9 million in 1983. This year the problem has been exacerbated due to the recovery from the recent drought because producers are retaining the stock they have left for breeding. It will be several years before slaughterings in Australia return to the levels of the late 1970s. It is also perhaps pertinent to comment on the proportion of stock from the Port Lincoln works area actually being slaughtered at Port Lincoln. It has been estimated that the proportions of livestock slaughtered locally in the past three years were sheep and lambs 65 pc, cattle 50 pc, and pigs 50 pc.

The Government is mindful of the plight of the people employed at the works. Consistent with Government policy, the salaried personnel will be redeployed to other positions within the public sector. These arrangements will be handled by the Public Service Board and the Job Transfer Office in consultation with SAMCOR management and the Public Service Association. The number of award employees is currently relatively low, and retrenchment provisions for award employees will be determined according to the length and continuity of service of the individuals concerned.

On the positive side there have been preliminary discussions with Lincoln Bacon Specialists Limited on providing a Government guarantee for a pig killing and processing facility which could be built on land purchased from SAMCOR. Such a facility would provide new job opportunities. Any request for assistance would need to be considered by the Industries Development Committee, but the Government would welcome such an initiative which could result in some further employment opportunities in Port Lincoln. The closure of the Port Lincoln abattoir will also provide an opportunity for a private operator to establish and operate profitably a small abattoir to kill cattle and sheep. Again, the Government would welcome such an initiative and give serious consideration to the provision of the necessary assistance according to the merits of the proposal. The

Government could, for example, assist through Government guarantees and/or a once-off subsidy.

Attention is also drawn to the recent announcement by the Premier of Government support for the Porter Bay marina and tourist resort development. The project could provide up to 250 jobs during the construction phase and up to 500 permanent jobs mainly in accommodation, entertainment, leisure and other tourist related services. This exciting venture has the potential to offer job opportunities that will more than offset the number of jobs lost by the closure of the abattoir.

If the Government was to continue to support industries which sustain losses such as are being incurred at Port Lincoln, it would continue to restrict its ability to assist other industries which have the potential to provide jobs, as well as return a profit, to the community. The Government has decided to take this decision with obvious reluctance and is aware of the effect the closure will have on the employees and Port Lincoln itself. In the light of all the evidence, however, it would be irresponsible to continue to spend taxpayers' money in propping up an enterprise that has not been financially viable for some time now, and which has no potential to be so in the future. I am sure all members will support this decision by the Government in the interest of more efficient government and encouragement to private industry.

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1), 1984

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 18 April. Page 3775).

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): What an extraordinary day in South Australian politics! We are now about to start the debate on the Appropriation Bill and Supplementary Estimates in this Parliament. We have seen the condoning of a position whereby a Minister can not tell the truth to Parliament and that that can be supported and condoned by the Cabinet, the Minister and the Government. What an extraordinary state of affairs! We have seen also the Government, in desperation moves, put on two major Ministerial statements today—one in relation to Maralinga Lands and the last relating to closure of the abattoir at Port Lincoln, brought in at late notice to get it on. Obviously, the no-confidence motion this Parliament has just debated had so much fact, basis and foundation to it that we have seen a Ministerial statement as it relates to withdrawal of funds to the Port Lincoln abattoir and its closure.

An honourable member: He's in cloud cuckoo land.

Mr OLSEN: I will tell you who is in cloud cuckoo land, mate: it is the South Australian Government, because the electors of this State will see this Government for what it is. Do not worry about that. It will be judged by its actions—there will be no doubt about that—condoning a Minister's telling an untruth to Parliament. That is the standard the Government has set: a new Westminster standard throughout this Parliament has been established by this Government which has stooped to the lowest.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Ferguson): I call the Leader to order. He is reflecting on a vote that has already been taken. I ask him to come back to the Bill.

Mr OLSEN: I was referring to the withdrawal of funding for the Port Lincoln abattoir, just announced in a Ministerial Statement to this Parliament. In May last year, in introducing the Supplementary Estimates, the Premier painted an economic picture which must have concerned all thinking South

Australians. He outlined a grave Budget situation and placed unrealistic stress on the three-pronged tragedies of drought, bush fires and floods. At the time I offered the Government the full support of the Opposition in whatever action was required to ease the burden of those tragedies. I said of the Premier in this House:

I am prepared to join him in helping the public to understand that this cost was impossible to budget for and is obviously unavoidable.

Because of the magnificent response from all concerned, the financial impact of those disasters is largely behind us. I pay particular credit to the people of South Australia who gave so generously and selflessly to help those hit by the fires. In most areas, the rebuilding and the restoration have been completed. A tragic chapter in South Australia's development is now behind us, but not forgotten.

I make this point to emphasise that the Premier can no longer hide behind natural disasters to try to lessen the effect of his curious and deceptive form of economic management. The Premier's economic strategy is rather like the performance of a blind-folded juggler: it does not look too bad while all the oranges are in the air, but what happens when they start falling? It will not be long before the Premier's economic oranges start falling, and he knows of only one way to catch them—further increases in taxes and charges being inflicted on the taxpaying public of South Australia. In his second reading explanation last week, the Premier gave the impression that South Australia's Budget position was sound. He predicts, for example, that by the end of this financial year the deficit on the Consolidated Account could be able to reach \$2 million. But that is only one of the juggler's oranges. At the end of his explanation, the Premier says:

The State still faces major financial problems . . . The pressure of our capacity to pay our way will increase over the next few years.

In giving these warnings the Premier makes no suggestion on how his distinctive form of economic management will overcome the looming problems of budget management. He is making assertions without giving answers.

The Premier appears to be laying the ground once again to break his pre-election promise on taxes and charges. As this House and the people of South Australia are well aware, this Government was elected to power on the twin promise that it would improve the State economy, and specifically that it would not resort to higher or new taxes or charges. I remind the House of the Premier's precise words in his election campaign speech:

We will not allow State charges—like transport fares, electricity and hospital charges—to be used as a form of backdoor taxation.

And the even more familiar promise:

The ALP will not reintroduce succession duties and will not introduce new taxes nor increase existing taxes during our term of office.

All South Australians are now acutely aware of those dishonest statements. Since the Government took office exactly 18 months ago, almost 10 separate State charges have been increased—that is a rate of six charges each month. Electricity charges have increased by 24 per cent, public transport fares have risen by an average of 47.6 per cent, water rates are up between 16 per cent and 22 per cent and sewerage rates are up 26 per cent. Births, deaths and marriages fees are up between 66 per cent and 400 percent.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: The Premier must have known of those figures.

Mr OLSEN: He did not want to hear them. He must have wanted to check on the debate in another place to see how it was progressing. Cremation permit fees have risen 100 per cent and other individual charges have been increased by up to 1 400 per cent. At the current rate of fee increases,

this Government by the end of its first and final term, will push up about 200 taxes and charges. For example, I believe there will be a further substantial increase in water and sewerage rates in July. The Transport Minister has refused to rule out increased costs for motorists—particularly drivers' licence fees and registration charges. Public transport fees are set to rise for a second time under this Government, and electricity charges will rise again during the next financial year because of the taxing policies of the Premier.

The introduction of Medicare, a system strongly supported by the Government, will not prevent a further increase in hospital bed charges during the 1984-85 financial year. These rises are all predictable. I would be delighted, later in this debate, if the Premier would give me an undertaking that I am wrong in that assessment and that these charges will not rise. But I remind the House that, when I asked for a categorical assurance from the Premier that he would not increase taxes or impose new taxes in the next financial year, he avoided giving a direct answer. He fudged. He said:

I will not become involved in a Budget guessing game, with members opposite raising questions and asking for categorical statements about this, that and the other thing . . . It is most unlikely that we will find it necessary to increase taxation in the next budget.

So the threat of tax increases remains. It is a certainty that charges will rise. While charges do not always have the same overall impact on the broad community, they fall heavily on specific sections. For example, hairdressers registration fees may hit a minority group but, when nearly 100 charges are involved, 100 minority groups are involved, and very few people escape the direct effect.

The hidden impact is the constant pressure on business and industry to increase their charges to the public to pay for the rising State Government imposts. These hidden increases have a major overall impact on the economic performance of South Australia and the nation. The Institute of Public Affairs estimates that Australia's inflation rate is at least double the rates of major trading countries such as Japan, the United States, Canada and West Germany, and 3 per cent higher than Britain. The Institute, in its latest publication states:

High inflation leads to loss of jobs as we price ourselves out of markets. Australia's continued rapid inflation is largely the result of Government policies. Government fees and charges (such as power, water rates, and motoring charges) have increased sharply in recent years.

Here, certainly South Australia is singled out unfortunately in the CPI rises announced today, where South Australia is second from the top in terms of heading towards the CPI push. Well the member for Brighton might smile at that. The so-called economic recovery was pushed publicly by the Premier in responding to a commercial this week. He really reacted to that commercial. He talks about economic recovery. We will see the real benefit of economic recovery in this State, as the member for Brighton will well find out as she door-knocks in the new seat that requires a .3 per cent swing.

The report points out that prices determined or largely influenced by Government policies are rising at almost twice the rate of prices in the private sector.

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: I understand that the quality is so good that inquiries have been made by the ALP about a film crew to do some work for the Party.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: They did a very professional job.

Mr. OLSEN: I acknowledge the Premier's remark that it was indeed a very professional job: I am pleased that that is on the record, and I will pass on to the advertising agency his commendation. In its 1984 summer review, the Institute, in relation to State taxes, reported:

Even after adjustment is made for inflation and some boost to revenues from improving economic growth in 1983-84, it is clear that in a number of States there has been a very heavy increase in the real level of taxation. Broadly, the Labor States, Victoria, New South Wales, Western Australia and South Australia, are pursuing higher tax policies.

They are not my words, but the Institute's. The report indicated that State taxes in South Australia would rise 14.3 per cent between 1982-83 and 1983-84, with an estimated increase of 26.7 per cent expected between June 1982 and June 1984. That is a quite savage increase. These facts illustrate vividly the damage both Federal and State Governments are causing to the economy.

No Government in recent times has applied a heavier financial burden on the community it directly affects than the Labor Government in South Australia. The Government claims there is a major improvement in the South Australian economy, yet it is applying policies which are reducing the opportunity of private industry to increase employment, reduce operating costs and improve productivity. In introducing the Appropriation Bill the Premier warned that tight controls on Government expenditure must remain, yet his Government has adopted a policy of heavy spending, particularly in the area of increases in the size of the public sector workforce.

His economic statements preaching control and constraint run directly counter to the spend-first-pay-later attitude of his Ministry. The Premier is employing economic bandaids within the South Australian economy instead of laying down a clear policy and direction which would allow industry and individuals to confidently plan ahead. This week I laid down the second phase of the firm and carefully considered economic policy of the Liberals. Earlier this year I released precise details of the Liberals' attitude to workers compensation, which has become one of the major new imposts on industry in this State.

That policy was enthusiastically accepted by the people it most affects—South Australia's business leaders. They recognise, as the Liberals do, that rapidly rising workers compensation premium costs are limiting the ability of industry to employ more staff. In the same way on Sunday night I laid down a clear and simple policy to be adopted by the next Liberal Government to reduce the massive tax burden being applied to individuals, to families and to industry in this State.

Before I put details of that policy before the House, it is worth noting the reaction of the Premier to my television advertisement, and I want to canvass that in a little more detail. Five hours before the advertisement was shown, and before he could have known what it contained, the Premier put out a statement suggesting I was trying to improve my public recognition because of poor public opinion survey results.

He had better have another look at the public opinion survey results in South Australia and the approval rating of the incumbent Leader of the Opposition. When he had seen the advertisement he changed his story. I might add that I was pleased that he put that out on Sunday afternoon, because any members of the public who had missed the article in the *Sunday Mail* certainly had it drawn to their attention during the course of the afternoon. I thank him for the service of drawing it to the attention of the wider South Australian community. When he had seen the advertisement, he changed his story to say that—

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: You did have peak time, too.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! Can we come back to the Bill?

Mr. OLSEN: Yes, I shall. I really need to put this in context because it relates directly to the economic alternative that the Liberals are prepared to put up—to put our cards on the table, front up and explain to the people of South

Australia the direction that we will take in this State, with the bottom line—reducing the tax burden and charges of South Australians and thereby providing relief for business enterprises which have had their capacity to employ people and maintain their undertakings, let alone their ability to create job opportunities, eroded by the increase in State taxes and charges. It is for that reason that the Liberals have put down a clear, definable alternative policy for the people of South Australia.

Of course, the criticism of the Premier that I needed to buy two minutes of very expensive paid time has some credibility problems of its own, because one can recall quite vividly that it was this Premier who last September bought a couple of minutes paid time to attempt to explain why he had broken his fundamental election promise not to increase taxes. That is an interesting factor.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I think mine was cheaper.

Mr. OLSEN: Yes, it looked it, too. The production was not good. My announcement on Sunday night put taxes and Government controls at the top of the agenda of political debate in South Australia—where they should be. So far the Premier has not responded in any substantial way to my suggestions. He has merely criticised without addressing the major areas of argument. Once again, he has avoided the issue.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: There's no truth in the rumour that there are public servants rushing all over the place trying to investigate the situation?

Mr OLSEN: I understand that a few telephone calls have gone out to the Central Linen Service and that the Minister of Water Resources is sending press releases along the Murray River to the country newspapers.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: I remind the Premier that the policy that has been determined, enunciated and put down by this Party is a clear commitment to the direction that a future Liberal Government will take. The response I have so far received from the Adelaide business community and from individuals indicates there is widespread support for the policy I have laid down. It certainly supports the clear view that high taxation and constant Government interference are the key issues of concern in the South Australian community.

The policy demonstrates quite plainly and simply that the next Liberal Government can and will halt the constant spiral in taxes and charges. It will reduce the cost of government by identifying and eradicating unnecessary services which are duplicated by private industry. It will set off these services and reduce the running costs which are now being funded by the South Australian taxpayer. The Liberals will reduce Government costs by ensuring that private contractors carry out government construction involving the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Highways Department and the Public Buildings Department.

It can be demonstrated beyond doubt that private construction firms are cheaper and more efficient than the Government authorities, yet the present Government insists that all possible construction work for Government departments be carried out by Government construction authorities. By reducing the cost of Government, the Liberals will reduce the drain on taxpayers' funds. These savings will be returned to the taxpayers in the form of reduced taxes and charges.

I have established a task force which is at present assessing areas of waste and duplication within the public sector work force. Although this work is still going on and will continue beyond the next election, savings of at least \$50 million a year have already been identified. The Liberals' pledge to reduce the tax burden on all South Australians is supported by hard fact and firm policy. It is a policy we will implement and a promise we will fulfil. The people of South Australia

are disenchanted by political Parties which make grand promises in the excitement and tension of a three-week election campaign and then promptly abandon their proposals.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: With no intention of delivery.

Mr OLSEN: No. The Bannon Government won government in 1982 by adopting precisely that tactic.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: The people still remember.

Mr OLSEN: Indeed, the people will remember. Market surveys seem to be the order of the day in the House at present, and if the Government has been doing any market surveys it would be clearly aware of the attitude of South Australians to its high taxing policies. Once again let me remind the House and the people of South Australia of that famous promise made by the Premier:

The ALP will not reintroduce succession duties and will not introduce new taxes nor increase existing taxes during our term of office.

It is that promise, more than any other, which helped the present Government win office. It is that promise which the Liberals will not allow the people of South Australia to forget. It is the promise of a man, of a Government, which would do anything and say anything to win office, and it is the type of promise which the Labor Party will make before the next election to hold on to Government at any cost.

In putting forward the second stage of the Liberals' economic policy, and promising a reduction in the tax burden in this State, I am totally confident that the Liberals can and will deliver. The policy of eradicating waste and duplication from the public sector and returning the benefits to the people is the correct economic direction for South Australia. In laying down the policy of smaller government, I give a firm undertaking to Parliament that no public employees will be retrenched. Indeed, last Friday I wrote to Mr John Lesses, of the UTLC, indicating clearly that I would not take that course of action. In my letter I indicated that I was about to release the first stage of the Liberals' new economic policy. I further stated:

Under the proposal, a future Liberal Government is committed to a reduction in the size and cost of Government in South Australia. The aim will be to lower demand on Government finances and clear the way for cuts in State taxes and charges. This will be done by disposing of Government services or facilities which are outdated or which can effectively be carried out by private industry. The policy will eliminate waste, duplication and inefficiency in the public work force.

I write specifically to give an assurance that no Government employees will be retrenched. Also, be assured that this policy is in no way a reflection on the efficiency or dedication of public sector employees. I believe the South Australian community is well served by its public sector work force, but this is not a reason in itself to persist with duplication or waste. Essential services such as community welfare, health, education, public housing and many others will not be affected by the new policy although some funds saved by the gradual reduction of Government cost will be spent on upgrading these services.

I indicated to both Mr Lesses and the Secretary of the PSA that I would be pleased to discuss that policy with the organisations they represent. The letter sets out clearly my attitude and the attitude of the Liberal Party in regard to economic policy. As I have said earlier, the Liberal Party has a detailed and comprehensive programme for the economic revival and development of South Australia. It is a policy that will avoid the type of Budget bungling being undertaken by the Premier at present. Earlier this afternoon I said that the Premier predicts that the likely deficit for the consolidated accounts at the end of this financial year will be \$2 million. That bland figure cloaks the real difficulties facing the South Australian economy and taxpayer. In giving that figure the Premier carefully skates over the accumulated deficit of \$65 million.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: An inherited deficit.

Mr OLSEN: It was not inherited, and the Premier knows full well that that is so. The plain fact is that to this very day the Premier has not challenged the statement that I made in Parliament in December 1982 following the last State election when not only did I state the position at that stage but I tabled documents from Treasury which had been legitimately available to us as the Government of the day and which indicated the Budget deficit figure as at the following June. To this very day the Government has not challenged those figures, and the reason it has not done so is that it knows there is no basis on which to challenge them. The Budget overrun was caused by a number of factors, not the least being Ministerial over-expenditure of the order of \$23 million. The Premier carefully skates over the fact that South Australia was given one-off assistance from the Federal Government to convert Loan funds used for lower-interest housing loans.

The previous Liberal Government was able to direct into housing considerable additional funds provided by the State Government Insurance Commission and the State Superannuation Fund. That was of considerable benefit to the housing and construction industries, and to people seeking various forms of public housing. The obvious need for greater stimulation in the housing sector, recognised by the previous Liberal Government, was supported by the present Federal Government's decision to provide more than \$127 million in Loan funds at concessional interest rates. This money has had a beneficial impact in the housing area and has provided some stimulus to other areas of South Australian industry.

It is important that the Premier, in his negotiations with the Federal Government at this year's Loan Council meeting, again seeks this concessional funding. This provision of concessional funds for housing has played an important part in the Government's Budget strategy. The Government's decision to call on reserve funds from various Government authorities has also played a key part. But one of the hidden elements in the present Budget planning is the enormous increase in revenue created by the increased taxes imposed last year. The Premier has used the massive impact of increased taxation to allow a spend-easy approach by his Ministry.

The increased size of the public pay-roll has a direct impact on the pockets of every South Australian. Without the taxation increases the 1983-84 Budget position would have been disastrous. That would not be an inherited problem, but a problem created by ineffectual management and undisciplined spending. In addition, the present upturn in the national economy has led to an increase in taxation receipts greater than had been expected when the Budget was drawn up. The net gain because of this unexpected windfall has been about \$17 million for the 1983-84 financial year—\$17 million that the Government did not expect to receive when the Budget was presented to this place eight months ago.

Instead of using that additional funding to reduce the accumulative deficit, the Premier has allowed his Ministers to fritter it away in departmental excesses. The short-term gain by individual departments in failing to control spending will be to the long-term disadvantage of the State. The responsible attitude would have been to use the unexpected \$17 million in additional taxation revenue to reduce the accumulated deficit. As to recurrent activities, receipts are likely to increase by about \$23 million and recurrent payments by \$20 million. After allowing for \$4 million on each side of the Budget where receipts match expenditure, the increases are in the order of \$19 million for receipts and \$16 million for payments.

The increase in recurrent receipts of \$19 million has been funded almost entirely from this additional taxation revenue

sourced to Treasury. Taxpayers' funds have been diverted to additional expenditure purposes, rather than being responsibly applied towards a year-end achievable Budget surplus of about \$6 million, after due allowance for increased wage and salary payments. During the Budget debate last year, I revealed the Liberal Party's alternative Budget strategy, a strategy which avoided taxation increases of \$41.6 million, as introduced by the Government at that time.

With recurrent receipts down by \$41.6 million through avoiding tax increases, and total savings on the expenditure side of \$60 million (comprising \$24 million in savings from continuity of our public sector employment policies and \$36 million from a more responsible attitude to spending policies), our deficit at that time was estimated at \$13.8 million, as compared to the Government's estimate of \$33 million through application of its strategy. On the recurrent payments side, the Premier has indicated net overruns of \$16 million, with the largest single impact relating to salaries and wages estimated at \$8 million, and with the remaining \$8 million made up a number of so-called relatively small items.

While I recognise that under the current prices and incomes accord a Liberal Government could not have avoided the impact on the Budget of increased wages and salaries payments, the impact would have been somewhat less under reduced public sector employment levels. However, by application of responsible financial management initiatives, a Liberal Government would have taken early corrective action to absorb the various expenditure overruns amounting to \$8 million. With our alternative Budget strategy on the recurrent side, it is estimated that there would be a likely increase of \$16 million in receipts and \$8 million in payments, thereby resulting in a year-end surplus on the recurrent side of \$8 million.

When coupled with our estimated surplus on the Capital Account of \$17 million (that is, \$17 million not \$28 million)—the Liberal Government was committed to proceed with the Finger Point treatment plant, \$2 million; Cobdogla salinity control project, \$2 million; and the O-Bahn busway between Darley Road and Tea Tree Plaza, \$7 million)—strict adherence to our alternative budget strategy would have resulted in a year-end Budget surplus of \$25 million, a more credible result than the cosmetic estimate of \$2 million given to this House.

As a result of the estimated \$2 million deficit on this year's activities, South Australia will now be carrying an estimated cumulative deficit on Consolidated Account, as at 30 June 1984, of \$65.2 million. Had the Liberal Party remained in office and continued with implementation of its 1982-83 Budget strategy, there would have been a cumulative deficit on Consolidated Account of \$44.7 million at the end of 1982-83, and with application of our estimated 1983-84 surplus of \$25 million a cumulative deficit of \$19.7 million on Consolidated Account as at 30 June 1984—a result obtained not by increasing or introducing new State taxes but by responsible financial management. These arguments may seem hypothetical with an election still 18 months or more away, but they serve to show that an alternative economic strategy, superimposed on the current budgetary situation could and would work. Under a Liberal Government South Australians would be paying far less taxation than they are today. The State Budget would be in a sounder and more manageable condition.

In his speech introducing this Bill, the Premier warned that 1985-86 looms as a year of potential problems. A report by the Australian Merchant Bankers Association predicts a mild recession next year, with increases during 1985-86 in both the unemployment rate and the consumer price index. The monthly summary issued last week by the Victorian Chamber of Manufactures also paints a dismal picture of

the prospects for continued economic recovery. It is unfortunate that the Premier will face these difficulties with the potential of a significant cumulative deficit and with no room for economic manoeuvre.

Next year the blind-folded juggler's oranges will start to fall. His only method of recovery is to implement another round of State tax increases. That will place increased financial burdens on every South Australian at a time of economic stringency, at a time when they can least afford it. The Opposition traditionally supports this Bill.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): As the Leader said in his conclusion, we support the Bill but with not much enthusiasm, because the Premier keeps repeating the canard which he has noised abroad in relation to the deficit he inherited. There is no enthusiasm for this Bill, because the Premier keeps repeating the completely untrue statement that he inherited this enormous deficit, but he was in charge of the Treasury benches for over half of that financial year, and he knows that. He knew that he was telling blatant untruths when he was speaking before the election. One only had to see him on television, when he finally appeared before the cameras after he believed he had won, to realise that he was back-peddalling; he was on a different tram altogether.

Let me lay this matter to rest once and for all. The Premier said before the election that he had accurate financial information, he knew where the State was going, and he had no hesitation in saying that there would be no need to increase taxes or charges; there would be no new taxes and certainly there would be no change in taxes until he had made some major full-scale inquiry. He said:

Labor believes it would not be appropriate to change the rate 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.

That was stated in the economic document he released in May 1982. He was very big on taxes because he knew the public was sensitive to that matter. He also said:

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

Mr Bannon said that in an interview on the ABC news on 27 May 1982. How hollow those words must ring in the ears of people who remember that lead-up to the election. On 23 July 1982, Mr Bannon was quoted as saying:

We have no plans to increase taxation.

His election policy speech contained two king hits. One was his unequivocal promise in relation to taxes, and the other was the complete backflip in relation to Roxby Downs, because he knew that they would both sink his chances of winning the election. He said that there would be no tax increases, and that Roxby Downs would go ahead after doing everything he could in this Chamber to scuttle it. He said that the ALP would not reintroduce succession duties. We will remember that when the Hawke wholesale review of the nation's taxing structure is undertaken in due course by his Federal colleagues. As a result of that review this Government might not have to be responsible for increasing taxes. In the policy speech made on 25 October 1982, the Premier said:

We will not introduce new taxes nor increase existing levels of tax during our term of office.

When the Premier did finally appear on television after the result of the election was known he was on the bike going the other way because Australia had seen the same spectacle in Victoria. The Premier was quizzed about certain promises and undertakings by a perceptive interviewer for channel

10 news on Wednesday 15 December, and after saying that he was not going to increase taxes he said:

I intend to work very hard to try and keep those but I think the public will understand we have still to grapple with reality as we find it.

He was asked:

You might have to drop some of your more costly election promises, in fact?

To which he replied:

Yes, we might. We certainly will have to revise some of the promises but in a sense we are in a real dilemma because in order to fulfil one set of promises in a sense you might have to modify or change other sets of promises. Now that process we are looking at now.

The whole of the Government's Budget strategy this financial year hangs on this enormous increase in taxes and charges which has taken South Australia from being the lowest taxed State under the Liberals to being close to the top. The policy speech, as reported in the *Advertiser* dated 4 November 1982, states:

We believe our programme can be costed without a tax rise. We estimate that revenue collection will match the extra expenditure we propose . . . As I understand it, Cain had been given certain information which proved to be wrong.

Mr Bannon was asked, 'But could that happen to you?' He replied:

We've got the Auditor-General's Reports, the programme and performance budgeting information, the Premier's own speeches on the economy.

After the election, however, the Labor Government seemed to move into a different gear. Even on the night of the election, in the midst of the joyous applause and euphoria of Labor supporters, the Premier was already back-peddalling on his promises. On 17 November 1982, we were told:

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

At that stage the Premier had plenty of time to be briefed, because he had been Premier for a couple of weeks and could see that there were problems. However, he said that he would solve those problems. Only three weeks after the election, the Premier said:

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

So, there we are getting around to the eventual back-flip with the biggest tax slug and the introduction of new taxes imposed by this Government, which knowingly told deliberate untruths to get into office.

As members of the Tonkin Government often pointed out in this House, the financial package espoused by the Premier while he was Leader of the Opposition was completely phoney. Even the meanest economic intellect could see that. The Labor package promised the improvement of working conditions, shortened working hours, more people on the public pay-roll, and reduced productivity by giving workers added benefits and reduced working hours. The bottom line was the promise not to increase taxes or charges, even though the public services provided by the Government were to be expanded.

Before the 1982 election, Liberal members pointed out how patently dishonest were Labor's promises, yet Labor members tried to hoodwink the public into believing that, under a Labor Government, extra taxes and charges would not be imposed. The other king hit was the complete back-flip in relation to the Roxby Downs mine, which Labor members had done their best to sabotage in this Chamber. Labor members do not mind bending and doctoring principles and policy statements if this gives them a chance of winning an election. As a result we now have a completely ridiculous situation in relation to the biggest uranium mine

in the world, which they allowed to proceed while slamming the door on two or three smaller uranium mines.

The newly elected Labor Government handled a Budget that was designed by the Tonkin Government to be balanced, and it would have been balanced as a result of the careful scrutiny that the Tonkin Government gave all public services on a fortnightly basis. For seven months of the year the Labor Government handled it, so it became a Labor Budget. The fact that the Budget blew out as it did was the direct result of the lack of effort by the present Treasurer and his Ministers to contain what was going on in their departments. They got cracking on their promised expansion programme, which we would not countenance, so more money was needed when they did not contain what was going on in their departments. Consequently, the Budget blew out. It was a Labor Budget and a Labor deficit and to suggest, as this Government has repeatedly suggested, that it was a Liberal deficit was completely untrue. After all, it was the present Labor Treasurer who promised not to increase existing taxes or to impose new taxes, so the statement by Labor members that the Liberal Government is to blame for the present deficit is blatantly untrue.

In December 1982, the present Treasurer made a Ministerial statement about the deficit. He said that the Government faced a large increase in the deficit. He was more concerned with Treasury forecasts of deficits of about \$100 million in later years. What he did not say was that in later years he would have the benefit of substantial oil revenues as the result of the Tonkin Government's plans to bring oil and condensate to Stony Point. The Labor members said that we were putting those plans into action far too quickly, but now they are to receive the benefits of those plans because of our actions. The infamous policy speech of the Labor Party, which deliberately hoodwinked the public, also criticised the Liberal Government for not getting the oil from the Jackson Field in Queensland flowing through to South Australia. Premier Bannon said that he would go to Queensland, tackle Mr Bjelke-Petersen, and have the oil flowing into South Australia as a result. However, I read in an oil industry journal last week that that oil is flowing to Brisbane. So much for Labor's pre-election promises!

In reply to my question about his proposed discussion with the Queensland Premier, Premier Bannon said that no discussions had been held. Apparently, he did not have the stomach to front up to the Queensland Premier. If the Premier has proved anything since he has been in office it is that he will not fight for South Australia. He will not take the lead on issues if it means crossing his political colleagues. He has no strength in Caucus and none in the Labor Party in relation to matters on which he should take the lead. This Government had the great benefit of the wage pause, but now we find the Premier whingeing about the salary rises with which he has to deal in these Estimates.

As a result of court determinations, he is faced with an increase of about \$8 million in the State's pay-roll, yet in his first Budget he inherited the enormous benefit of the wage pause, as a result of which there was no increase in salaries or wages for a period. I remind members that, while my Party was in office during the late 1970s and early 1980s, the Public Service received enormous increases in salaries and wages, in some cases over 20 per cent. The Premier knew about the wage pause, yet he did not have the wit to capitalise on it. Now he is whingeing about the increases in salaries and wages even though he has had the benefit of the wage pause. So, this colourless document proceeds. Concerning water rates, he states:

On the other hand, we now expect a short-fall in receipts of the Engineering and Water Supply Department as the mild summer has caused a reduction in water usage. Revenues could be down by some \$5 million or more.

That is after a record increase in water charges in South Australia. The Labor Government reduced significantly the amount of water available and increased the charges, in some cases by 28 per cent in one year. This was done by a Government that said that it would not introduce any new taxes or increase existing tax charges. Premier Bannon talks about the benefits of his tax package, yet he introduced the iniquitous financial institutions duty—one of the new taxes that his Government was not going to introduce! The householders in this State now have to bear a 28 per cent increase in water rates in some cases. The Minister can grin; he knows that I am correct.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: You don't know what you are talking about.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I know perfectly well what I am talking about, and if the Minister knew half of what went on he would know also. If the Minister does not know that water charges increased by 28 per cent, then he does not know what he has inflicted on the public of South Australia. Obviously, he did not listen to the people from the Riverland who met on the steps of Parliament House. On that occasion the Minister was conspicuous by his absence, just like the Minister of Health in another place, who has just had the singular honour (for the first time in the 15 years that I have been a member) of losing a vote of no confidence.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Unprecedented in the Westminster system.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is unprecedented. The Minister of Health did not appear on the steps of Parliament House to confront doctors who met there for the first time in history. The Minister said that he had too much nouse to front up there. When the Minister of Health was insulting and scurrilously slandering someone in another place during one of his uncontrolled outbursts, he was asked to repeat it outside and he replied, 'I wouldn't be such a bloody fool to say it outside.' They were his exact words. If the Minister of Water Resources wants to get into bed with a colleague who says things like that and does not know what his Department charges or has inflicted on the public, it is about time that he got himself into some other business where he does know what it is all about.

Despite that enormous increase of up to 28 per cent for water, it is stated that the E&WS will be \$5 million short. The speech states:

The marked degree of variation from original estimate, for example a big improvement in duties related to real estate transactions. . .

We all know that that is a result of the enormous infusion of taxpayers' funds into housing. We cannot continue to have an enormous Federal deficit to fund housing, unemployment and welfare programmes. That deficit has to be funded and that has led to this increased improvement in real estate transactions. Significantly, the speech also states:

. . . but no improvement even a very small decline in pay-roll tax.

That means that fewer people are being employed by those people who make a contribution to State taxes through pay-roll taxes.

Unemployment in South Australia has increased by 9 000 since the Labor Government was elected. There is all this hoo-hah about improvement, joy and comradeship, how we all love one another, and the sermon for the day being consensus. However, in South Australia there has been an artificial infusion of funds in some areas, and there has been an enormous tax slug. In terms of the economy, if it had not been for a record rural season, we would all be a darned sight worse off than we were when this Government came to office. As I have said, since this Government came to office there are 9 000 extra people out of work, even

after all of the stop-gap schemes and the \$70 million which has been spent on unemployment in this State.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: On top of that there is the wage pause and the record agricultural season.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: On top of a wage pause, which was of enormous benefit to the Government, and a record agricultural season, there are still 9 000 more people out of work in this State than was the case when the Government was elected. In Opposition, Labor members wept crocodile tears over unemployment. They referred to the tragedy of unemployment everyday. At that time, under a Liberal Government, we were holding the line in relation to national figures. In fact, in the resources area, where we could develop, we did generate jobs. However, the Labor Government threw people out of work in that area. Labor members said that the Stony Point development was going too fast. That development created enormous employment even though it was only for a relatively short space of time. In relation to uranium mines Labor said, 'No, Roxby is a mirage in the desert.' Honeymoon and Beverley were almost up and running, but Labor shut the door for the most specious, flimsy, inconsequential and, indeed, plainly untrue reasons one could imagine.

The Ministerial statement in this place in relation to Honeymoon and Beverley must take, if not first prize, one of the major prizes for being the phoniest statement made in this House by any Minister. The Minister went through a series of reasons as to why the Government was throwing out of work the people employed at Honeymoon and Beverley. It is quite plain that that was done to try and cater to the completely dishonest uranium policy which the national Labor Party had concocted to save the South Australian Labor Party from annihilation. So, the 'mirage in the desert' suddenly blossomed and bloomed. Overnight it was transformed into one of the largest uranium mines in the world. However, that decision has led to some internal warfare within the Labor Party.

The Young Labor movement, at least, has a conscience. The young tend to be a bit starry-eyed and still have some principles. Members of the Young Labor movement were not going to accept what the old stagers in the Labor Party were doing, in doctoring a policy which was plainly incomprehensible and dishonest, so they demonstrated. It must be the day for the Left wing to wear a red flower, because I notice that the member for Elizabeth has one.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: It's May day—that's the significance of it.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Leader of the Left came in earlier (late as usual) and must have been dismayed. He was probably searching for an adjective weaker than orange-flower water, because he came in halfway through the speech of the Premier (he will not acknowledge him as his Leader) to try to shore up ailing failures of the Minister of Health, who suffered a vote of no confidence in another place. The Leader of the Left came in wearing a red carnation and promptly fell asleep, so impressed was he with his Leader! The Young Labor movement was so disgusted with the Labor Party—

The Hon. J.W. Slater: You would be the greatest character of all time.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I have had a few good teachers during my time sitting here. Members of the Young Labor movement demonstrated at Roxby Downs because they understood the morality of the situation. One is either for or against; one cannot be for and against only some of it. There is either uranium mining or there is not. The Labor Party is partly for it: it is for Roxby Downs because it is a big show, and it is opposed to Honeymoon and Beverley because they are little shows. Roxby had to proceed, under the weight of political pressure. However,

as a sop to the carnation wearers Honeymoon and Beverley had to go, so they were axed for the most specious of reasons. I felt sorry for the Minister of Mines and Energy, who had to defend a decision which was completely indefensible. That is a fairly difficult assignment.

However, the Minister rose and read his brief which, in due course, was demolished. Again, I make the point that the Premier of this State refuses to give a lead. He would not give a lead in relation to the wage pause, although he got the benefits from it. Cain and the other Labor Premiers were in bed together on the wage pause. John Bannon was trotting along behind because the Deputy Premier (who really has the strength in the South Australian Labor Party) and the other heavies were not too enthusiastic about a wage pause. The Deputy Premier shores up the Premier. The Premier can go off, do his running and be the fittest Premier in Australia (I think that is the latest headline), while Big Jack does the dirty work at home. The Deputy Premier was not enthusiastic about the wage pause because the unions were not enthusiastic. Of course, John Bannon had to fall in behind.

What has the Premier done in relation to the lead now being given by the Prime Minister, Senator Walsh and other sensible characters who want the uranium policy rationalised? The Premier was questioned after Senator Chaney made a statement, and he said, 'Oh, no; the policy is all right as it stands. We will keep Honeymoon and Beverley shut.' The Premier will not battle for South Australia. We had to get him up to the barrier in relation to the Darwin railway. The Premier goes to water on any major issue that involves a clash between South Australia and the Federal Government. There was a time when there was a bit of leadership in the Labor Party—but it now has a Leader who goes to water. If a problem gets too hard, the Premier shuts the door, hides behind his desk and hopes that it will go away. We have had innumerable examples of the Premier of this State doing that kind of thing. The Premier made a pathetic little speech to this House—

The ACTING SPEAKER: The Deputy Leader's time has expired.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I support the Bill. It is a time for reflection. Quite obviously the Premier sought to reflect selectively when he presented his statement to the House on 18 April—selectively in the sense that he quite adequately pointed out the changed circumstances which led to a better end of year result than he had contemplated. The Premier even predicted the possibility of there being a lower annual deficit than that originally budgeted. I hope that that can be achieved. However, I am sceptical that, if the Premier had to deliver that same speech in the middle of July, he would be able to provide for us the same happy picture that he left with us in on 18 April.

Clearly, there have been a number of activities that have been of tremendous benefit to this Government. The same set of circumstances for the previous Government would have seen it still in office, both Federally and at a State level. Let us not forget that. It is the quirk of the season that was particularly responsible for the losses to both the State Liberal Government and the Federal Liberal Government in 1982-83. That is easily picked up from the statements now made by the Premier, who has said that with the change of seasonal circumstances not only has there been a greater throughput of agricultural production (and its on-going benefit to the transport industry and through the inventory of spares required by people in all areas of activity), but it has also helped to force up the value of agricultural land and—to use the Premier's own words—that is reflected in marked increases in the amount of stamp duty. That has been offset, as the Minister will know, by a reduction in the amount of

water used and, therefore, in the revenue received by the Government by way of excess charges. Although there is still plenty of excess water use, a marked increase in overall income has resulted from massive increases in the rate per kilolitre which has been effected by the present Government.

Another plus mentioned in the document we are considering is the reduction in the amount of pumping required from the Murray River into the reticulation system. Which-ever Government benefits from that set of circumstances, which allows a reduction in incidental costs, there is inevitably a benefit in other areas of the Budget which allows the Government to undertake a series of new initiatives or initiatives ahead of the previous schedule. The Premier did not spell out in great detail to the House the grave doubt being expressed by a wide variety of economic advisers from various backgrounds (including academics, those associated with industry, banking, and representatives who are providing consultation to governments) about how long the improved spending will continue.

Dr Barry Hughes, of Flinders University, is an economic adviser to the Federal Government. He gave an excellent address to the Urban Development Seminar in Brisbane in October last year. He picked up very quickly that the advantage to the present Federal Government, and it was a bonus that it did not expect, was that the improved seasonal circumstances allowed a large number of manufacturing organisations to increase their inventory in anticipation of sales. Dr Hughes pointed out that they have benefited from those increased sales, but he believes that there is a limit to the amount of buildup that they will be able to shift.

Already there is a very clear indication that there is a falling back in forward orders for inventory lines because of the doubts which exist about just how far the economic improvement will go. A great deal of the economic improvement is predicated against the prices and incomes accord. Increasingly, questions are being asked about the fragility in the prices and incomes accord. They recognise the dangers to an on-going economic recovery, not only for Australia but also in the world sense.

Dr Barry Hughes very clearly identified the international bonus which the present Federal Government has received. There has been a marked improvement in the international situation, which has allowed for a great deal of anticipated improvement on the domestic scene. That helped to overcome the heavy drain that had been taking place. However, this morning on the radio programme *A.M.*, it was stated that there had been an indication in the past few days of a downturn in the economic upgrowth of the American economy of the order at this stage of 1.1 per cent. Therefore, I again ask the question: how long will it be that we can maintain the apparent benefits which have been accruing and which are reflected in the figures that the Premier has brought to us in the Budget document?

Some might say that 1.1 per cent is not a very great difficulty or a very great amount, but the statements by the Premier in bringing down his Budget refer to 1 per cent up or down being quite significant in a \$2.6 billion total Budget. That is not very much if one says it quickly, but a very major problem when one has to work out that 1.1 per cent is the equivalent of \$26 million, and \$26 million is a very major problem if one has lost it or has to make it up from some other source. Therefore, we have those inherent difficulties associated with the current position.

Recently the Housing Industry Association held in South Australia its nineteenth national congress, which was attended by the Prime Minister, who gave an opening address in which he lauded the activities of the Housing Industry Association in bringing to the Government's attention at the time of the national consensus a means of improving employment and helping to improve the overall approach

to economic benefits in Australia. Indeed, the initiative of the Housing Industry Association allowed the fairly rapid increase of building in all States of the Commonwealth which has brought about approximately a 29 per cent increase for 1983-84. We are looking at a completion rate of between 130 000 and 135 000 homes for 1983-84, a commendable increase on that which has been with us in the not so recent past, although the last Budget of the Tonkin Government certainly introduced into South Australia an improved expenditure in housing, the benefits of which have accrued to this Government and are reflected in the better financial situation which applies today along with their own initiative (and I do not deny them that) of turning large sums of otherwise public works money into the housing industry.

The Prime Minister suggested that it would be quite impossible to see the degree of increase which has taken place in 1983-84 projected into 1984-85. There is a distinct possibility that the top of the building figure will be of the order of 145 000 units for 1984-85, an increase of about 10 000 on 130 000. Honourable members will appreciate that that is less than a 10 per cent increase: it is a marked increase, but it may not be to the same degree that has taken place in the immediate past. That is probably a very good thing, for two reasons: there is a marked reduction in the market place of skilled tradesmen able to undertake work of a professional nature in the building industry; already there are a number of indications in the South Australian scene where there have been delays in the finishing of contracts. You, Mr Acting Speaker, have highlighted that issue to the House.

I have taken the opportunity of drawing the Deputy Premier's attention to the need to look very closely at the provision of additional skilled tradesmen, either by an improvement in the apprenticeship scheme or, alternatively, finding some way in which we can attract back into the building system those people who have been lost to it because of the depression in the building industry over a period of years, which meant a lack of job opportunity, so that for regularity of employment many went into other non-skilled areas and few have been prepared to come back. Another very real problem has been alluded to in debate in this House during this session, more particularly by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, when we were considering the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act Amendment Bill and the impact which enforced unionism and enforced prices in the subcontractor field will have on the building industry, and I do not canvass that any further.

The Government's failure to get on with the job of creating further blocks of land is creating a problem in that the cost of housing is increasing markedly, whether it be design and construct of properties which the Housing Trust purchase or which Government instrumentalities are developing on their own part or in the private field. One finds the town of Gawler, for example (where I have been resident for more than 30 years), that the cost of a housing block—if one can buy one—has increased from \$8 300 to \$8 500 in August 1983 to something in the vicinity of \$14 000 today. That is in just one town which is not a part of the metropolitan area. If one moves into the metropolitan area it is not infrequent that one can see \$27 000, \$30 000 or \$32 000 being asked for a single block of land, and in the more prestigious parts of the metropolitan area the price is much greater than that.

Certainly, those who are working in the area of providing housing for the multitudes, such as the Hickinbothams, the Galaxies, the Fairmonts, The Rosssdales or the Caj Amadios of the building industry regularly advise that the cost of land is increasing at the rate of \$480 to \$700 per six weeks, and that is not an uncommon figure which is reflected in the price of building where the builder is providing the land

made available to the first or second home buyers or whoever wants to purchase a home. The increase in the funds made available by the Commonwealth for the Commonwealth Homes Scheme has been a tremendous advantage to individuals, and I do not decry the fact that the funds are there. They were there under the previous Government under a somewhat different formula and were being used adequately under that previous scheme.

However, in all these areas these increased subsidies are having the effect of increasing the basic value of stock, because there is a greater demand for the finished unit. As soon as one gets a greater demand for the finished unit, the speculative producer, manufacturer, or (in this case) builder, can start to ask more, knowing that if he does not make a sale today he will make a sale tomorrow, next week or the week after. The Commonwealth funding is having an inflationary influence on the cost of housing. We should not deny that fact of life: it reflects against the advantages of the housing programme which on a bipartisan basis we all support, but we should not be so blind as to neglect to recognise what we are doing and the increases that we are forcing on the first home buyer, mainly the young people.

There are certain advantages for people who with a very small deposit are now able to buy their own house. Governments of various persuasions have been working towards that end for a long time. The fact that people are now able to enter the home purchase field with much smaller deposits than were required previously means that there is an increased pressure on the value of properties available, and therefore people buying a property with a small deposit are starting to pay dearly for the benefit of becoming home owners. Utopia has never existed, and I doubt whether it ever will. The best advantages of the various schemes to which we have referred are adversely reflected in some of those 'hotspot issues' which I have sought to bring to the attention of members of the House.

In his statement the Premier said that an increase had occurred in the amount of money available from stamp duties, referring to the benefit that has come from increased motor vehicle, land and property sales. The increase in duty available to the Government for its various programmes is extracted from those people whom we are seeking to assist in one way or another. That is certainly reflected in the cost to people who are purchasing their first home, and who derive the benefit of a stamp duty holiday, and the reduction effected in regard to reduced council rates, electricity charges or water rates to some is matched by higher charges to people elsewhere in the system. We should never fail to recognise that the balance shifts from one place to another, sometimes impacting on those least able to absorb it. On other occasions, it impacts more on the so-called tall poppies from whom the Government seeks to extract additional income. It is only a short time before a cyclic effect becomes evident as the economic cycle moves on its normal course.

At the Housing Industry Association conference, following the Prime Minister's speech a number of other keynote speakers contributed, following which there was an excellent programme by a series of economists, namely, Mr Don Stammer, of Partner Bain and Company; Professor Dick Blandy, Director of the National Institute of Labour Studies at the Flinders University; and Alan Carroll, an international business consultant. That session, chaired by Professor Cliff Walsh, of the University of Adelaide, was titled 'The Business Outlook'. All of those gentlemen referred to economic factors relevant to Australia, this State, and overseas. They were able to project them on to the State or Australian scenes as they saw them.

Even though they were not exactly of the same opinion on all issues, they were able to agree that there are problems ahead, that it is not a matter of when, in a sense of next

week or the week after, but more in the sense of whether they will occur in 1984 or 1985. We must accept that these people, with the computerised programmes that they now utilise in their projections, are able to depict by way of diagrams, slides and films a series of previous events, all of which show that the economic cycle has always existed and will continue to do so. The only variable in the economic cycle relates to highs and lows and the frequency with which they occur.

I do not want to preach doom and gloom, which would be the last thought I would have in a debate of this nature but, while reflecting on the advantages that the Premier sees in the current activities of his Government, we ought to take heed of the factors that will have a significant influence on those activities, factors that are quite out of the grip of the Premier in regard to doing anything about them. I refer to such things as the improvement in the seasonal circumstances that has occurred, the breaking of the drought, and the benefit that it has had on a number of factors with which we are dealing in this budgetary context. I referred to them earlier. We are unable to predict seasonal conditions and, therefore, we are unable to say, as the Premier would have us believe, that improvement has occurred due to good management on the part of the Government, placing us in the advantageous position where we might be \$2 million better off as at 30 June than had been predicted earlier.

In regard to the information made available by the Premier concerning monthly reviews, and more particularly monthly accounts, regrettably, that information is now being delivered later than it was previously. On earlier occasions one could expect an end-of-month report to be available no later than the 16th of the following month, sometimes by the 12th of the month. However, often it is now not available to Parliament until some six or seven weeks after the end of the month. I criticise the Treasurer quite strongly in regard to his denying the House information to which it has a right. Those documents belong to the Parliament and ought to be made available with a minimum of delay. With a proper appreciation of the details of those documents, quite often one can predict what difficulties will arise, and where they could occur.

From information available and projections in graphical form derived from information made available in the past and currently available for the 1983-84 year, I query whether the statements made by the Premier after 30 June will indicate an effect as beneficial as he would have us believe in the documentation made available on 18 April. Certainly, in regard to the experience of 1983-84 and of recent years from 1979-80 onwards, the graphical projections do not indicate as rosy a picture as the Premier would have us believe. As an Opposition, with a responsibility to the people of this State, I point out that, whilst we would like to see the best possible result achieved for the benefit of the people of South Australia, it is necessary to highlight the fact that there is a possible area of deficit, and that we feel that things are not as rosy as has been publicly projected by the Premier. The Opposition supports the passage of this measure: to do otherwise would be against all the normal principles, but we intend to participate in a great deal of questioning in regard to specific lines at a later date.

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

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): In taking the opportunity to speak briefly to the Appropriation Bill one cannot help but question the magnitude of the Supplementary Estimates when one considers the conditions under which the Supplementary Estimates have been presented to the Parliament. As stated earlier by the Deputy Leader of the

Opposition, the wage pause has been of enormous financial benefit to the incoming Government. That benefit was not available to the previous Government: even though the wage pause was brought into effect by the Liberal Government in Canberra, the previous Liberal Government in South Australia did not have the benefit of its effects.

Any Minister would be well aware of the round sum allowances that need to be provided for the escalation in wages and salaries throughout the financial year to meet that unknown quantity as the year progresses. I must say that the present Government had the tremendous financial advantage of the wage pause, and not only did it have that advantage but, as did the whole of Australia, it had the tremendous advantage of one of the best agricultural seasons in history. That, in itself, has injected countless millions of dollars into the economy of Australia and it has made things much easier for this Government and the Federal Government during the past 12 months.

I take this opportunity to look at the attitude adopted by this Government in relation to increasing charges and taxes in this State, especially as it came to office under false pretences in that it stated quite clearly before the last State election that it would not introduce any new taxes and would not increase any existing charges, and yet we have seen 70-odd new increases in charges and taxes. I want to talk briefly about the effects of two or three of those increased charges, particularly in relation to the irrigation industries.

During the past 12 months we have seen an increase of 24 per cent in electricity charges and an increase of 28 per cent in the direct irrigation charges instituted by this Government, which have had a massive impact on the irrigation industries in the State and have distinctly disadvantaged the irrigation industries as compared with their counterparts in the Eastern States. One must keep in mind that we are all competing on a similar market. The products produced under irrigation in Victoria and New South Wales are sold on the same major markets in Australia and the same overseas markets. That higher cost structure brought about by increased power charges and water rates places the South Australian horticultural industries at a very distinct disadvantage as compared with their counterparts, particularly in Victoria and New South Wales.

There was recently a major seminar held in the Riverland in relation to the economy of the Riverland district. It was an excellent two-day seminar attended by the Premier on the first day, and in fact many of the papers presented could not be argued with in any way. What is more, the Premier was unable to argue with them and, likewise, the Minister for Primary Industry (Mr Kerin) was unable to find fault with the presentation of the papers by a number of the leading horticultural industry people in South Australia. If we look at what has come out of that seminar, since that time virtually no action whatsoever that I am aware of has been taken by the South Australian Government and yet it was spelled out quite clearly, and I will refer to one or two of the papers that were given.

First of all, we are talking about the dried fruit industry. A very detailed paper was presented by the Chairman of the Australian Dried Fruits Association, Mr Tankard. He spelt out clearly that the problems confronting that industry were very much the result of the lack of control over imports where the product is heavily subsidised. In Australia we are looking at dried vine fruits, dried sultanas in particular, returning about \$750 to \$800 per tonne, and yet we are confronted with imports from Greece, in particular, which subsidises its growers to the tune of \$800 per tonne. Quite obviously, it is absolutely impossible, no matter how efficient an industry is, to compete with imports from an overseas country which is very clearly dumping its product on the Australian market at prices with which the local

growers have no chance of competing. There is no doubt in my mind that the Australian grower can compete very effectively with overseas countries, but there is no way the Australian grower can compete with subsidies in the form of \$800 per tonne when we anticipate that the end return to the Australian grower for dried sultanas will be only around \$750.

If the Government is serious about the redevelopment or restructuring of the Riverland it has only to look at the existing products in the Riverland and see that they are adequately protected and that the growers in Australia are able to compete on an equal basis with their competitors overseas. I have heard nothing from the State Government since that conference as to what action it is going to take. Any protection in relation to imports is provided in the form of protection through the Federal Government, but it is still very much in the arena of the South Australian Government to promote the need for that action to be taken. Undoubtedly, the Minister for Primary Industry (Mr Kerin) could not argue with the paper that was presented in relation to the dried fruit industry and, unless the State Government is to stand up and be counted in relation to the dried fruit industry and strongly represent the industry in South Australia in particular to the Federal Government, there is little hope for the future, especially if the EEC countries continue to subsidise their growers to the extent that they are doing.

The citrus industry is in a very similar situation. We have principally dried fruits, citrus, wine grapes and canned fruits which make up the majority of the production in the Riverland, which is one of the best areas in the world for producing the fruits I have just mentioned. The quality of the fruit produced there is equal to the best in the world, but there is no way the industries in the Riverland can compete with the level of subsidy being provided by countries such as Greece and Brazil.

Brazil, a large citrus producing country that desperately needs foreign currency, is prepared to dump its excess production on the Australian market at any price for whatever foreign exchange it can get. The problems of the Riverland are not that it cannot produce quality products: it produces some of the best products in the world. However, unless the Commonwealth and State Governments ensure that the Australian products at least have the opportunity to be produced on an equal basis with that of their counterparts in other countries, there is little value in talking about redevelopment.

The Premier has announced the establishment of a Riverland development authority for the purpose of considering new products and other potential development in the Riverland. The traditional crops produced there are equal to the best in the world. If, for example, the growers there are encouraged to grow other products and then are not supported by the Government of the day, the same problem will develop again. The problems of the citrus industry in the Riverland are clearly set out in a paper presented by the President of the Murray Citrus Growers Co-operative Association Limited, who states:

There is a shortfall in citrus production of around 200 000 tonnes which is equivalent to approximately 4 000 hectares of citrus plantings in full production. However, growers lack the confidence to invest in this important industry because of lack of commitment by Government to the long-term viability of the industry.

There, the President is saying that, although there is a significant shortfall in the production of citrus in Australia, because of the heavy capital cost and the long-term nature of the investment in bringing citrus into bearing many growers will not undertake the risk of planting citrus, bearing in mind the 10-year lead time required for citrus growth.

The Government can destroy the citrus industry virtually overnight by the stroke of a pen. All that is needed to bring stability to an area such as the Riverland is a policy of long-term commitment by the Government, especially the Commonwealth Government, no matter which political Party is in power. The citrus industry is not the sort of industry such as that in which wheat may be planted this year and barley the next. If a grower commits himself to permanent planting of citrus or vines, much money is invested and the grower must have some security that, when those plantings come into bearing, the industry will not be destroyed by the Government of the day. Unless Commonwealth and State Governments look at the horticultural industries from the point of view of the long term and plan for the long term, all the redevelopment authorities in the world will not help an area such as the Riverland.

The problems of the horticultural industries, not only in the Riverland but in Australia generally, can be resolved at little cost to the Government so long as the Government gives a long-term commitment in order that growers may know where they stand not only this year but for the next 10 years when these high cost industries that take a long time to develop come into bearing. It is no use being six or seven years down the track where there is the potential for bringing the citrus into bearing and the Government then varying the tariff arrangements, because that will wipe out the industry overnight.

This principle was spelt out clearly to the Premier during the summit conference in the Riverland, and it is the key to the whole problem. No matter what products are produced under irrigation, if there are long-term permanent plantings there must be long-term policies for the industry. Mr Webster (President of the Murray Citrus Growers Co-operative Association Limited) continues:

Tariffs and sales tax exemptions both vital to the industry are constantly queried by Treasury officials, IAC commissioners, economists and Government advisers. Added to that, State and Federal charges like workers compensation, irrigation water rates, power, export inspection charges, etc., can all have devastating effects on citrus growers' livelihoods.

Therefore, unless the Government gets out in the field and acquires a basic understanding of the long-term commitment required, the redevelopment proposals will obviously be shaky indeed. The industries with which we are already involved in the horticultural areas of South Australia are good industries. They are industries that are natural to the area about which I have been talking, and the quality of their production is extremely high. However, in existing circumstances when we see increasing charges, such as a 24 per cent increase in electricity charges over the past 12 months and an increase of 28 per cent in water rates, and when the industries are already in dire straits, it is ludicrous, to say the least, to expect the horticultural industries to survive without Government consideration. I appreciate the fact that there are virtually no rural members on the Government side, so it may be difficult for Government members to understand the true position, but it is high time that they got out into the country and learned what these industries are on about and took appropriate action to help them.

The future of horticultural industries, especially in the Riverland of South Australia, is assured if only a little common sense prevails on the Government side, not only in South Australia but in Canberra as well, because conditions are critical in the long term in respect of imports and tariff arrangements. It is very much up to the South Australian Government to help the South Australian horticultural industries and to represent them strongly in Canberra. That is very much the role of the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture: they should carry the message to Canberra, because millions of dollars may be poured into redevel-

ment and, unless such help has a sound basis, it will be money down the drain, and there is no need for that. Indeed, this fact is recognised by members of some trade unions operating in the Riverland.

In this respect, an article appeared in the *Murray Pioneer* on Tuesday 13 March 1984 which, under the heading 'Dried Vine Fruit Import Ban Sought', states that the Riverland Trades and Labor Council has called for a complete ban on all imports of dried fruit. The trade union movement in the Riverland realises what is going on, but it does not seem able to get the message through to the Government, the Premier or the Prime Minister. Trade union members in the Riverland are well aware that their livelihoods depend on the dried fruit industry, the wine industry and the citrus industry but, unfortunately, up to the present they have not succeeded in getting a reaction from this Government since the successful summit conference was held in the Riverland three or four months ago. That is a great pity, because there is absolutely no value in changing to different crops if the crops being produced are some of the best quality products in the world. The only reason why the industry is in dire straits is unfair competition from other countries that are desperate for foreign exchange at any price and will therefore dump their product in countries such as Australia for any price they can get, receiving massive subsidies from their home Governments.

The answers, I believe, are comparatively simple but, unless the Government is prepared to act responsibly, all the redevelopment in the world will do little to help the future of the Riverland industries. We have seen the 24 per cent electricity charge increase and the 28 per cent increase in water charges, and only the other day we had marine survey charges increased by 400 per cent, affecting the houseboat industry in that section of the Riverland. Yet the Government did not even realise it had done it. What is more, the Minister did not even realise what a marine survey was, which is more incredible still. It is absolutely beyond belief that a Government can proceed unwittingly to increase a charge by 400 per cent without having any idea what the impact on a major industry in South Australia will be. What is more, it is not particularly concerned as to what that impact will be.

When that matter was raised in this House some two or three weeks ago it was quite obvious that the Minister was unaware of what a marine survey was all about and it is incredible to realise that he did not know the impact of those charges when he had in fact introduced those charges and submitted them to Cabinet and that they had passed through Cabinet, were gazetted, and came into law. When we are talking about employment and desperately trying to push South Australia along, whether in the horticultural industries, the tourist industries or any other secondary industry, it is absolute incompetence on the part of the Ministers responsible when they sign into effect regulations that have a significant impact on any section of the community and they are completely unaware this has occurred. I believe it is high time the Premier took the necessary action to get his Ministers into a situation where at least they know what is happening and examine closely proposals put forward to them by their departments, and not just blindly sign them into effect, leaving the industries and the people involved, who have committed countless thousands of dollars in good faith, to then find they are suddenly confronted with charges, for instance, rising to \$6 000 when they had previously paid \$1 500.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: This is Government consultation; they always consult first, so they say.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: That is what they say, but when it comes to the crunch the Ministers do not even realise they have taken these actions. Quite obviously, the

proposal was put up to him by his Department. The Minister blindly signed it, without even reading it or understanding what it is all about. If that is how the State is to be run, not only the horticultural industries but secondary industries and tourism industries are going to be in dire straits before much longer, because most of the industries we are talking about in this day and age are working on fairly fine margins. To have a sudden increase in one charge of 400 per cent is a massive impact that has to be absorbed by the proprietor of a company.

There is no doubt that that charge has to be passed on to the consumer, and consequently fewer and fewer people will avail themselves of the facilities of that industry. Therefore, more and more people will have to be laid off as a result of it. It is short sighted, and unless the Government is prepared to get down and start doing its homework we will find ever increasing amounts being required in the Supplementary Estimates. This can only have the effect of reducing the number of jobs available to the people of South Australia.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Coles): I support the Bill, but with severe reservations about the way in which this Government is managing the State's economy and the taxpayers' finances. As my colleagues have said, the two greatest things going for this Government are the wages pause instituted by the former Liberal Federal Government and the rural recovery, for which even the present Prime Minister cannot take credit, although he would no doubt like to. Despite the Premier's proud assertions that the deficit has been reduced, if that is the case it is not as a result of initiatives by the Government but as a result of the fortuitous actions outside his jurisdiction which have benefited his Government. That should not be forgotten when this Government seeks to lay claim to any success as regards economic management.

As has been indicated, the speech with which the Premier introduced the Supplementary Estimates makes inevitable reference, although oblique reference, to a number of promises broken by the Government in relation to taxation and charges. It is interesting to see the very astute wording of the Premier, in introducing the Appropriation Bill, in stating that perhaps it was not even really necessary to introduce such a Bill because things were going so well but in order to be on the safe side and to allow Parliamentary debate he proceeded to do so. He harks back to the claim that he inherited an extremely difficult situation and that that is the justification for what he describes as having to take some very unpopular actions. I would describe them as not only unpopular, although they certainly have been, but as unprincipled actions in breaching so many promises.

In his speech the Premier identifies the fact that he introduced a package of revenue measures to help the recurrent Budget. Those measures, of course, were the introduction of a new tax, which he swore would not occur prior to the last election, and the increases in 70-odd charges. There have been variations in the amounts of revenue that the Government expected to receive and those which have been received. There has been a short-fall of around \$2 million in FID receipts due to the later than planned commencement of that tax. For that we can only give thanks to the other place and to the existence indeed of a House of Review in the South Australian Parliament.

It should be borne in mind that \$2 million, which is not in the Government coffers as a result of the deferred introduction of that tax, is in the pockets of South Australian taxpayers, of South Australian bank customers, of South Australian businesses, of private citizens who have that money to spend at their own discretion, rather than it being in the Treasury as the result of a tax introduced with a

completely blatant and almost unprecedented disregard for honour in politics.

On the payments side the Premier, of course, refers to the cost of wage awards which is now expected to be about \$8 million in excess of the round sum allowance. He refers to other sundry relatively small items which collectively make up \$8 million in payments that were not anticipated by the Government when it introduced its Budget. Among those payments are the special costs incurred by the police during the demonstrations at Roxby Downs, extra overtime in correctional services, and additional costs for the Royal Commission examining the Splatt case.

Whilst I do not quarrel with some of these additional items (for example, the additional support to the Australian Dance Theatre as a result of a likely short-fall in funding by the Victorian Government) nor with expenditure relating to school security alarms, which I would describe more as investment and preventive spending than straight-out expenditure, and the cost incurred by the police during the demonstrations at Roxby Downs, one can only say that with a different Government and with different management some of those costs, if they had been incurred, would have been somewhat minimised. There is no doubt that it was Labor supporters who led the charge at Roxby Downs. It was Young Labor there. It was a Labor inspired demonstration that resulted in the incurring of those costs, and the Government has to take some considerable degree of responsibility for the fact that those costs were incurred. Despite the factors which have enabled the Government to come out of this better than it deserves to, and better than it might have imagined, the fact remains that 9 000 more people are out of work in South Australia now than when the Government came to office, and that must be the greatest indictment of all.

In the period to which the Supplementary Estimates relate there has been a new FID tax and additional taxes imposed by the Government, partly stamp duties, which are reaping an even bigger amount of revenue than the Government anticipated, and of course the liquor tax. No opportunity should be allowed to pass in this House without criticising the Government for levying that tax, a 33½ per cent increase provided in the Bill introduced in the House in August last year, which was designed to net the Government \$7 million in a full year and \$2 million this current year. In fact, because the Government had failed to take into account the cumulative effect of indexed Federal excise, the net gain from that tax is to be considerably more. It was only after enormous pressure from the hotel industry in South Australia that the Government realised the enormity of its mistake and back-tracked very slightly. It did not back-track so far that the hospitality industry in South Australia has not been adversely affected. It did not back-track so far that consumers are not having to pay considerably more, almost on a monthly basis—certainly with sickening regularity—for every glass of alcohol they consume. That should not be allowed to be forgotten—an act by a Government which purports to represent the interests of the tourist industry.

Since Parliament resumed, which was immediately following the Adelaide Festival of Arts, I do not believe that there has been an opportunity—certainly there has been very limited opportunity—for adjournment debates. I would say that the Opposition has had barely a half hour or 40 minutes collectively to participate in adjournment debates in the time that we had been sitting since the House resumed in March. Consequently, I do not recall hearing any reference whatsoever to the Adelaide Festival of Arts since the Parliament resumed, and yet what I have to say about the festival is directly relevant to the State's economic situation and therefore to the Government's revenue and expenditure.

One of the reasons why there has been an upturn in economic activity in this past six months is directly related to the huge economic stimulus that the Adelaide Festival of Arts gives to South Australia. This was abundantly apparent in 1982 when the tourist visitor figures for the March quarter were brought out the following September, and there was evidence of a considerable upturn with all the economic consequences that that brings. We do not yet have, of course, the domestic tourism monitor for the March quarter 1984 but when we do I have no doubt whatsoever that the figures will demonstrate a significant percentage increase.

The effects of that increase can only be beneficial to the Government in terms of increased receipts from a whole variety of revenue-raising measures. As the Arts Editor of the *Advertiser* said in his introductory report to the festival:

The Adelaide festival touches almost everyone with its ambitious sense of occasion and its celebration of all the arts, both highbrow and for everyone.

Mr Campbell goes on to say:

The festival makes a greater impact on the rest of the world than anything else that South Australia does.

That impact is not only a cultural one: it is an economic impact because it serves as a magnet to attract people to South Australia, not only for the reasons of the existence of the festival (that is, artistic reasons) but also because it focuses attention on a unique State which, with a comparatively small population, has the capacity to stage an arts event of world-wide significance.

If one looks at the actual economic impact of the festival, it is hard to estimate precisely what that impact is. However, an interesting assessment of it was made in an article by Tony Baker in the *News* on, I think, 1 March 1984, where he estimates it as being a \$50 million festival. He makes up that total by looking at the fact that the festival usually attracts 200 000 people over three weeks. If each spends \$250, which he describes as a conservative estimate—it certainly would be the case that some people would spend much less but undoubtedly some would spend much more, and that is of course not just on ticket sales—that makes for a conservative estimate of a \$50 million event.

According to the Festival Centre officials, it costs \$3 million to mount the festival, with \$500 000 coming from private sources. The very fact that that much money comes from private sources is in itself a huge tribute to the organisation of the festival. Tony Baker quotes the Minister of Tourism who identifies the fact that there is the immeasurable value of the part the festival plays in putting Adelaide on the map as a marketable commodity. That, of course, is what Lance Campbell said. One can look at the various events which go to make up the festival, and not in an artistic sense but purely in a financial sense (purely in the way that one is adding up figures—dollars and cents—how much is spent, how much is sold and how much is bought) and a glance through that list of events will give some ideas of the huge economic impact of the festival on the State.

In the *Weekend Australian* of 3 and 4 March 1984, Peter Ward writes an assessment of the main events and refers to the 3 000-strong parade of banners through the city streets. Let us stop at that point. There would be the cost of mounting those banners and the cloth that had to be bought; although, admittedly, some were not costly, someone brought that cloth, someone sold it and someone received profit from it.

He refers to the Regimental Band of the Coldstream Guards and the fact that that band had to be accommodated for the period that it was in Adelaide. He refers to the magnificent London Philharmonia Orchestra under the superb baton of Vladimir Ashkenazy. That orchestra of scores of musicians had to be accommodated. They had to pay for their accommodation and food. There would scarcely

have been one of them who did not engage in some kind of personal expenditure outside food and accommodation during their stay in Adelaide.

Peter Ward refers to the \$20 000 fireworks display which opened the festival on the Torrens. He refers to the 15 overseas and 27 Australian companies which gave more than 250 performances with a total audience capacity of 160 000 over 17 days. All those people spent money which would not otherwise have been spent in South Australia. Ward makes the point that box office receipts, private sponsorship and Government subsidy pay for the festival. It enjoys unrivalled financial support from the private sector which, this year, as I said, guaranteed events to the value of more than \$500 000.

Ward refers to some of the companies—the Dutch virtuoso recorder group (which was a small group), the Polish Chamber Orchestra (which was a bigger group), the controversial Japanese Theatre Company, the Macunaima Brazilian company, and the Raun Raun Theatre Company of New Guinea. All these people had to be accommodated. Their members spent significant funds while they were in South Australia. Ward refers to the separate 60 exhibitions which are estimated to have been mounted throughout Adelaide. One must consider the practical costs associated with mounting an exhibition. Some of the paintings for the various exhibitions were framed in other States, but a significant number of them were framed in South Australia, especially the exhibitions by local artists. That, in itself, when added together with all the other factors, has a significant economic impact.

Ward states that added to these and other line-ups is the Festival Fringe, which is administered separately and covers more than 400 events, large and small. Certainly, many of them were low-cost events, but significant amounts of money changed hands. As a most appreciative patron of the events at the Adelaide Festival of Arts, one thing came very clearly home to me: the superlative performances that were put on for our pleasure were matched in quality by the extremely high standards of presentation by back-of-stage staff and front-of-house staff in almost all the venues.

Tonight I want to say a word in praise of usherettes. I suspect that they form a group which does not very often receive much Parliamentary attention. Late last year when I attended the 25th anniversary of the Australian Ballet at the Festival Theatre it came home to me very strongly what extraordinary quality we have in front-of-house staff at the Adelaide Festival Theatre. On that particular night they were naturally on their mettle because it was a very special occasion. One saw this same quality in evidence at many of the festival performances. I think that those people, who are very much in the background when we are talking about artistic performances, do deserve commendation: I am pleased to take the opportunity that is available to me tonight to give it. Because I was so impressed with the quality of the service provided by the usherettes, I took the trouble to visit the Festival Theatre late last year and find out what special training and arrangements are involved.

I was interested to learn that there are an enormous number of applications for usherette jobs. It is seen, not surprisingly, as the glamour job for usherettes in Adelaide. Five of the members of the usherettes staff have been at the centre for 10 years, which is a very long time for someone working in what is customarily perceived as a casual occupation. A total staff of about 30 work on a casual basis and are paid per performance. There are 20 usherettes who work in the actual theatre and 10 working in the Playhouse.

The usherettes at the Festival Theatre do have on-job training, for which the head usherette is responsible. The former head usherette was Mrs Maureen Lyons, and the

current head usherette is Mrs Lorraine Craig. The work of those two women is something for which the theatregoers in Adelaide have every reason to be grateful. The job of the head usherette and her staff is to make the public welcome, and also to welcome the artists. I was told that the front-of-house staff at the Adelaide Festival Theatre have a national and international reputation. The quality of their work is so good that it is remarked upon by national and international companies when they visit the Festival Theatre. Invariably, letters of thanks and acknowledgement are sent when companies have performed in Adelaide at the Festival Theatre. I am told that there is a very strong *esprit de corps* among the staff. They regard the theatre as their own and they are pleased to maintain the very high standards of dress and grooming which are set for them.

Over the years, the uniform has been varied, but whatever the uniform has been the usherettes have always, in my opinion, looked good in it and have worn it with great distinction. This may seem to some members of the House to be a small thing, to be speaking in Parliament about the work of usherettes. However, it is invariably the small things that go to make up the quality of the whole. I believe that that is the case with the Festival of Arts. Genius has been described as an infinite capacity for taking pains. So many people have taken such pains over the production of the Festival of Arts in whatever capacity they are working—whether it is the Artistic Director himself (Anthony Steele) who performed a *magnum opus* in taking up the task very late in the day and delivering the goods in superlative style, or whether it is someone who is apparently playing a minor role by providing a public service in work such as usheretting.

The Adelaide Festival of Arts certainly injected considerable funds into the South Australian economy at a time when it badly needed an injection of such funds, whether indeed it was \$50 million (as has been suggested), whether it was some lesser amount or whether quite possibly it was a greater amount, the Government has felt the benefit of it in increased receipts, and the community has felt the benefit not only in a financial sense but in a thousand intangible ways that have helped to make the quality of life in South Australia much better for all of us.

I recapitulate returning to the Premier's speech on the Appropriation Bill. He says that looking ahead to 1984-85 the Government believes that a continuation of budgetary stringency will be necessary. He also states:

On the one hand the Budget will have the benefits of the full year receipts from the package of taxation measures which we introduced during 1983, but on the other hand we seem likely to lose special additional moneys which the Commonwealth made available in 1983-84 . . . Further, we face the full year costs of the wage awards which have been given during the course of 1983-84.

I doubt that anyone on this side of the House would describe the Premier as having engaged in budgetary stringency. No-one who has allowed the budgets of a significant number of departments to blow out in the way that has occurred in South Australia could be described as having exercised budgetary stringency.

At the same time, the Government has scarcely been vigorous in condemning the wage awards that will cost South Australian taxpayers dearly. In short, although the Premier has given himself a pat on the back (but self recommendation is no praise), so far the Government's efforts have not been creditable. The Government has been helped in a way that could scarcely have been dreamed to be possible, and I refer to the breaking of the drought as well as the cumulative effects of the wage freeze. The next 12 months will be tough. The effect of Medicare on the State's health budget will, I believe, be devastating—and that is not too strong a word to use. The Government will have to use extraordinary measures to contain health costs in a system which is more

or less designed by its very nature to ease all the natural self-regulating restraint that should be exercised by patients seeking health care.

I predict that the outpatients departments, particularly of the metropolitan teaching hospitals, will be very severely stretched and that costs will increase in that area. That has already occurred to the extent of \$7.5 million, as required by the Supplementary Estimates. I support the Bill, with a warning to the Government that it will have to do a great deal better if it is going to survive the next 12 months without inflicting even further blows on the South Australian taxpayer.

Mr ASHENDEN (Todd): I also support the Bill before the House, but with a considerable degree of qualification. This is yet again another financial measure introduced by a Government noted for only one thing, namely, its financial mismanagement, and also for the fact that it is a Government which undoubtedly is the most dishonest Government ever to occupy the front benches of this House. The Government was elected on completely false premises and false promises. The Government was elected because the population of South Australia was told that, during the entire period of office of a Labor Government, there would be no increases in taxation and no new tax measures introduced. We have seen what those promises were worth.

The Government promised the residents of the north-eastern suburbs that a guided busway to Tea Tree Plaza would be completed by 1986. However, very shortly after it was elected the Government advised the residents of the north-eastern suburbs that that no longer would be the case and that, in fact, the guided busway would be completed only to Darley Road. We now find that the Government will not even address itself to the question of whether the guided busway to Tea Tree Plaza will ever be completed.

A number of questions have been asked in this House of the Minister of Transport and of the Premier as to whether it is the Government's intention to complete the guided busway from Darley Road to Tea Tree Plaza. To date, those questions have remained unanswered. Neither the Premier nor the Minister will confirm that it is the Government's intention to complete that busway. That lack of response has not been missed by the residents of the north-eastern suburbs. Before the Government was elected, the residents of the north-eastern suburbs firmly believed that a Labor Government would make funds available to enable the project to be completed.

On many occasions members of the Government have said that the Opposition is always urging it to spend more money while at the same time criticising the Government for raising taxes. However, the point I make is that the Government's priorities are completely wrong: it is allocating expenditure in the wrong areas and it is inefficient. The Government is wasting funds with the result that projects such as the north-east busway have to be deferred. I will address myself to that matter in more detail later.

Before being elected to Government, the Labor Party promised the population of South Australia that there would be no increases in taxes and no new taxes. It promised the residents of the north-eastern suburbs a guided busway, and it promised the residents of South Australia that the Penfolds Grange vineyards would be retained. I could go on and on and show only too clearly that the Government was elected following the Labor Party's putting to the people of South Australia a platform containing deliberate untruths. Since its election to office the Government has continued to tell deliberate untruths. Today we witnessed one of the most disgraceful exhibitions that this Parliament has ever been subjected to: the Premier's defence of a Minister who obviously told a number of untruths in another place. It

was shown only too clearly that that is the case. A democratically elected House of Parliament passed a motion of no confidence in the Minister of Health, showing only too clearly that the majority of members in the other place (comprising not only members of the Liberal Opposition) know only too well what the Premier and the Government know but will not admit, namely, that the Minister of Health has told deliberate untruths. Of course, the Premier has been involved in that web by defending his Minister, and he, too, has told deliberate untruths.

When moving through their districts, I am sure that other members would have been receiving the same message that I have been receiving namely, that people feel that the Government and the Premier cannot be trusted. Many of the people with whom I have spoken have been honest enough to say that at the last election they were fooled by the Labor Party promises and that they believed that those promises would be fulfilled. They have made the point to me that never again will they believe a Bannon Government promise. They have pointed out to me the way that they have suffered since the election of the Government. They have pointed out that it is their opinion that the Government was elected as a result of its totally dishonest promises and that it has been totally dishonest since its election. On a number of occasions the Premier has told untruths in this House, as has the Deputy Premier. The Minister of Health has told untruths in the other place. It makes me wonder how many other Ministers have told untruths in this House. Unfortunately, members of the Opposition are in the position of not knowing whether answers given by a Minister are correct and honest or whether they constitute yet another deliberate fudge, and so, the fine Westminster tradition on which this Parliament is based has been destroyed by a Government without any conscience whatever.

I want to address myself particularly to one of the broken promises of the Government—a matter that comes to mind when any financial measure of the Government is under consideration. I refer to financial institutions duty. That tax has never before been levied in South Australia. Its level is higher than that in any other State of Australia. It is a well known fact that the only States in Australia that have imposed financial institutions duty are States under a Labor Government. However, the Premier was not content to impose the duty at the level imposed by other Labor Premiers—he had to go one better and introduce it at a level higher than that imposed in any other State. I think that it should be recorded that the member for Newland has interjected and laughed at the comments I have just been making about financial institutions duty. The member for Newland would find, on moving through his district, that many of his constituents (many of whom will be my constituents after the next election) are angry about the Government's imposition of the financial institutions duty.

Mr Klunder interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: For the benefit of the member for Newland, I point out that a constituent in the present district of Newland and the new district of Newland telephoned me only today to express his anger about the rejection of an application from his organisation (a non-profit organisation) for exemption from financial institutions duty.

That organisation applied to be exempted from the financial institutions duty, but the Government rejected that application. The constituent told me that I could mention that the organisation is known as Youth Benefits. It is an organisation set up to raise funds in order to provide help for organisations which are in need of financial assistance. Some of the organisations assisted by Youth Benefits are Cooina, the Children's Hospital (particularly in the area of medical research), and local schools such as the Salisbury Primary School, which recently had a fire. Youth Benefits

has also helped the YMCA. I notice that the member for Newland still regards this as highly amusing. He and his Government may find it amusing but the residents of the north-eastern suburbs do not find the financial institutions duty amusing at all.

When the Financial Institutions Duty Bill was before the House, the Opposition pointed out to the Premier that, if the duty was imposed in the way he intended, it would have a severe impact on charitable organisations and on small business. I point out that last evening I was asked to address a dinner comprising predominantly residents of the new district of Newland. There were well over 50 people in attendance and most of them had some connection with small business. After I had spoken, a number of questions were raised from the floor. All of the questions related to problems experienced by small business because of the present Government. Of the questions and points raised by that group last evening more than half were directed to the financial institutions duty and the effect that it is having on small business operators in the north-eastern suburbs. Also, those people who were not small business men were critical of the financial institutions duty. It was pointed out to me—and I did not have to point out to them—the fact that they paid duty when they are paid their salary, because the money goes into a bank; when they pay their mortgage, they again pay the duty; when they use their credit cards, that duty is again imposed; when they pay their credit card accounts that duty is again paid, and it goes on and on.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: Would you repeat it?

Mr ASHENDEN: The Minister has just woken up, so for his benefit I will point out that the Leader of the Opposition has already stated that he will remove the double-dipping of FID, provided of course that any money is left in Treasury by the present profiteering Government. In that case, hopefully, the whole duty could be removed. The sensitivity of Government members is only too obvious in their responses. They are critical of the Opposition because we defend the constituents of our districts who feel so let down by a Government which has broken so many promises.

I turn now to another example of the poor financial management of this Government in relation to schools. There are 25 educational institutions in the district of Todd, and many of them are State Government institutions. I can state without fear of contradiction that the school councils of everyone of those State schools have expressed to me their dismay, anger and concern at the way in which the Government is not providing funds for the maintenance of those schools. I am sure that members present would remember that over a month ago I questioned the Minister of Education about the Houghton Primary School. I pointed out that there have been serious injuries requiring hospitalisation as a result of the deteriorated state of the school yard at Houghton Primary School. I raised this matter with the Minister last year, and I wrote to the Minister on a number of occasions. The school council also wrote to the Minister on a number of occasions, as did the parents. No replies were received and the Minister, when he spoke in Parliament a month ago, said, 'Yes, I apologise. I should have written to the member and to the school council to let them know that I was considering their application and that we were looking into it. Of course it is a serious matter. I could have just ruled it out straight away, but I said that my staff had to look into the matter much more deeply.' The Minister apologised because he had not written. He still has not written to me to tell me what is going on, and he has not written to the school council. He has made no contact at all, even after his so-called apologies for his lack of response to my earlier correspondence and that of the school council. Over a month has passed since I raised this matter in the House and he still has not indicated whether

or not that desperately needed financial help is going to be provided.

Do not let any member of the Government get up and say that we are critical of the Government raising taxes while at the same time we are asking it to spend more money. We are saying that the Government must get its priorities right and spend the money where it is needed. The way in which this Government has cut maintenance funds in schools is absolutely appalling. Whilst on the subject of cuts in Government spending, an instruction has also been given to the Modbury Hospital by the Health Commission to the effect that for the rest of this financial year it must halve its costs. In other words, for the rest of this financial year Modbury Hospital must trim its costs by one half, according to an instruction from the Health Commission to Modbury Hospital.

Mr Ingerson: That's pretty good budgeting!

Mr ASHENDEN: As the member for Bragg says, that is pretty good budgeting. I would not use the word 'good'; rather, it is absolutely incredible. This is from a Government that promised better deals in education, better deals in health, no new taxes, no increased taxes, the O-Bahn completed to Tea Tree Plaza by 1986, and so on.

I know that the member for Newland has also been made well aware of Tea Tree Gully TAFE's concern at the lack of interest that this Government is showing out there. Since this Government came to power, it has reduced funding to the Tea Tree Gully TAFE in an area which is growing in population. It has reduced staffing in the Tea Tree Gully TAFE since it came to power. The member for Newland is seeking some kudos. He has been to one or two meetings of TAFE. If he goes back through the record, he will find that I have probably attended 10 to 20 times the number of meetings that he has attended at Tea Tree Gully TAFE. As he well knows, the Tea Tree Gully TAFE Council has approached me for assistance, because the Government has continually rejected its applications for assistance. This is something that I will be addressing further. Earlier today the Tea Tree Gully TAFE Council provided me with some extremely interesting figures, which I am working on and completing. I am certain that the member for Newland will not be very proud of his Government when the full expose comes to light. He will then see exactly what the Government has not done in positive ways in an area that is growing in population.

Tea Tree Gully is one of the most rapidly growing areas of South Australia. It will have the Golden Grove development. However, the Government is reducing funding to a college of further education which has had to reduce course after course, because it can no longer provide staff, as a result a lack of funding, to take on students. I think the Government should be condemned on this one issue alone.

Last year, students commenced some courses that they expected to be able to continue for some years, but they have been chopped off this year. Students have either had to discontinue the course or to attend colleges at places like Elizabeth. One student has even had to transfer to a college as far away as O'Halloran Hill to attend the course previously provided at Tea Tree Gully. The member for Newland is laughing at me as I say that, but I tell him that because Government funding has been reduced, students cannot complete their courses at Tea Tree Gully, and I would like the fact that he was laughing to be on record.

Mr Klunder: I wouldn't laugh at you: you're not important enough to laugh at.

Mr ASHENDEN: I hope that the honourable member's laughter and his interjection will be on record because this will go back to Tea Tree Gully for constituents, including students, to read. This Government stands condemned for

what it has done in relation to the Tea Tree Gully TAFE college.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs Appleby): Order! The honourable member is getting a little carried away. Will he please get back to what he was talking about originally.

Mr ASHENDEN: Thank you, Acting Speaker. This is a financial Bill and this is a totally dishonest Government that was elected on the statement that it would do more for education than the previous Government was doing. Yet, in my district, primary and secondary schools cannot maintain their services. Their maintenance funding has been reduced. We also have a TAFE college that is getting less funding not only in real terms but in actual dollar terms, despite what the Minister of Education has said in letters to the college. Despite the reduction in funding, this college is trying to provide education for a growing population.

In the District of Todd, we also have, unfortunately for the residents in the Hills area, rich deposits of clay used for the manufacture of bricks for building homes, and there are in the area some clay mines. A company has applied to open a new clay mine in the area and, against the wishes of, and despite strong protests from, local residents, the present Minister of Mines and the Minister for Environment and Planning gave permission for clay mining to proceed, even though the mine is next door to a residential area. I have written to the Minister for Environment and Planning because permission was given for mining to proceed under certain conditions that were supposed to be imposed by the Government. In fact, for mining to proceed a condition of approval was signed by the Chairman of the South Australian Planning Commission. That condition states that quarry vehicles full or empty shall not travel on Range Road South.

Despite this condition, residents have told me that about every 10 minutes a quarry truck now travels along Range Road South. Originally, residents contacted the Minister's office to tell him what was going on, pointing out that a condition of approval by the Minister was that no vehicle would be allowed to travel on that road. The departmental officer, whom I shall not name although I have been given his name, said that he was terribly sorry but that no action was intended to stop the operation of quarry trucks, despite the condition of approval signed by the Chairman of the Planning Commission. One of my constituents also has a letter from the Commission, which states:

I understand that some unladen trucks return to the present quarry along Range Road South. The proponent [the mining company] has indicated that this practice would not be continued should they obtain approval to work the subject land.

Approval has been given, yet these trucks use that road. This is the same area where residents have been so let down by the Government in relation to their water supply. This Government refuses to spend just \$40 000 to \$50 000 to provide an auxiliary diesel motor that would enable water to be supplied to this area in the event of power failure. I have previously pointed out to this House that the Electricity Trust will cut off the supply of electricity to any area threatened by bush fire so, even when a fire threatens Houghton properties, the power will be turned off, the pumps will not operate, and no water will be available for my constituents. The Minister of Water Resources has said that he will not spend money in that way. In this and many other ways Hills residents consider, as so many of my constituents consider, that they have been let down by this Government and that it cannot be trusted.

Also in the Houghton area an approach has been made to the Minister of Water Resources concerning the actions of employees of the E & WS Department. When the header tanks at Houghton were drained incorrectly, too much water was let go too quickly and swept down a couple of gullies to cause great damage to the properties of at least two of

my constituents. In one case a driveway was washed away and in the other a dam was filled with silt, and also causing considerable damage to plants on the property. The damage in both cases has been inspected by officers of the Department. My constituents have made representations to the Department and I have made representations on their behalf to the Minister, but the application seeking that compensation for the damage caused by the run-off that could have been stopped, because my constituents went straight to the officers who were controlling the flow of water and told them what was happening and asked them to turn off the taps was refused. The officers refused to turn off the flow, yet despite the damage done and seen to be done, this Government has provided no financial compensation for those residents.

I use the examples of primary and high schools in my district that are in desperate straits because of the lack of assistance in respect of maintenance, and I have referred to the Tea Tree Gully TAFE College. In respect of the latter, I have more than 20 letters from students of the college, some unemployed who are trying to acquire qualifications for employment, others who are in employment but who need additional qualifications for promotion, and others who on their own initiative are taking courses purely and simply because of their interest in the subject. These students have written to me because the courses they were undertaking in 1983 have been stopped in 1984. Already, more than one staff member has been removed from the college this year, and I have been told only today that another is to go.

It seems that the Government has a deliberate plan to wind down the operation of that college so far that it will be completely ineffectual, and then the Government can say that there is no point in continuing it. If that is the case, it is a disgrace. I believe that it is the smallest college in the metropolitan area, if not in South Australia, and it is serving one of our largest metropolitan districts. If anyone can explain the logic of that to me, I shall listen. In my district there are 25 educational institutions, which indicates the great number of children in the area whose parents are concerned about the lack of priority that this Government is giving to education. In 1982 education was a subject about which honourable members had much to say. In my district, there was a Labor campaign organised through the South Australian Institute of Teachers, and I was approached at the time by parents who considered that the Labor Opposition was offering much more than the then Liberal Government was offering.

Most of those parents have come back to me now. The chickens have come home to roost, because they have pointed out to me that they feel absolutely let down and deceived. They have found that in their schools they do not have more teachers for the children there, they have less funding in relation to maintenance needs, and they have more problems than they had in the 1979-82 period. They ask why this Government cannot get its priorities right. All I can say to them is that I have taken up case after case with this Government. I have written to many Ministers seeking assistance for schools or other institutions or other persons within my electorate. No matter how firmly based upon fact my requests have been, they are almost invariably rejected. This is being noticed by the people out there. I would point out, as the member for Coles has done, that I support the Bill with considerable reservations because I see nothing in it that is going to provide the relief so desperately needed in so many of the areas in the electorate of Todd.

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I support the Bill tonight but, like the member for Todd, I would like to make a few very general comments on how the Budget has developed and how the Government has handled itself in the first 10

months of this financial year. As we know, this Government, like the Federal Government, had the pleasure of inheriting probably the best agricultural season that we have had. Tremendous gain has come out of that. A lot of the glorification and running around by our Prime Minister can be put down to the fact that we had a good season and the fact that the Fraser Government was wise enough to implement a wage pause.

It is interesting to look at the *News* tonight and to see the headline saying, 'Inflation nosedives'. Of course it nosedives, because the Government has taken out one of its major expenses. Anyone running a business who has an overdraft of \$10 000 at the start of the year and who then decides to put all his income in and not pay anybody at the end of the year does not have any overdraft. That is exactly what the Federal Government has done by putting off the future cost of Medicare. It is a tragedy that the Australian public cannot see through this total economic fiddle being done by the Federal Government.

The same sort of thing occurs at State level where we have a Government coming in and saying we have a Budget mess. Yet when we as the Opposition ask what was the position when it took over, we cannot get the Premier to state publicly whether the position that we put to him was either correct or false. All he does is fudge it around and say he does not think he need comment on the position put forward by us in December. That is absolute nonsense. The position we put forward was either right or wrong. The sooner we get the Premier coming out and saying that, the better every one of us will be in any future economic debate.

Another thing which has been important to this State, and which has been mentioned in this Bill by the Premier, is the effect of the wage pause. Since the wage pause, we have had indexation, which the Premier says is going to cause him problems in 1984-85. Why is that? First, it is because of this massive increase in salaries, and, secondly, it is because we have had some 1 000 extra people employed by this Government in the past 10 months.

Here we have a Government that says to business, on the one hand, 'If you get into trouble you have to get yourself out by controlling your costs, by pulling your wage structure into line', and on the other hand this Government totally ignores that and increases the number of people employed. Then it says that in future there will be a problem because wage and salary costs are going up. That is an unbelievable situation, that the Government can stand off and say, 'We will put more people on and now we have a problem because our wage and salary costs have gone up.' Of course they are going up. How can one tell business to get its house in order, then run the economy in the way they think it ought to be run, which is wrong, and then make criticisms of the other side?

The Government can balance its Budget only by taking money from the private sector. That is exactly what it is doing: it is increasing taxes and charges. If we go back to that marvellous election time, the Labor Party said there would be no tax or charge increases. We now have these increases because we have 1 000 to 1 100 people in the Public Service whom we did not have in 1983. We must admit that the Government has entered into a massive exercise in public spending on housing. That is an area it needs to be congratulated on. The area of the increase in numbers in the Public Service is an area which it should have and could have controlled.

It is the private sector that pays for this. It is small business in South Australia which pays for it. Who else is there in South Australia to pay? We do not have any major industries; 95 per cent of the State is small business. What has this Government done to small business? It has increased electricity charges by 24 per cent, put up water rates by 28

per cent, increased the price of gas for those manufacturing companies using gas, and increased petrol costs. Transport costs to businesses have gone through the roof. In the hospitality industry the Government has increased the liquor tax. Finally, we have the situation now, the last and final push, where the Premier has said in this Budget that land tax is down by \$500 000 in collectable dollars but in reality businesses are paying between 400 per cent and 2 000 per cent increase in land tax. Who finally pays that? Small businesses cannot purely and simply pluck the magic dollar out of the air; they have to borrow it. More importantly, it has to be repaid. It puts people off.

This Government is taxing and charging more, and forcing businesses to put people off. The Government is taking up that slack, putting people in the Public Service, and small business and the taxpayers are paying again. It is a vicious circle: tax the small business, put the people off, employ them in the Public Service, and tax business more again to pay for services. It is about time this Government woke up to the fact that it cannot keep on bleeding the golden goose. It is about time this Government realised that small business should be given the opportunity to expand and push this State forward. Unless small business in South Australia decides to put money in and expand its opportunities, this State has no opportunity to get through to the twenty-first century.

We have the other iniquitous tax, this thing called pay-roll tax. We have seen in this Budget that the collection of pay-roll tax is about the same as it was previously, but we also have a lot of nonsense put around that lifting this exemption levy on pay-roll is a great thing for small business. That is absolute nonsense, because the majority of small businesses employ fewer than 10 people.

If a business employs fewer than 10 people it cannot possibly pay out enough salaries to reach the exemption level. So, it is absolute nonsense for this Government to say that it is doing a great thing by lifting the pay-roll tax level by such a small amount. If it is to do anything, it should do it properly and lift the pay-roll tax level. It is an iniquitous tax; it is a tax against employment and a taxation that all governments should do something about.

Workers compensation is another area of major concern for business. Recently we introduced a workers compensation package which will reduce the cost to business by about 20 per cent. We are considering further amendments which will enable it to be reduced even further. I am happy to see that the Government is recognising this as a problem area, and it will be interesting to see in the next few months what it comes up with, and whether it is interested in reducing the cost of workers compensation while still recognising that benefits have to be paid in legitimate cases. Another area of concern is the effect of the recent Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act Amendment Bill. Fortunately, some of its Draconian measures were amended in the Upper House and business will not now see some of the extra hurdles that could have been put in its way.

I refer now to education expenditure. My criticism is not on the amount of money spent but on the allocation of the dollar. In the past two or three months I have visited all public and private schools in my area, and what concerns me most is the maintenance problems in the schools. When I had the opportunity some time ago of being a candidate in another electorate the situation was exactly the same. The problem went back for many years and had not been created in the past two or three years. If one has assets one needs to look after them; if one does not look after them there will not be any assets for the future. Often fences were falling down, schoolyards were not being looked after, rooms had not been painted for 10 to 15 years, and that sort of nonsense should not be going on in any Government area.

It is of concern that we are not maintaining the assets which will be used well into the future in the public sector and, as most of our children go through the public sector education area and a massive sum of money is spent on education, surely we ought to be able to look at properly maintaining the grounds that our schools occupy.

It is ridiculous to ask the parents and friends bodies to raise funds to look after the schoolyards and to repave them. What happens in the disadvantaged areas? It cannot be done. The children in my electorate are fortunate in that their parents are in a reasonably affluent position to afford to put money into paving yards, but they are being asked not only to pave yards and fund fencing, but also to provide money for building recreation facilities as well. What is going on? It is absolute nonsense that this should happen.

Mr Hamilton: You're talking nonsense when you don't recognise the seven years your lot was in power federally, and the allocation to the States.

Mr INGERSON: Surely the honourable member is not telling me that it is also not a State problem. There is no question that it is a Federal problem but it is also a State problem. The Minister tonight talked on television about how good it was to see computers in schools, but the parents of the children had paid for them. In the area where I lived for 20 years, parents cannot afford to put computers into schools, and in my own area the parents cannot do that when they are expected to provide money for schoolyards and recreation buildings. There must be a better allocation of the education dollar in this area of technology. We have the Minister telling us how important it is to have a recognition of the technological development needed for the future of this country.

Mr Hamilton: What sort of a Budget would you put up? You tell us.

Mr INGERSON: I say that it needs to be reallocated. Instead of allocating so much money for teachers, why is not more money put—

Mr Hamilton: Tell us how you would reallocate it, in specific terms: we are open to suggestions.

Mr INGERSON: Why is not more money put into the area of maintenance and the provision of computers for schools instead of putting on teachers? Why is the dollar not reallocated? The Government grandstands on the need for us to upgrade and bring ourselves into the twenty-first century, with more technology and more skills for our children, but the Government is asking the parents to put up the money for the computers. It is about time the Government reallocated its dollar and recognised that this is its major responsibility.

Regarding our future problems, page 11 of the Budget papers states:

The Government inherited an extremely difficult situation at the end of 1982 and has had to take some very unpopular actions to ensure that the difficulties did not overwhelm the State. As I have stressed before, to not act as we did would have been grossly irresponsible. The State still faces major financial problems.

As I have outlined, those major problems are principally ones of salaries and wages. The major cause of that problem is indexation and flow-ons in the wage and salary area over and above indexation. There have been catch-ups in the Public Service. If one recognises indexation, the need to have a prices and income accord is an important factor; one cannot continue to put on people and keep on knocking off the private sector to fund that Budget. It is about time that this Government recognised that it cannot have its cake and eat it, too. If it expects the private sector to continue to be taxed and wound down, it will very quickly have to reduce some of its fanciful budgeting.

Mr RODDA (Victoria): When we discuss money, some of us shrink into our shells. A large proportion of members in this House from both sides have had academic training in economics, but I sometimes wonder whether it is backed up by practical experience in the field of spending money. I remember the late Sir Thomas Playford saying that one could know something about academic economics but that practical economics meant that anyone who spent more than he or she had and continued to do so would end up in a lot of trouble. That probably still holds true. My business is in the rural area and if my productivity provides less than the dues I must meet throughout the year I have someone like a banker who wants to talk with me. He expects certain arrangements to be made to cover that contingency. Over the years, especially when I was establishing myself, I found that one of my biggest outgoings was interest payments. I suppose that, although affairs of State or the nation are much wider, basically they vary very little from one's own affairs.

I found the Premier's document interesting, as I think are all Budget speeches or speeches concerning supplementary funding and authorisation for the Treasurer to draw the cheques to keep the State afloat until the Budget is passed later in the year. At page 3773 of *Hansard*, the Premier said:

On present information, the Government would be able to manage its financial affairs comfortably for the remainder of the year and would have no appropriation problems unless there were a quite extraordinary event—for example, another major natural disaster before 30 June. Technically then, I believe that Supplementary Estimates are not necessary. However, there have been benefits to Parliament in having the opportunity for the kind of debate about financial matters which occurs when Supplementary Estimates and an Appropriation Bill are introduced.

That is very true. We have this discourse from either side of the House and of course, it is the Opposition's role to have a go, as it were. I do not know how practical other members are, but I can say that in the evening of my career perhaps we are not being terribly practical. Although I have spent most of my time in Opposition, I have had the privilege of being in Government. One is not surprised to hear some learned opinions outside the House from people wondering what the devil we are talking about when we make such criticisms. Irrespective of the colour of the Government, one is looking at the same cows eating the same grass. Over the years I do not think the cows are any better or worse but the grass varies. We are dealing with an investment of capital available to the Government. Wise investment produces what I call green grass, and all Governments aim for that. The Premier's statement is interesting: on present information he does not see the situation as being bad. I could launch into a tirade, but I will not do that. The Premier talks about recurrent activities at page 3774:

As to recurrent activities, receipts seem likely to increase by about \$23 million and recurrent payments—

he must be talking about capital, and the figures are interesting—

by about \$20 million. About \$4 million of the increase on each side of the Budget is of items which more or less balance—including such things as additional receipts from the Commonwealth which have to be spent on specific programmes, recharges between departments for services, and so on. Thus, the increases to be explained otherwise are of the order of \$19 million for receipts and \$16 million for payments.

We do know, of course, that there is Commonwealth input in the form of grants that help the State along. The other night we were talking about local government, and we were asking local government to do more. In 1973 or 1974 the then Prime Minister, the Hon. Gough Whitlam, included local government in the collection of taxation and tax sharing from the Commonwealth. It was understood by many people

that he intended it to be in the order of 5 per cent, which it has never reached.

If local government has funds available to it, it can use them sensibly because it is close to local activity. That would take much pressure off Government. In this State we have some 135 local governing bodies. The Federal moneys are disbursed by the Grants Commission, but this does little more than scratch the surface. However, if the 5 per cent talked about in 1973 were appropriated to local government it would greatly assist in building and maintaining district roads. For instance, the Lock-Elliston Road I knew in my youth was a disaster, and is still a horror stretch about which the member for Flinders talks. Unless some funding is made available to the local council concerned, we will never see an improvement in that road. I stand to be corrected, but I think that a subvention of 5 per cent was mentioned. This would be a practical way of putting money in the hands of people who are on the spot to supervise certain works and assess priorities. Those matters should be looked at.

Even here in far off Adelaide, the moneys made available to Government can do little more than patch up soft spots. We do very well but we cannot reach out into those areas. If the Commonwealth and State could not afford 5 per cent for local government, which as I have said is close to the people, this country will not be as great as we believe it should be.

My colleague the member for Bragg talked about unemployment benefits being paid to people. Unions hold grave fears about this matter. Unfortunately, some people who live in my district have not been able to get work, and they receive unemployment benefits. They have told me that they feel embarrassed taking funds to live on in this way. They would very much like to do something for the community. I think that the third largest area of expenditure by the Commonwealth Government involves the disbursement of unemployment benefits. It would be good if something could be done in this area without impinging on jobs of those who are employed. However, I know it greatly concerns the union movement. If this problem was properly addressed it would greatly benefit all communities and the nation as a whole.

This is a matter that requires more than lip service. I wrote to the Minister of Transport today about another problem that has arisen in my electorate in relation to roadworks required at Bordertown. Those in the region that I represent are grateful for the roadworks being undertaken as part of the Australian Bicentennial Road Development programme. I refer in particular to access roads in the Bordertown area. Bordertown is the first major town through which visitors travel when coming to South Australia from Victoria. It is the town from which travellers embark on visits to the South-East, the Green Triangle, or the Riverland. There are two major motels in Bordertown.

I am pleased that the Minister of Tourism has come into the Chamber, because this is a matter that would be close to his heart. The problem arises in regard to the existing roads servicing two motels which are 34-bed units and they are the jump-off point in regard to exits. The exits are a kilometre apart, although immediately adjacent to the motels. The exit on the Adelaide side is in the vicinity of the Pizza Hut, which is obviously an excellent food place because there are often literally 50 or 60 or 100 transports parked on the side of the road (there are no parking facilities for them). The motels attract many overnight travellers and visitors, and the roads are causing concern. It is a matter that the department must look at.

The area generates money, and I refer, for instance, to Clayton's farm. That is an old farm. The Australian artist Joliffe goes there annually and derives a lot of inspiration

for his cartoons which are seen nationally and internationally and which give so much pleasure to people. Clayton's farm is becoming a part of rural history. There are other scenic places around the district, like Poocha Swamp, which is being developed for its wildlife attractions. There are many places like that. These places provide the bread and butter to local residents and cover the matter to which the Premier referred in talking about increasing receipts.

I am pleased that the Minister of Tourism is in the Chamber. I forwarded a letter to him also today. I hope we will be able to reach some sort of agreement on matters that I raised. I know that engineers are not very happy about politicians making certain remarks; they are not rude remarks but are pertinent and practical remarks concerning the placement of roads. It is one thing to ensure that transports can travel from capital city to capital city expeditiously and perhaps at high speed, but the stopping places along the way must also be considered. Time is getting on and I believe that some agreements have been made about completing this debate by tomorrow, and so I conclude by indicating my support for the Bill. I always have pleasure in supporting a Budget debate, irrespective of which Party is occupying the Treasury benches.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN (Davenport): In this debate we are dealing with Supplementary Estimates, and I think it is most appropriate that I draw to the attention of members of the House certain matters which I believe the Government must consider in regard to additional funds. I wish to raise three specific matters, and I refer first to land tax and the effect that its imposition is having on small businesses. There is no doubt that land tax is having an almost crippling effect on many small businesses. No adjustment to the rate in the dollar of land tax has been made since 1977. The last significant inflation in land values incurred in 1970, at which time, due to pressure from small business communities, the Dunstan Government found it necessary to adjust the rate in the dollar for land tax applied in successive years. The rate was readjusted in 1975, 1976, and again in 1977. It has not been adjusted since then.

In 1983 a sharp escalation in land values throughout the State occurred and is now continuing. This sudden jump in land values is causing a significant jump in land tax. Of course, it is a progressive tax: if land value increases by 20 per cent, the amount of land tax is likely to rise by 30 per cent, which is exactly what has occurred. Although many businesses on which land tax is imposed might be owned by very large developers, the cost of land tax is passed on to tenants who occupy large shopping centres, for example. Ultimately it is the small business people who have to pay the cost of increased land tax. I shall cite some examples of the size of the increase.

I have some figures before me which indicate an increase in land tax of 138 per cent paid this year by a property owner, as compared to that paid in 1982-83. This relates to a large shopping centre in the Burnside area. The land tax escalated from \$18 891 in 1982-83 to \$44 922 in 1983-84—a rise of 138 per cent. One small manufacturer has seen a rise in his land tax from \$257 in 1973 to \$4 865 in 1983, representing an increase of 1 793 per cent in that 10-year period. That is a staggering increase, to say the least. In the last year alone the land tax payable to the State Government on that property by that small manufacturer has increased by 25 per cent, whereas the inflation rate for the same period was only 9.1 per cent.

I want to insert in *Hansard* a table giving details of land tax payable by that small manufacturer, Symons and Symons Pty Ltd, who are glass merchants, mirror specialists and who provide glass display systems and complete shop fittings.

I highlight this case because this is a South Australian manufacturer who is now finding it extremely difficult to compete against substantial interstate companies which have attempted to move in and take over the aspects of glass manufacture in South Australia. Of course, the material is not actually produced here in South Australia: the large manufacturers from interstate merely ship in the final product from interstate. If the Government has any regard whatsoever for local manufacturing in South Australia, if should do something about some of these enormous impositions, such as land tax, on small businesses. I seek leave of the House to have inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it a table showing the escalation in land tax paid by the company to which I referred between 1973 and 1984, with the assurance that the information is purely statistical.

Leave granted.

LAND TAX

Year	Due date	Site value	Amount	Increase
		\$	\$	%
1973-74	6.12.73	Not given	257.71	—
1974-75	14.11.74	" "	1 092.60	324
1975-76	13.11.75	" "	1 343.10	23
1976-77	2.12.76	" "	1 593.98	19
1977-78	1.12.77	" "	1 703.75	7
1978-79	17.11.78	" "	2 570.58	51
1979-80	14.12.79	" "	2 660.00	4
1980-81	19.12.80	" "	2 905.00	9.5
1981-82	18.12.81	" "	3 640.00	25
1982-83	17.12.82	200 000	3 885.00	7
1983-84	16.12.83	290 000	4 865.00	25

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Those are just two cases, but I would also like to briefly quote to the House other cases. I have another case before me involving a particular property where the land tax in 1982-83 was \$10 469 and in 1983-84 it was \$15 081, a rise of 44 per cent for the year. I then had a letter from the Building Owners and Managers Association of Australia, which association in fact wrote to the Premier and had taken up this issue with the Premier. The letter from Mr Whittington, who is the Executive Director of BOMA, highlights the enormous escalation in land taxes that have occurred in the past few years. He attaches a number of examples, and I would like to just quickly read to the House details of some of them. For a place in Rundle Mall land tax rose from \$33 635 last year to \$42 473 this year, an increase of 26 per cent. For another property in Rundle Mall there was an increase of 27 per cent from \$108 000 last year to \$137 410 this year.

For a third property in the Rundle Mall the tax has gone from \$76 160 to \$100 660, an increase of 32 per cent, and in another case in Rundle Mall the increase has been 27 per cent. There is a further example in Austin Street where the increase in land tax has been 55 per cent. I think that highlights the problem, because I have given a fair range of examples not only in my own electorate, but in the City of Adelaide also. It highlights that, across the board, the increase seems to be at least an average of 25 per cent to 30 per cent, with some cases being as high as 50 per cent and, as I pointed out, one case being as high as 138 per cent.

I raised this matter with the Premier. I wrote to him earlier this year and was extremely disappointed in the type of response that I received. I pointed out that a number of small businesses had complained to me recently about the huge increase in land tax which had been imposed upon them especially during 1983-84. In that letter I said:

These increases in land tax are now causing extreme financial hardship. To highlight the extent of that hardship I quote the following examples.

I quoted a number of the examples I have already given to the House this evening, and went on to say:

Another example is a large shopping centre in the Burnside area. The land tax increased from \$18 891 in 1982-83 to \$44 922 in 1983-84, an increase of 138 per cent in one year. Under the normal lease agreement, the small retailers who occupy this shopping centre are required to pay this account and so meet this increase. No such increase can be morally justified.

Small businesses have complained that land tax, together with pay-roll tax, workers compensation premiums, and increases in electricity and water charges, are crippling small businesses and removing their incentive to employ more people, or to even continue present employment levels.

I ask that your Government completely abolish land tax. Land tax on the principal place of residence and on rural properties has been abolished by previous Governments. Failing your willingness to do this, you should introduce legislation to reduce the tax rate in the dollar and to make it retrospective to 1 July 1983. Again, previous Governments have made such a reduction, especially during periods of escalating property values.

Your prompt action on this is necessary to provide the assistance to small businesses that you promised prior to the election.

The response I received from the Premier, as I said, was very disappointing. It was largely a political response and really indicated that the Premier had little or no concern whatsoever for the plight that small business people faced. I would like to quote briefly from that letter, which states:

Thank you for your letter of 1 February 1984 concerning increases in land tax.

You would be aware that land tax is based on valuations of property prepared by the Valuer-General. If a taxpayer disagrees with the value attributed to his property, there is an objection procedure laid down whereby he may seek to have the valuation altered.

Your letter does not indicate whether the owners of the properties in question disagree with the valuations made by the Valuer-General. If they do not, I suggest your argument that the increases in land tax cannot be 'morally justified' is ill-conceived.

The Premier has completely ignored the point that I made. In fact, his letter almost suggests that he does not even understand the procedure by which land tax is imposed in South Australia. If that is the case it is an acute embarrassment to any member of Parliament to have the Premier and Treasurer of this State not understanding the procedure of land tax.

Therefore, I again take the issue up in the forum of this Parliament and ask the Premier to introduce immediately legislation to ensure that the rate in the dollar for land tax is adjusted to take account of the escalation in land values. I lay down a challenge tonight that the Premier must do something about the land tax situation, at least for the next financial year of 1984-85. I personally believe that he should have done something in 1983-84, and I highlight to him, although there is a lot of talk of economic recovery in Australia and in South Australia, that recovery is very isolated. It basically boils down to the rural industries and the flow-on effects of rural industries and, therefore, a select few manufacturers, and to the housing industry.

It has occurred in the housing industry through artificial Government stimulation. I am not decrying that, but again it is very limited and there has been no general recovery throughout the manufacturing sector, which is the largest employer of people in this State. Until the Premier realises that and hands out some tax concessions or reduces the tax burden he is currently imposing upon the small business person and other manufacturers in this State, that investment in new plant, new equipment and new products will not occur and there will not be a general economic recovery throughout this State. I again ask and in fact challenge the Premier to introduce legislation some time this year, to take effect from 1 July 1984, to ensure that the tax rate in the dollar for land tax is adjusted, if he has not the courage and good economic management to ensure that it is entirely removed. I would ask the Premier, in responding to this debate, to take up that challenge and at least to respond to it and to take it up on the basis that he understands the

crucial issue involved and makes sure that he gives a response on that.

The second issue I wish to raise relates to what I think should be a Government priority in terms of spending money on a highways or transport problem. It relates specifically to the intersection of National Highway 1 and the road leading from Port Pirie. I am delighted that the member for Stuart is in the House and, if he would just give his attention for one moment instead of smiling and talking to another member, I wish to talk about the tragedy that occurred at this intersection at Easter time. I am still disappointed that, despite the fact this tragedy occurred I understand in the electorate of the member for Stuart, he is taking no interest in the particular point involved and that it is time the Highways Department, and particularly the Minister of Transport, did something about improving that intersection. Why has not action been taken by the Government?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: You're about tenth in line—

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: If I am tenth in line, why has action not been taken by the Government? I call for the Government to act immediately. I draw to the attention of the House a letter that was sent by the Mayor of Port Pirie (Mr Bill Jones) to the Minister of Transport, which states:

I wish to draw your attention to a serious traffic hazard that exists at the intersection of National Highway One and the road leading into Port Pirie about 6 km east of Port Pirie. This was the scene of a triple fatality on Easter Sunday when a car was involved in a collision with a semi-trailer. Since the intersection was established some years ago it has been the scene of a number of fatal accidents, and the number of times that I have traversed it I must say I never felt comfortable because of its dangerous nature. I know my concern is shared by many motorists. May I suggest that your officers hold an urgent investigation into means of relieving the danger that exists, and may I further suggest that consideration be given to the installation of traffic lights or a roundabout at this intersection. I await with interest your comments.

I have also received a letter from the driver of the semi-trailer involved. It is a long letter and I will not read it. The letter is sensitive and emotional in tone, and I can only imagine the turmoil that that man has gone through having been involved in such a tragic accident. I understand, however, that the driver of the semi-trailer was in no way negligent: the major contributing factor to the collision was probably the nature of the intersection. The point I make for the Minister of Transport (and I am delighted that the member for Stuart has now had the courtesy to take an interest in this matter) is that the Minister of Transport must give a high priority to removing the traffic danger at that intersection by allocating money as soon as possible to ensure that action is taken to restructure that intersection immediately. I understand that several fatal accidents have occurred there.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: How many?

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: The Mayor, who would know, says that several fatal accidents have occurred there.

Mr Hamilton: When?

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Over the past 15 years.

Mr Hamilton: When was it last upgraded? You don't know.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I point out to the honourable member, who is interjecting out of his seat, that I would have expected that any responsible member would support the case for restructuring that intersection. I have spoken to several people who regularly use that intersection and they all say that, because of its nature and the curve of the roads coming in from both sides, it is extremely difficult to judge the speed of approaching vehicles. It is unfortunate that, although it is known that dangerous intersections exist, it seems that the Highways Department will not take appropriate action and spend money to ensure that restructuring

proceeds so as to remove the driving hazard as soon as possible. I am glad that honourable members opposite, including the member for Ascot Park, have been interjecting.

Ms Lenehan: He isn't even in the House.

Mr Hamilton: You're wrong; it was the member for Albert Park.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I was wrong; it was the member for Albert Park who interjected. I point out that this year the funds allocated by the State Government for construction and maintenance of roads have declined in real terms, even though the State Government has imposed an extra 1 cent a litre fuel tax. That additional revenue has been creamed off and taken away from the Highways Fund and put into the general revenue of the State to prop up the results of this Government's failing economic mismanagement. It is a travesty of justice for road users that our roads are in such a deteriorating condition and that the Government gives such a low priority to road safety, maintenance and construction. It is also deplorable that the Government is willing to see less money from the Highways Fund being spent on roads than the amount required to maintain them in safety. Indeed, this afternoon a Bill was introduced whereby the Minister of Transport will cream off even further money so that it can be allocated for purposes other than road maintenance and construction. That is the dilemma we face as a result of the actions of this Government, which is slowly strangling our road system.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Your remarks about me earlier were unnecessary. When you referred to me, I was talking to the member for Flinders about an important matter and you started a personal attack by saying I was not listening.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: The honourable Minister was sitting in his seat with a smile on his face that I could clearly see, although the subject to which I was referring is an important one in his own district. It is a pity that the Minister does not take up such issues to see that the hazard at this intersection is removed. I call on the Minister of Transport to have a report prepared immediately on this intersection, so that members may see the number and nature of the accidents that have occurred there. I call for that report to be tabled in this House as soon as possible. If that cannot be done this session, it should be done on the first day of the new session later this year.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: In the meantime, while you grandstand I shall be doing some work.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I hope that the Government is doing some work and immediately allocating funds to remedy this defect. If the Government does not do that, I shall take up this matter as soon as Parliament resumes next session to see what, if anything, has been done. In conclusion, I refer to the warning of the truckdriver in his letter, as follows:

After speaking with local people, it has been the scene of many bad accidents and another horror smash is a real possibility for as long as the current layout remains.

What will it be next time? A family of six or a school bus? For the sake of the people of Port Pirie, I call on the Minister of Transport to ensure that funds for the restructuring of that intersection are allocated as a matter of priority.

I now turn to the matter of the supply of water in my district. This is a fundamental issue, because all people, especially those in the metropolitan area, should be able to expect an adequate supply of good quality water. In this respect, I have three problems in my district. The first concerns inadequate water pressure and supply at Mount Osmond. This inadequacy no doubt contributed to the loss of some homes in the area on Ash Wednesday last year, although I realise that the Minister of Water Resources challenged that claim when I first made it. However, the tanks at Mount Osmond ran dry quickly on Ash Wednesday

because the pump at the bottom of the hill had broken down. I give the Minister full credit that, after reading letters on the subject and receiving a deputation that was introduced by me, we have eventually had some action: at least, a monitoring device has been installed on the pumps at Beaumont to ensure that, when they break down, an alarm sounds immediately so that action can be taken.

Before that there was no warning that the pumps had broken down until the supply at Mount Osmond ran out. Invariably, it was then far too late, particularly on a dangerous day, which is the very sort of circumstance when the breakdown of pumps has tended to occur. I give the Minister full credit for installing the monitoring device so quickly. The Minister wrote to me on 28 March and said that expenditure of \$110 000 would be required to make sure that the water pressure in the whole of the area could be upgraded.

I highlight to the House that the existing water pressure is so poor that some people are virtually unable to turn on a tap and obtain a reasonable flow of water at the height of summer. I am disappointed that funds have not been allocated to enable this work to be carried out, because I believe that it is work of the highest priority, and it should be carried out before next summer. Although it is not included in the Supplementary Estimates, I ask the Minister of Water Resources to make sure that provision is made in the 1984-85 expenditure and that the work is undertaken before September or October of this year. Unless that work is carried out, the members of this House can be well and truly assured that I will take up the issue again when the Budget is debated later this year.

The second item on water in my area relates to the very poor water pressure that exists at Belair. There is no doubt that Belair has probably the worst fire hazard in the whole State. The fire hazard that Belair faces in terms of potential loss of property and lives is increased because of the low water pressure, particularly along Sheoak Road. I again commend the Minister for having taken up this issue. Perhaps the Minister is tough, but I find that I have to argue with him, both publicly and through letters, to get him to even acknowledge that the point I am making is correct. The Minister has now acknowledged that and said that two stages of work need to be carried out.

The first stage will immediately restore the existing supply to departmental standards. I commend the Minister for allocating \$78 000 in this financial year for that work to be carried out. The second stage will improve the scheme and to account for ultimate development of the area. The total cost of both schemes is \$345 000. I hope that the Minister will make sure that that money is allocated in the not too distant future, because I am sure that the development of the area will proceed at a fairly rapid rate. I stress again that I appreciate the fact that the Minister has allocated the initial \$78 000 for the laying of 844 metres of 150 millimetre main along Sheoak Road.

The final area concerning water in the area relates to Upper Sturt. Some years ago when water was laid on along Upper Sturt Road, it was only for about half the distance. I think that Ash Wednesday highlighted the need to make sure that reticulated water can be supplied wherever possible. This scheme comes under what is called deferred works with uneconomic schemes. I realise that the scheme will not supply or return the 15 per cent return on capital investment involved, but I ask the Minister to reconsider, particularly because of the location and because of the fire risk those people also face, and to make sure that that work proceeds as quickly as possible. The Minister is asking individual householders to pay \$4 575 up front capital to allow that work to proceed. I believe that that is an unfair

restriction, and I ask the Minister to amend his policy so that a more justifiable policy can be adopted.

Mr BLACKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

CITRUS INDUSTRY ORGANIZATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Education): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill to amend the Citrus Industry Organization Act, 1965, effects two changes to the principal Act. The first change relates to the name of the Committee established under the Act called the 'Citrus Organization Committee of South Australia'. That body's name is changed to 'The Citrus Board of South Australia'. The second change is to increase from 100 to 200 the minimum number for a petition under section 36 of the Act.

Both changes were amongst the recommendations of the Report of the Committee of Inquiry into Citrus Marketing in South Australia released in 1979. The recommendations were considered by the various sectors of the industry at the time. The change in name is desirable to better reflect the Committee's functions and to identify both the name of the State and that of the industry in a simple and direct way. It also brings the name into line with sister organisations interstate and with similar agricultural boards within South Australia, for example, The South Australian Potato Board or the South Australian Egg Board. There is support from the industry itself for the name change.

Under section 36 of the principal Act, where not less than 100 growers petition the Minister requesting that a poll be taken on the question whether the Act shall continue in operation, such a poll must be held. The case for increasing the minimum number of growers for a petition from 100 to 200 rests with the fact that with an industry so compact in its geographical location, the ability of only 100 growers to demand a poll has in the past generated an atmosphere of uncertainty and conflict within the industry. This can have serious implications for marketing arrangements. There is general agreement within the industry that the number should be increased.

Both amendments the subject of this Bill are supported by the Citrus Organization Committee of South Australia. The industry has been consulted and is agreeable to the provisions of this measure.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 3 of the principal Act which is the arrangement provision. The amendment reflects the changes in the headings to the principal Act effected by the Bill. Clause 3 amends section 5 of the principal Act. References to the word 'Committee' are struck out and references to 'Board' are substituted. A new definition of 'the Board' is inserted (being the Citrus Board of South Australia continued in existence under section 8) and the definition of 'the Committee' is struck out.

Clause 4 amends section 6 of the principal Act. References to 'Committee' are changed to 'Board'. Clause 5 strikes out the heading to Part II of the principal Act and substitutes a new heading:

PART II

THE CITRUS BOARD OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Clause 6 strikes out the heading to Division I of Part II of the principal Act and substitutes a new heading:

Division I—The Board

Clause 7 amends section 8 of the principal Act. Subsection (1) is struck out and a new subsection substituted, which provides that the corporation known as 'The Citrus Organization Committee of South Australia' shall continue in existence under the name 'Citrus Board of South Australia' and the change of name shall not affect the corporation's rights or obligations. The references in other parts of the section to 'Committee' are changed to 'Board'.

Clause 8 amends section 9 of the principal Act. Subsection (1), which is now obsolete, is struck out. The references in other parts of the section to 'Committee' are changed to 'Board'. Clause 9 amends section 11 of the principal Act. Subsection (1), which is now obsolete, is struck out, and a consequential amendment is made to subsection (1a). The references in other parts of the section to 'Committee' are changed to 'Board'. Clause 10 amends section 12 of the principal Act. References to 'Committee' are changed to 'Board'. Clause 11 amends section 13 of the principal Act. References to 'Committee' are changed to 'Board'. Clause 12 amends section 15 of the principal Act. References to 'Committee' are changed to 'Board'.

Clause 13 amends section 16 of the principal Act. The reference to 'Committee' is changed to 'Board'. Clause 14 amends section 17 of the principal Act. Reference to 'Committee' are changed to 'Board'. Clause 15 amends section 18 of the principal Act. References to 'Committee' are changed to 'Board'. Clause 16 amends section 19 of the principal Act. References to 'Committee' are changed to 'Board'. Clause 17 amends the heading to Division II of Part II of the principal Act. The word 'COMMITTEE' is struck out and the word 'BOARD' is substituted. Clause 18 amends section 20 of the principal Act. References to 'Committee' are changed to 'Board'. Clause 19 amends section 21 of the principal Act. References to 'Committee' are changed to 'Board'. Clause 20 amends section 22 of the principal Act. References to 'Committee' are changed to 'Board'.

Clause 21 amends section 23 of the principal Act. Subsection (7), which is now obsolete, is struck out. The references in the other parts of the section to 'Committee' are changed to 'Board'. Clause 22 amends section 23a of the principal Act. References to 'Committee' are changed to 'Board'. Clause 23 amends section 24 of the principal Act. References to 'Committee' are changed to 'Board'. Clause 24 amends section 25 of the principal Act. The reference to 'Committee' is changed to 'Board'. Clause 25 amends section 27 of the principal Act. References to 'Committee' are changed to 'Board'.

Clause 26 amends section 28 of the principal Act. References to 'Committee' are changed to 'Board'. Clause 27 amends section 30 of the principal Act. References to 'Committee' are changed to 'Board'. Clause 28 amends section 31 of the principal Act. References to 'Committee' are changed to 'Board'. Clause 29 amends section 32 of the principal Act. References to 'Committee' are changed to 'Board'. Clause 30 amends section 33 of the principal Act. References to 'Committee' are changed to 'Board'.

Clause 31 amends section 34 of the principal Act. References to 'Committee' are changed to 'Board'. Clause 32 amends section 35 of the principal Act. References to 'Committee' are changed to 'Board'. Clause 33 amends section 36 of the principal Act. The minimum number of growers required to petition the Minister to hold a poll on the question whether the principal Act should continue in operation is increased from 100 to 200. The references in other parts of the section to 'Committee' are changed to 'Board'.

Clause 34 repeals section 37 of the principal Act and substitutes new section 37. The new section provides that the Board may be wound up in accordance with Division 6 of Part XII of the Companies (South Australia) Code. The purpose of the amendment is to update the existing provision which, although of the same effect, refers to the old Companies Act, 1962. Clause 35 amends section 38 of the principal Act. A reference in subsection (1) to 'section 292 of the Companies Act, 1962-1965' is changed to 'section 441 of the Companies (South Australia) Code'. References in the section to 'Committee' are changed to 'Board'.

Mr EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

SEEDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Education): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This small Bill makes an amendment to the Seeds Act, 1979. That Act regulates the sale of seeds and this Bill is concerned with section 7 of the Act, which stipulates certain information in relation to seeds that a vendor must supply to a purchaser. Amongst other things, that section requires a person selling seeds to inform the purchaser of the proportion by mass that inert matter mixed with the seeds bears to the total mass of the seeds and the inert matter. Although inert matter is defined precisely in the regulations, it may be said to consist of broken seed which is not expected to germinate, dirt, sticks, stones, husks and other extraneous material.

However, none of the interstate legislation relating to seeds requires the proportion of inert matter to be notified and, as there is a vigorous interstate seed trade, the South Australian provision creates difficulties for producers and merchants in this State. It is considered that the requirement should be deleted from the principal Act in order to remove an unnecessary restriction upon the industry.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 7 of the principal Act by striking out paragraph (d) of subsection (3).

Mr EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

EGG INDUSTRY STABILIZATION ACT
AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Education): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill makes an amendment to the Egg Industry Stabilization Act, 1973. That Act regulates the egg industry

and requires persons who keep hens for the production of eggs for human consumption to be licensed. It is a condition of each licence that the holder not keep more than his quota of hens for a licensing season. The quota system maintains the stability of the industry in ensuring that the total State egg production is kept within manageable limits.

The quota system applies only to hens which are at least six months old and, in 1973 when the principal Act was passed, that age was a realistic guide to the age at which hens produced eggs in commercial quantities. However, as a result of research and improved breeding techniques, hens now produce eggs in such quantities at an earlier age. As a result, a significant number of hens that are capable of producing eggs in commercial quantities are not taken into account for the purposes of assessing quota under the Act. The Bill remedies this situation by amending the definitions of 'hen' and 'pullet' so that the relevant age is now twenty-two weeks, some four weeks younger than the present age of six months.

Another problem addressed by the Bill is one which arises under section 5 of the principal Act. That section provides that the Act does not apply to persons who do not own or keep more than twenty hens. Subsection (2) of that section provides that where, on a prescribed day which, by virtue of the Commonwealth Poultry Industry Levy Act 1965, occurs every fourteen days, a person is not liable to pay a levy under that Act, the principal Act does not apply to that person during that period of fourteen days. The purpose of the provision was to provide similar criteria of operation as between the State and Commonwealth legislation. Under the Commonwealth provisions, a person is not liable to pay a levy unless he kept hens, aged six months or older, for commercial purposes, and the subsection was intended to extend the latter criterion to the operation of the quota system under the State Act. However, the provision has been abused by some producers who raised an entire flock of hens of uniform age so that the flock achieves the age of six months one day after a prescribed day. Then during the next 13 days, the hens may be kept in contravention of the principal Act with immunity, and they are not taken into account for the purposes of assessing quota. The Bill remedies this situation by removing subsections (1) and (2) and providing simply that the Act does not apply except in relation to persons who own or keep more than 20 hens for commercial purposes.

These amendments have been considered in consultation with the South Australian Egg Board and the United Farmers and Stockowners of S.A. Incorporated. Both of those bodies support the measure. In summary, this Bill will substantially reduce the number of hens, capable of producing eggs in commercial quantities, kept in excess of the State hen quota, thus lessening the need to dispose of surplus eggs on unprofitable export markets. It is estimated that a saving of 8c to 10c per dozen eggs will be achieved and it is hoped that this saving will be reflected in the retail price of eggs.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 4 of the principal Act. The definition of 'hen' is amended so that that word now means a female domesticated fowl of the genus *gallus domesticus* that is not less than 22 weeks old. The definition of 'pullet' is also amended. That word now means a hen that is less than 22 weeks old. Clause 3 amends section 5 of the principal Act. Subsections (1) and (2) of that section are struck out and new subsection (1) substituted. The new subsection provides that the principal Act does not apply except in relation to persons who own or keep more than 20 hens for commercial purposes.

Mr EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

CHILDREN'S PROTECTION AND YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The question of young drug offenders has been considered as part of the whole exercise that culminated in the introduction of the Controlled Substances Bill. As honourable members will recall, that Bill specifically excluded children from the drug assessment provisions relating to simple possession offences, as it is considered that the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act provides its own alternative system for dealing with young persons charged with offences.

The Bill before the House therefore simply makes provision for the addition of a person approved by the Minister of Health to a children's aid panel that is about to deal with a child charged with a drug offence. It is also considered inadvisable to exclude cannabis offences from the panel system, as this discretion should still lie with the screening panels to decide whether a child is to be dealt with by a court or by a children's aid panel.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 provides for the inclusion of persons approved by the Minister of Health in the children's aid panel list. Clause 4 provides that where a drug offence is alleged against a child, the children's aid panel that will deal with him must be comprised of a member of the Police Force, a Community Welfare Department officer and a person approved by the Minister of Health, all chosen from the panel list. Where truancy is also alleged, the panel will have a further member chosen from the list of Education Department officers. It is made clear that it is the Director-General of the Community Welfare Department who selects the members to comprise a children's aid panel. 'Drug offence' is defined to mean an offence against the Narcotic and Psychotropic Drugs Act.

Mr EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr EVANS (Fisher): The subject about which I wish to express some concern and bring to the notice of the House tonight is that of the Old Mill and the water wheel at Bridgewater and the general area of land and buildings close to that building. I wish to point out the tourist potential and the heritage value of the area which includes the mill and other buildings.

On the piece of land which is situated adjacent to the railway line, Careys Gully Road and Mount Barker Road, is the original school built in Bridgewater in 1882, which was beautifully restored to as near as one could get it to its original state by the Stirling District Council in 1982. It is a building that displays the era of the new schools that came

to the Hills when the railway line went through in the 1880s. In pointing that out, I congratulate the council.

Immediately below that is situated the community hall which was built in 1913 and which has been the hub of much of the community activity in Bridgewater for most of the past 70 years. It still carries out that role, even though there may be other community buildings now used in Bridgewater and in other neighbouring communities which have their own facilities. Through the property where the Old Mill is located travels the Heysen Trail. All I can say about the Heysen Trail in that area is that it is a damned disgrace. It is easy for Parliament to pass legislation and give departments the opportunity to create a public facility such as a trail in memory of one of the great artists of this State. Hans Heysen, who was prominent in the Hills because of his paintings of landscape and farm life in particular, also gave a lot to the community.

In creating a path to commemorate Hans Heysen and his family, one would expect it to be kept in reasonable repair so that people could walk on it without having the discomfort of being hooked by a blackberry, boxthorn or some other form of vegetation. On a wet day it can be quite unpleasant if there is a slight drizzle. One cannot enjoy a walk without getting too wet from the odd shower or being able to shelter from the odd shower, because the plant growth overhangs the trail and one becomes saturated from the drops held by the leaves of the foliage. The steps of the Heysen Trail at the north-western side of the Old Mill are still there, but not even a goat could negotiate them because of the blackberries and other undergrowth. One has to move further up the creek 30 or 40 metres and take a very dangerous climb over a reasonably steep embankment: if one is young and fit there is no problem. However, many of the people who walk the trail or part of the trail are sneaking up in years or have slight disabilities and they find it very difficult, in fact, nigh on impossible to climb the embankment.

The cost of employing someone to go along the trail in the Bridgewater area, for instance, and clear it once a year, would be insignificant, taking into consideration the overall benefit to tourism. Bridgewater is a town which has great tourist potential. It is appreciated by many people already, but it could be appreciated even more, and the community would benefit even more if it was cared for and promoted a little more by Government departments.

I now turn to the mill itself. It is one of the great engineering feats of the mid-19th century. In 1859 Mr Dunn set out to establish his mill there. He was a great philanthropist and a milling magnate. He created employment by building the mill in Bridgewater, and he also created a lot of employment and community benefit by his efforts in Mount Barker through other milling and business interests in that area. The mill now stands at Bridgewater with one of the few water wheels in Australia. Unfortunately, it has broken spokes, half the main bearing has been stolen, the roof is dilapidated, and the building is falling into disrepair. It is only fortunate that on the last Ash Wednesday the fire did not travel through the main centre of Bridgewater, not only for the mill's sake but also for the many homes, and hence people's lives. However, had that occurred the old mill would have been destroyed, because hanging over the major part of the mill are blackberry bushes and other forms of fuel for fire.

The mill is to be sold by auction on 11 May and the Minister on behalf of the Government said that he hopes that someone in private enterprise will buy it and do something with it. The other comment by the Minister was that the Government might buy it and lease it to private enterprise. However, the building and the wheel are such that they constitute a tourist attraction and should be preserved because of their heritage value. No-one can deny that. In

about January 1981 the Minister's Department brought down a report pointing out that the engineering achievement was of significance to the State and referring to the value of the mill to the State in heritage terms. I ask the Government to say straight out that it will buy the mill. It is as important as any other part of this State, as far as heritage is concerned. If private enterprise was to turn it into a restaurant, it would have to alter the character of the building internally, if not externally, quite significantly.

The Hills Branch of the Arts Council would like to see it developed as a performing centre for the local community, and I commend that as a thought. It is one of the thoughts that can be considered, if at the same time the heritage value of the building can be preserved. The Mount Lofty Ranges Historical Society would like to see it developed as a museum to display those things that have some historical value concerning early life in the Hills, the settlers coming there and the development of the Hills over the years from farming, rural and timber pursuits to a residential and tourist area.

The mill could be made operative to crush grain and, if the Government was to lease it to private enterprise, it could bake bread and scones. Devonshire teas could be sold and it could be a real tourist attraction where people could enjoy the benefit of the historical value of the mill and surrounding areas, the school, the hall, the garden and the local hotel, which is also of some significance. People can enjoy all those things while at the same time helping to preserve the heritage of the State.

It is very easy for a Government in power to say that it believes in preserving the heritage of the State and that it wants some minority group to pay for it. The mill is so important that it should be preserved, and in fact it is the most important piece of heritage for sale in the State at the moment. The Government has the chance to prove that it is prepared to do what it said it would do before the last State election, that is, to preserve such items. I ask the Government to buy it now, because the wheel is falling to pieces.

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

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): It does not give me a great deal of joy to stand up tonight after hearing the pathetic and outrageous contribution made by the member for Davenport. He alluded to the tragedy and the death of three people on the outskirts of Port Pirie and tried to make cheap political capital in this Parliament. I am ashamed to be called a politician when there are people like him on the other side of the Parliament.

It is one of the most outrageous and despicable acts I have seen in my five years in this place. I was hoping that the member for Davenport would be here so that I could give him a Billy Graham. I have seen the tragedy of a road accident and a death within my own family, yet we have people like him, who are the lowest of the low and who want to make cheap political capital in this place, without even contacting the local member for the area or the Minister of Transport on the telephone, which he could have done quite easily.

He could have said, 'Look, Minister, I am concerned about this tragedy. I know we are on the other side of the fence, but what can I say to these people about the tragic loss within their family?' But not the member for Davenport! I understand that that intersection was upgraded. I lived in Port Pirie for 11 years. I am glad to see the member for Davenport come into the House to cop it, as indeed he should. I lived in that township, and I know that those people were pleased when that intersection was upgraded. Certainly, this has to be looked at now in the light of this

tragedy, which I believe the Minister will do. I spoke to the member for Stuart, who assures me that he has written to the Minister concerned. But not the member for Davenport, the lowest of the low, who has raised this sort of issue in this Parliament.

In the light of what has taken place that intersection should be looked at, and I believe that the Road Traffic Board, the local government authority, the police, the Minister of Transport, and the Road Safety Council will all look at it. But, did the member for Davenport contact the Minister and say that in the Parliament? Did he say that he contacted the member for that area? No. He wanted to make some cheap political capital out of someone else's tragedy. How disgusting!

To top it all off, when the Minister, the member for Stuart, was talking to the member for Flinders about a constituent's problem, as is the wont of all members on both sides, whether in Opposition or in Government (they speak to the Minister who occupies the bench), the member for Davenport implied that the member for Stuart was laughing about this matter, which is outrageous to say the least. The member for Stuart assures me that he was not laughing about it. In fact, he told me that he went to the funeral of these people. For the member for Davenport, the lowest of the low in this place, to use that to make political capital in this place, reflects on all of us, much to my dismay. Is it any wonder that people outside this place talk about politicians when we have people of his calibre and ilk raising such matters in the Parliament? I am absolutely outraged and disgusted by such a tactic.

Whilst on road safety issues, I was going to raise matters about my electorate, but last week in the press the member for Davenport made an inane statement that the Government was not doing anything in relation to road safety and tragedies on the road which caused loss of life over the Easter period. All thinking politicians would be concerned about road tragedies, not only in terms of loss of lives but families of those people and the traumas that continue long after most of us have forgotten about those accidents.

I would have thought that the member for Davenport would know about constraints on funding. Successive Governments have spent money on road traffic research. But the member for Davenport has made another cheap grandstanding gesture about road safety. What has the Government done? We will see what it has done about trying to address the road safety problem. I suggest that the member for Davenport should read the newspapers. If he had looked at the *Advertiser* of 24 April he would have seen an article headed, 'Road safety workshops plea: let public report on bad drivers'. Written by transport writer Stuart Innes, the article states:

The S.A. Government will be asked to consider citizens reporting drunk or dangerous drivers. The idea is among recommendations from specialised workshop groups that met following a Government-sponsored road safety seminar in March.

The Government is not doing anything? How stupid is this man across there who says he is shadow Minister of Transport. The article continues:

The Government organised the seminar and workshops to 'set the agenda' on what it could do to improve road safety.

The member for Davenport once again is not prepared to give recognition to what this Government is trying to do in terms of addressing the road problem. On 25 April, an article in the *Advertiser* headed, 'Tough moves on South Australian drivers likely soon', states:

Probationary drivers in South Australia may be restricted to blood-alcohol limits of .02 per cent before the end of the year as part of a State Government crackdown on road safety.

Also, the Minister is reported in the *News* on 24 April as saying that he was looking at the problem of speeding on the roads. The article states, in part:

The Transport Minister, Mr Abbott, said today he was disgusted at the toll. The Government would seriously consider reducing the maximum speed limit by 10 km/h.

The article reports the Minister's concern about the road toll. What little respect I had for the member for Davenport tonight dissipated very quickly. I hope that, when he wakes up tomorrow morning, if he has any conscience at all, he will personally apologise to the member for Stuart for his outrageous and debased statements in this Parliament—a poor reflection on his own Party, to say the least. If that is the best the Opposition can put up in terms of trying to criticise this Government I suggest that he and his colleagues will be in Opposition for many years to come.

I know that the member for Davenport is listening to what I say tonight, but his colleagues would share my view, because I believe that the majority are fair dinkum in relation to their political beliefs and would be outraged by his comments tonight. I hope that, if he has not got the guts to stand up here tomorrow and apologise, at least his colleagues will get the message through to him by saying, 'Dean, you are the lowest of the low when you try to use someone's personal tragedy to try to make cheap political capital in this Parliament.'

Mr BAKER (Mitcham): I wish to address myself to the disturbing trend in government to use surveys and committees as a means of changing people's attitudes. I mention particularly two reports recently put before this Parliament, then I will move on to the infamous survey conducted by the Minister of Health.

I have been concerned for some time about Governments using the committee and survey mechanism as a means of getting over a political opinion which is out of tune with the community at large. I can cite two reports that have been brought before this Parliament. They related to the medical area: one was the Barnes Report on the dental area, and the other concerned St John Ambulance. Both contained serious flaws, because they were undertaken by people with a certain perspective—in fact, it was a socialist perspective. The reports were presented to Parliament as having been prepared by people of excellence. In the process, of course, they were supposed to indicate to people that changes were required to the current system, but they were changes quite unacceptable to those on this side of the House, and I imagine to the populace at large.

I would hope that if reports are to be undertaken they will be undertaken competently. Both of the reports to which I refer contain many misstatements and many incorrect judgments. Their sample sizes were far too small. The dental survey involved only about 100 schoolchildren, but some views formed as a result of that survey were inconsistent with the data that was actually collected. If the Government is to spend thousands of dollars on surveys and reports I wish that at least it would get them right and obtain people who are competent to conduct surveys and run committees.

The main matter to which I wish to refer tonight concerns a topical matter, namely, the drug survey conducted last year by the Minister of Health. I want to comment on a number of matters. I think that, first, if the Government commissions a poll it should not introduce a few political questions into it, because it is the taxpayers who must pay for such a poll and, secondly, if the Government is going to include questions that do elicit a response to political questions, it should ensure that those questions do not bias the response of the people being tested. I shall run through the survey that was actually put to 1 002 respondents in

South Australia, and I will mention a number of the observations that were made as a result of that survey, which to me were quite biased in the way that the results were approached. However, I will admit that there is some very interesting data in the document of an attitudinal nature, and provided that the bias is not too great, and it is probably not to a great extent having regard to the results, there will certainly be some information obtained in relation to future educational programmes on use and abuse of drugs. However, I do not regard it as being a landmark survey, because I believe that it was biased in the way it was approached, thereby placing the whole survey at risk.

I refer to matters canvassed and the questions that people were actually asked. They were asked whether they were satisfied or dissatisfied with the running of the State Government, and for their views of the Premier in that regard, as well as of the Leader of the Opposition. They were asked which Party they intended to vote for, or, if unsure, who they were leaning towards, and who they voted for at the last election, which was stated as having been conducted in 'September of last year', although I point out that the last State election was conducted on 6 November 1982. The survey conducted by ANOP for the Minister of Health referred to that date as being September 1982—that was only three months out, but if surveys are to be conducted the questions should at least be factual.

Mr Mathwin: He always gets mixed up.

Mr BAKER: He does indeed, yes. Further questions sought to find out whether people had changed their support, and if they had done so, how certain they were of voting for a Party, thereby attempting to ascertain whether there is a chance that they will lean another way if offered the right sort of policies. Further, there were questions about whether it was considered that the Government had done any good, or whether it had not done very well at all—

Mr Mathwin: Easy to answer.

Mr BAKER: It would be very easy. I imagine that some very salutary results were obtained, which are probably down at Trades Hall or the State ALP headquarters.

Mr Mathwin: It must have hurt them.

Mr BAKER: It must have hurt them to see some of the results. In regard to the main part of the survey (and I do not disagree with the way some of these things were done), it then refers to schools and education, mineral deposits and State taxes. Of course, none of the results obtained were ever produced, so we really do not know how important they are. But, certainly the State ALP knows, because the Government paid for the survey.

Mr Mathwin: Did it?

Mr BAKER: We presume that the Government has the results and that it collected the data for some specific purpose, otherwise Mr Cameron would have a waste paper bin full of results which mean nothing. I imagine that they would have been passed on, but we cannot guarantee these things because the Minister of Health has no knowledge. The survey then asked whether it was considered that the Government had done a good job as far as drugs are concerned. I think the only thing that people had heard about drugs until that time was from the Minister of Health saying that he was going to decriminalise marihuana.

Mr Mathwin: He thought it was a good idea.

Mr BAKER: He did think it was a good idea until the public outcry occurred. The survey then asked people for their opinion on the matter. There are a few other questions in the survey, but I will not refer to all of them. It then asks, 'What do you think of the Minister of Health?', and if the person answering the survey was unaware of his name, they were told what it is. We did not get the result of that question, either. The first one and a half pages of the survey are dedicated to political questions. The ethics of the matter had already been raised in Parliament. I am saying that Governments must be accountable for the way in which they conduct surveys. Any person who has had any experience with surveys (and I certainly have had a vast experience with political and non-political surveys, and survey design and sample in a whole range of other areas at a professional level) will understand that one can bias the results before one starts by the way questions are framed and if they are not led in properly. Certainly, raising political spectrum matters can be a form of bias, and certainly, raising the name of Dr John Cornwall—who was only Mr 43 per cent in South Australia, not Mr 78 per cent—

The Hon. D.C. Brown: I think they both have an ego of about the same size.

Mr BAKER: I think that is probably right. They have obviously biased the survey, because Dr Cornwall's name evokes a certain emotion. I will not go much further, because I have only two minutes left. However, I think it is important to look at the results. The results (which have been laid on the table) indicate that the survey could be perceived as being a marihuana survey. Marihuana really dominates the results of the survey. In fact, the results have been interpreted to give the answer that was wanted, because it states quite clearly that 68 per cent of people in South Australia want harsher marihuana laws, that 22 per cent are quite happy with the laws as they are at present, with the remainder of about 10 per cent wanting lesser penalties. So, 90 per cent of South Australians said that they wanted the penalties to remain as they are or to be increased. Obviously, the Minister took account of that when he drafted the recent Bill. I simply mention that to indicate what public opinion is.

The justification is that in the results we are then told that the previous level of antagonism was about 90 per cent, thus indicating that we are getting a better understanding of the marihuana problem. I make the point that it is important to conduct surveys of this type, because I think they are important for educational purposes, but when a survey is biased, and certainly when the results are biased, when the Government is looking for support for what it is doing, then I believe that the Government is wasting money, and in fact is trying to change people's minds in a quite nefarious way. I believe that the Government has to rethink its position on this.

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

Motion carried.

At 10.30 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 2 May at 11.45 a.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 1 May 1984

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

FIREARMS

274. Mr GUNN (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. How much revenue was collected during the past financial year by the Police Department from registration of firearms and shooting licences?

2. How many officers are allocated to the administration and enforcement of the Acts and regulations relating to use of firearms?

3. Is the revenue collected meeting the financial commitments for the computer and the cost of operations relating to firearms?

4. Has the registration system had any positive effect in reducing the use of firearms?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The replies are as follows:

1. In the financial year ended 30 June 1983, \$830 000 was collected for firearms registrations and licences.

2. Eleven police members and eight public servants within the Firearms Division are principally responsible for the administration and enforcement of the firearms legislation.

3. Current fees have been determined with the objective that revenue collected cover the cost of administering and equipping the operations of the firearms control system. However, receipts are currently below expected levels.

4. The aim of the legislation is to control the possession and circulation of firearms in the community. In this regard, the system is considered to have a positive effect.

308. Mr GUNN (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. Is the Police Department satisfied with its .375 Smith and Wesson hand gun?

2. Has any evaluation of any other hand gun been carried out and, if so, by whom?

3. Does the Department intend to purchase any new firearms during the next 12 months and, if so, which firearms have been evaluated?

4. Does the Department examine the type of weapons used by other law enforcement agencies, such as the Special Air Service and various other groups?

5. Has the Department considered standardising its weapons with the type of weapons used by other police forces in Australia?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. Yes. A range of handguns was evaluated by specialist groups within the Police Department before a final decision was made.

3. Provision has been made on the financial estimates for the coming year to purchase twenty .357 calibre Smith and Wesson revolvers of a short barrel design for use by detective personnel. The decision having already been made to adopt the .357 calibre Smith and Wesson revolvers as the standard handgun for use by police personnel, no further evaluation of any other firearm has since been made or is proposed to be made before proceeding with the purchase in the coming year.

4. Yes. At the time of evaluating the type of weapon to be adopted by the Police Force, information was obtained from other Australian police forces. The handgun carried by the Special Air Service is an automatic pistol and was rejected for the reasons of operational safety.

5. The .357 Smith and Wesson is, in fact, a refinement of the .38 Smith and Wesson used by all other Australian police forces, with the exception of Tasmania. Basically, the weapons are the same, having interchangeable parts and projectiles. The .357 calibre model was selected because of its superior operational qualities.

TORRENS RIVER

335. The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: What specific mechanism has the Government established to ensure that the value of the Torrens River is recognised in any development proposals?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Development of land near the Torrens River is controlled under the Planning Act, 1982. This Act provides that all development requires the consent of the relevant planning authority unless it is permitted by the principles of development control set out in the Development Plan compiled under the Act. The Development Plan has recognised the special value of the Torrens River by providing that no development within 60 metres of the River is 'permitted'. As a result, all development near the River requires planning approval, and the merits of any proposal are considered having regard to the amenity, aesthetic appearance or scenic beauty of the Torrens River, the land within 60 metres of the River and the landscape visible from the Torrens River.

Prior to making a decision on any application for development adjacent to the River, a council is required, under the Development Control Regulations, to give public notice of proposals other than dwellings and minor development. Councils have then to consult with and have regard to the advice of the South Australian Planning Commission.

Upon receipt from a council of details of proposed development near the River, the Commission, as a matter of practice, refers such details to the River Torrens Committee for advice. This committee was established in 1964 to monitor and advise on development near the River. The committee comprises four elected members from councils adjacent to the River, and representatives of the Environment and Planning Department, the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Treasury Department and is chaired by a representative of the Highways Department. The committee is assisted by the River Torrens Improvement Standing Committee which includes representatives of riverside councils except the City of Adelaide.

Advice from the River Torrens Committee is forwarded to the Commission which then advises the council of its view on the development proposal. As a result, a council before approving any development adjacent to the Torrens River, has regard to the advice of the Commission, and through the Commission, the River Torrens Committee. In addition, the Government is proceeding with development of the Linear Park in conjunction with flood mitigation and busway works, along the Torrens River. Development of the Linear Park is based on the results of a study made to establish a complete framework for the conservation and enhancement of the River and its environs. The River Torrens Committee has particular regard to the report which resulted from that study when reaching its view on development proposals near the Torrens River.

While there is no statutory obligation on riverside councils to abide by the advice of the River Torrens Committee, experience has been that councils have ensured that the value of the Torrens River is taken into account before development proposals are granted planning approval.

STATE PARKS AND RESERVES

339. **The Hon D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning:

1. How many management plans for State parks and reserves have been completed since the Government came to office?

2. How many of those plans contain specific recommendations as to the staffing levels appropriate to the proper management of those parks and reserves?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. Ten separate park planning documents have been published. These documents provided draft or final plans of management for 17 separate reserves.

2. All of the plans contain recommendations as to appropriate staffing levels.

SOUTH-EAST HYDROLOGY

397. **The Hon. H. ALLISON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. Is there a clearly defined natural drainage system in the South-East of South Australia?

2. Is there a regional underground drainage system in the South-East and can the hydrological balance be defined in those terms and, if not, how is the balance defined and what research evidence can the Minister produce in support of his answer?

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

1. Apart from Tatiara, Nalang, Morambro, Naracoorte and Mosquito Creeks, there is not a clearly defined natural surface drainage network in the South-East Region.

2. The term a 'regional groundwater system consisting of an unconfined aquifer and an underlying confined aquifer' is now preferred to the quoted term a 'regional underground drainage system'. Its hydrological 'balance' or components can be conveniently defined as:

vertical recharge to the unconfined aquifer;
vertical leakage from the unconfined aquifer to the confined aquifer;
vertical leakage to the unconfined aquifer from the confined aquifer;
lateral inflow to the unconfined aquifer;
lateral inflow to the confined aquifer;
use and/or loss directly from the unconfined aquifer;
use and/or loss directly from the confined aquifer;
change in storage of either aquifer.

Estimates on each component are available and are based on various assessments undertaken from 1970 to 1983 by the Department of Mines and Energy, Engineering and Water Supply Department and research institutions (for example, CSIRO and Flinders University).

398. **The Hon. H. ALLISON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources: What is known of the origin of a large steady discharge from springs near the coast in the South-East or of the possibility that a considerable underground drainage system exists from which the springs emerge?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The steady discharges from springs near the coast in the lower South-East are from the unconfined aquifer (Gambier Limestone) which regionally flows toward the coast. The unconfined aquifer is mainly recharged in the area south of Mount Gambier, at an average rate between 100 mm to 200 mm per annum. Discharges observed at the coast have been measured to be near 150 000 ML/annum, further discharge of the unconfined aquifer to the sea occurs underground. The spring discharges are but a surficial reflection of the large quantities of groundwater naturally discharging out of the region.

399. **The Hon. H. ALLISON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. What is the rate of flow per day from Eight Mile Creek (in the Lower South-East) to the sea and what has been the annual rate of decline since the flow was first monitored?

2. Is the flow rate still being monitored and, if not, why not?

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

1. 190 ML/day flows from Eight Mile Creek to the sea. There has been no annual rate of decline since monitoring began in 1970.

2. Yes.

400. **The Hon. H. ALLISON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. Do swamps in the South-East lose most of their water by seepage or by evaporation and drainage?

2. Are most of these swamps in fact perched aquifers on impermeable bases of clay and/or enclosed by clay?

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

1. Detailed information on the many individual swamps and wetlands in the South-East in terms of their water balance characteristics is not available. Studies have indicated that evaporation and transpiration is a major water loss for some swamps, while seepage to groundwater and artificial drainage can be important for others.

2. Many swamps are thought to have an impermeable base and create a local perched water table on groundwater mound. However, generalisation of this phenomena to all swamps and wetland sites is not valid.

401. **The Hon. H. ALLISON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources: Have man-made drains in the South-East significantly altered the natural hydrological balance in the region, and what is the annual deficit between rainfall, and its loss by evaporation, evapo-transpiration, drainage, crop irrigation, household and factory use:

(a) in the Mount Gambier area; and

(b) in the Kingston area?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: Yes. The bulk of the estimated 140 000 ML/annum that currently drains to the sea would have previously evaporated from interdunal flats. There is no deficit.

402. **The Hon. H. ALLISON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. On an annually calculated basis does the area of Kingston (S.E.) have a deficit balance or a credit balance when rainfall and evaporation have been compared, and what is the loss or gain in litres/sq. km per annum?

2. If there is a deficit, how can recharge take place in the event of heavy additional extraction of water being permitted?

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

1. The area has a positive balance of rainfall over evapo-transpiration in the order of 150 ML sq. km per year. This positive balance occurs during the cooler high rainfall months of the year, and provides recharge to the aquifer. After infiltrating to the aquifer there is less opportunity for this recharge to be lost by evaporation. The result is a net gain of water to aquifer from rainfall.

2. Not applicable as there is a positive balance.

403. **The Hon. H. ALLISON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources: Has the possibility that water discharging from springs to the sea, east of Cape Northumberland, is old enough to have fallen before commercial afforestation took place, and that the high water usage rate of the forests will cause a significant reduction in discharge quantities over the next 30 years, been investigated and, if so, what is the result?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: Yes, the impact of afforestation on the regional groundwater resources has been investigated. The water use by forests affects the region's groundwater resources by reducing its potential recharge. Regionally speaking about 50 000 ML/annum of recharge is 'lost' to the unconfined aquifer compared to the aquifer's region recharge potential of 1 000 000 ML/annum, thus representing a 'loss' in the order of five per cent. It should be noted that the progressive conversion of native vegetation to pasture which increases recharge would have a significant compensating effect on the afforestation's depletive impact.

404. **The Hon. H. ALLISON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources: What are the sources of water for the Blue Lake, the Gambier Limestone Aquifer and the Knight Sands Aquifer, and what are the research and statistical source which support the answers?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The sources of water for the Blue Lake, Gambier Limestone and Dilwyn formation (Knight Sands) aquifer are as follows:

Blue Lake—The Blue Lake is predominantly recharged by water from the Gambier limestone aquifer (regionally known as the unconfined aquifer). The Dilwyn formation (incorporating the Knight Sands) termed as the confined aquifer may possibly contribute. Research on this matter has been mainly undertaken by the Flinders University using environmental isotope and hydrochemical techniques, and by the Department of Mines and Energy.

Gambier Limestone—The Gambier Limestone (unconfined aquifer) receives water directly from rainfall recharge over most of the region. Some inflow occurs from over the S.A.-Victorian border and from upward vertical leakage from the confined aquifer. Studies by CSIRO have generally established recharge rates using environmental tritium tracing techniques.

Dilwyn Formation—The confined aquifer (Dilwyn formation including Knight Sands) receives water from vertical leakage from the overlying unconfined aquifer where the head differential is suitable in the west of the region. Some throughflow from over the S.A.-Victorian border also occurs. Assessments are based on the Department of Mines and Energy well observation network and measurements of groundwater flow between the confined and unconfined aquifers.

405. **The Hon. H. ALLISON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources: Have Engineering and Water Supply Department research staff clearly defined the extent to which it is permissible to mine the limited water resource such as in Millicent, Mount Gambier and Padthaway and, if so, will the Minister make that research publicly available and, if not, why not?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The term 'mining' in relation to groundwater resources usually means the permanent removal of water such that recovery does not occur. The water resources of the South-East are not currently being managed in this way and therefore the limits of mining have not been defined.

406. **The Hon. H. ALLISON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. Why does the Engineering and Water Supply Department no longer maintain a graph to indicate a comparison between the Blue Lake level and rainfall?
2. Does its discontinuance indicate that the Department now considers that there is no relationship between the two?
3. Does the Blue Lake tap several aquifers?
4. Do the Knight Sands contribute in any way?

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

1. Blue Lake water levels and rainfall records are collected by the Engineering and Water Supply Department and graphs

are still prepared periodically to indicate the comparison between water levels, rainfalls and other salient data (e.g. pumping rates).

2. Not applicable.
3. The Blue Lake only intersects the unconfined aquifer (Gambier Limestone).
4. The confined aquifer (incorporating the Knight Sands) is not now considered to be a significant source of water to the lake.

BORE WATER

407. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. Is water in the South Australian section of the Great Artesian Basin a non-renewable resource and, if so, why?
2. What are the criteria for establishing bores in the Great Artesian Basin?

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

1. No. The basin is replenished principally from rainfall in New South Wales, Queensland and the Northern Territory.
2. Appropriate bore construction to control artesian pressure and corrosivity of the underground waters is set down in the Water Resources Act, 1976-1983. There are special criteria for the Olympic Dam Project water supply borefield and these are detailed in clause 13 of the Roxby Downs (Indenture Ratification) Act, 1982.

408. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. How many pastoral bores are there in South Australia and how many are in regular use?
2. What quantity of water is pumped daily on average from these bores?
3. Have water levels and quality diminished in the past 50 years in these bores and, if so, why?

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

1. There are approximately 120 000 bores utilised for stock and pasture watering, the majority of which are in regular use.
2. It is considered that each bore would pump approximately 2 kilolitres/day.
3. Changes in levels and/or quality have occurred in those areas now proclaimed under the Water Resources Act, 1976, and in certain other areas of the State. The more significant changes are usually due to overpumping, intense irrigation or industrial development.

409. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. What is the estimated daily minimum quantity of water required by the operators of the Roxby Downs uranium project at present and in the future when production commences?
2. What is the source of the water at present and what will it be in the future?

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

1. 500 kilolitres/day during 1984 and in the future approximately 33 000 kilolitres/day.
2. The Great Artesian Basin.

SOUTH-EAST WATER RESOURCES

410. **The Hon. H. ALLISON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. Are there any surface indications of a significant intake of water to the South-East of South Australia from Victoria other than from Morambro, Mosquito and Naracoorte Creeks?

2. What is the net gain or loss of water across the South Australian/Victoria border?

3. Is it a fact that the origin of any important source of water in the South-East must be sought within the region and that the primary source of water is rainfall?

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

1. No.

2. There is a net gain of approximately 46 000 ML/annum from groundwater (confined and unconfined aquifers) and, on average, 15 000 ML/annum from surface water.

3. The major proportion of recharge occurs within South Australia and the origin is rainfall.

411. **The Hon. H. ALLISON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. What would be the effect of any substantial lowering of levels and pressures in the Knight Sands Aquifer?

2. Would there be a risk of the Gambier Limestone and Knight Sands Aquifers collapsing into one another?

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

1. This would depend on the degree of lowering and location.

2. No.

412. **The Hon. H. ALLISON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. Is the Minister aware that J.W. Holmes and M.W. Hughes, writing in 1969 for the journal of the Geological Society of Australia, stated that water in springs in the South-East may have taken 30 to 60 years in moving from its origin to the coast?

2. Does the Minister have access to research to disprove the theory that water in the South-East may be fossil water which is being used faster than it is replaced and, if so, will he make the information publicly available?

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

1. I am aware that work on the groundwater resources of the South-East was being conducted by J.W. Holmes and others in the CSIRO around that time, but it is understood no article was published in the journal of the Geological Society of Australia in 1969.

2. Yes. This information is already publicly available and can be obtained from the Engineering and Water Supply Department. Further, an Engineering and Water Supply Department report consolidating information on water resources assessments, quantity and quality aspects, water uses, current and likely future issues and problems for the South-East region is being prepared and is expected to be completed later this year. Consideration to the public release of this report will be given at the appropriate time.

413. **The Hon. H. ALLISON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. Is the Minister aware that in 1969, reporting to the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Engineer for Investigations stated that groundwater levels alone are little more than indications of water table levels, that without supporting evidence they give no indication of the extent of the water stored or whether it is static or moving and that as this is of fundamental importance in an assessment of the availability and use of the resources of water in the (South-East) region there is a real need for a better understanding of the hydro-geological factors involved?

2. Can the Minister now produce properly researched evidence as to the extent of resources stored and their movement in the South-East?

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

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

414. **The Hon. H. ALLISON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. Is the Minister aware that in 1969 the Engineering and Water Supply Department, Engineer for Investigations advised 'that the Knight Sands and Gambier Limestones contain large volumes of water in their pores and interstices, and that even if there were no replenishment it is theoretically possible to remove a substantial portion of this. (However) as in mining, such a use cannot be repeated . . . without a risk of serious long-term harm'?

2. Have the region's problems now been accurately assessed and does a problem now exist?

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

1. Yes.

2. Since the 1969 report the water resources of this area have been further assessed and the problem envisaged in that report does not exist.

415. **The Hon. H. ALLISON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. Is the Minister aware that in 1969 the Engineering and Water Supply Department was advised by its Chief Investigations Engineer that his investigations 'raised serious questions as to the nature of effective water resources of the (South-East) region because up to now it had been tacitly assumed that the greater part of the usable water would be found underground. It is clear that this assumption requires careful scrutiny . . . It is doubtful whether there can be an excess above that which can be usefully used within the region.'

2. Will the Minister make publicly available all research evidence which may allay the concerns then being expressed?

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

1. Yes.

2. This information is already publicly available and can be obtained from the Engineering and Water Supply Department. Further, an Engineering and Water Supply Department report consolidating information on water resources assessments, quantity and quality aspects, water uses, current and likely future issues and problems for the South-East region is being prepared and is expected to be completed later this year. Consideration to the public release of this report will be given at the appropriate time.

416. **The Hon. H. ALLISON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. Is the Minister aware that in 1969 the Engineering and Water Supply Department was advised by its Engineer for Investigations that 'there is no evidence that underground aquifers (in the South-East) can provide a perennial supply of water in any great quantity. The presence of large volumes of underground water provides no assurance that the mechanism of replenishment is more than rudimentary. The removal of this water may be strictly analogous to the removal of a mineral resource by mining'.

2. Is this still the assessment of the Department and, if not, will the Minister make publicly available any research evidence which may have changed it?

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

1. Yes.

2. No. The view put forward in the quoted 1969 Engineering and Water Supply Department report has been considerably updated by various investigations and assessments of both groundwater and surface water resources of the South-East region, which are available from the Engineering and Water Supply Department. A report on the most recent review of the region's water resources and related issues is being prepared by the Engineering and Water Supply Department and is expected to be completed later this year. Consideration to the public release of this report will be given at the appropriate time.

417. **The Hon. H. ALLISON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. Is the Minister aware that in 1969 the Engineering and Water Supply Department's Engineer for Investigations advised that so far as South-East water resources were concerned 'there is no evidence of the availability of a large surplus of water suitable for the development of an industrial complex in the region, or for export to Adelaide'?

2. Has the potential water supply now been accurately assessed and, if so, when and by whom, and will the Minister make publicly available all relevant research data?

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

1. Yes.

2. Yes. The water resources have now been assessed and a number of unrestricted Engineering and Water Supply Department and Department of Mines and Energy reports, as well as other technical papers by the CSIRO and Flinders University have been issued since the late 1960s and provide an update of the perception of the water resources and hydrological regimes. These are available from the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

Further, an Engineering and Water Supply report consolidating information on water resources assessments, quantity and quality aspects, water uses, current and likely future issues and problems for the South-East region is being prepared and is expected to be completed later this year. Consideration to the public release of this report will be given at the appropriate time.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN SUPERANNUATION FUND

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

1. What are the properties held by the South Australian Superannuation Fund and in relation to each:

- when was it acquired;
- what was the purchase price;
- what is the value now and what is the profit or loss of investment; and
- what is the annual percentage return on investment?

2. What was the gross amount of rent received from all properties during the past 12 months?

3. How much has been paid in rates and taxes during the past 12 months on these properties?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: On previous occasions when questions have been asked in Parliament regarding activities of the South Australian Superannuation Fund Investment Trust it has been indicated (by my predecessor as well as by myself) that the trustees are not, nor can they be, in any way subject to Government direction, that they operate in a commercially competitive environment and that this places some limitation on the information which they can reveal publicly about specific investments. The Chairman of the Trust has always been prepared to give further information to any member on a confidential basis. The following answer provides information in a different form to that sought by the honourable member for the reasons stated above and because the fees for a valuation of the properties not otherwise required at the present time would be very substantial.

The properties presently held by the Trust are:

- Completed developments leased at market determined rentals
Wakefield House, Wakefield Street
Associated Midland House, Pirie Street
North Adelaide Village, O'Connell Street
Bay Junction Shopping Centre, Glenelg
Renaissance Centre, Rundle Mall and environs.
- Properties currently under construction or held for redevelopment
107 Grenfell Street, Adelaide
17-25 Currie Street, Adelaide
Retail Development Site, South Road, Edwardstown

C. Developments leased at CPI-linked rentals
Sir Samuel Way Building, Victoria Square
*Government ADP Centre, Glenside
*Various residential properties

*Property held on a leasehold basis.

In relation to Group A, the dates of completion and the development costs as at completion (including imputed interest holding charges) were as follows:

		\$
Wakefield House	March 1980	11 116 000
Associated Midland House	June 1977	750 000
North Adelaide Village	December 1979	6 051 000
Bay Junction	September 1978	4 032 000
Renaissance Centre	October 1982	22 325 000
		\$44 274 000

The estimated net income (that is, gross income from all sources less all outgoings) from the above properties for the 12 months ended 31 March 1984 was \$4 930 000 which is 11.14 per cent of the total development cost. During that period, the total amount paid in rates and taxes in respect of such properties (including amounts paid by or recovered from tenants) was \$644 000.

In relation to Group B, the total amount spent to date on such properties (including imputed interest holding charges) is \$11 365 000. The total amount spent on rates and taxes during the past 12 months (including stamp duty) was \$255 000.

In relation to Group C, the dates of completion and the development costs as at completion were as follows:

Sir Samuel Way Building	June 1983	33 191 000
ADP Centre	December 1983	4 597 000
Residential properties	October 1982	8 000 000

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

1. What is the share portfolio of the South Australian Superannuation Fund and in relation to each shareholding, what are the details of:

- the prices paid;
- the reason purchased;
- average purchase price; and
- current valuation, indicating profit or loss to date?

2. What shares have been sold in the past three years and what capital profit or loss was made?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The South Australian Superannuation Fund Investment Trust does not hold shares as long term investments. Nevertheless, from time to time shares may be acquired as a result of subunderwriting positions which the Trust may have accepted. It is Trust policy to dispose of such holdings at an opportune time. The Trust presently holds 100 000 shares in Caltex Ltd which it acquired at a net cost of \$195 500 and whose current market value is \$130 000. During the past three years it has sold shares in Australian Consolidated Industries Ltd, Dunlop Olympic Ltd, Pioneer Concrete Ltd and Pioneer Sugar Mills Ltd and units in Westfield Trust, such sales producing a total net capital profit of \$779 323.

COOBER PEDY RETICULATION SYSTEM

443. **Mr GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Labour:

1. What financial undertaking has the Government given to the Coober Pedy Miners' and Progress Association towards construction of the new water reticulation system?

2. Does the Government intend to make available any funds by way of grant or loan to the Association for this project?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The replies are as follows:

1. The Coober Pedy Progress and Miners' Association has received a grant of \$1 126 464 under the Community Employment Programme towards construction of a new

water reticulation system. The State Government has approved an additional amount of \$540 000 to be made available to that project.

2. The funds will be made available through the Engineering and Water Supply Department by way of grant.

REGISTRAR-GENERAL'S OFFICE

445. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Lands:

1. How many plans of survey were lodged in the Registrar-General's Office in the years 1980 to 1983, respectively?

2. What is the current delay in working days between lodgement and commencement of examination of a plan of survey, and lodgement and initial examination of a transaction?

3. What are the times involved—

(a) from lodgement of a strata titles application to issue and delivery of new certificates of title;

(b) from lodgement of a subdivisional plan to issue and delivery of a new certificate of title; and

(c) from lodgement of a plan of division to issue and delivery of new certificates of title?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. 1980	915
1981	1105
1982	1409
1983	1346
1984 (to 30 March)	418
2. (a) 23 working days	
(b) 17 working days	
3. (a) 20 working days	
(b) 30 working days	
(c) 30 working days	

CROYDON PARK COLLEGE OF FURTHER EDUCATION

448. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Are students enrolled in the Croydon Park College of Further Education automotive course travelling in a group to Stan Keen Motors, 959 South Road, Edwardstown, to undertake their studies of dynamometers because there is no machine installed at the College?

2. Did the College have delivered on 27 July 1983 a dynamometer costing \$25 154; if so, has it remained in its carton waiting to be installed since that date and, if so, what is the reason for the delay of its installation, and when will it be available to the students?

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

1. Students did undertake studies involving dynamometer studies at Stan Keen Motors on one occasion and will do so on one further occasion.

2. A dynamometer was purchased at a cost of \$25 154 and was delivered on 27 July 1983. As yet it has not been installed due to the need for complex minor works associated with the installation; however, these works are currently being organised by PBD and will be completed in the near future.

PARLIAMENTARY SITTINGS

452. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier: Is it still intended that earlier commencement of Parliament will facilitate fewer late night sittings?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The earlier commencement of the House of Assembly provides members with more day time hours to debate the legislation before the House. The time at which the House rises in the evening depends on the length of the debate on the matters then before the House and the amount of business which must be dealt with in the session. This question is currently being investigated by a Joint Select Committee of the Parliament and a final decision on any future policy in this regard must await the report of the Select Committee.

VOLUNTARY WELFARE FINANCING

453. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare:

1. When will the report of a feasibility study for a means of financing voluntary welfare activities through private and corporate donations to a central funding pool be released; will all Members of Parliament receive a copy and, if not, why not?

2. Have any officers of the Department for Community Welfare investigated the 'United Way' fundraising method; if so, who and where and, if not, why not?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The replies are as follows:

1. The feasibility of central funding is being investigated. A report has not yet been prepared.

2. Yes. The Director-General investigated the 'United Way' method in the United States of America, and in Geelong, Victoria.

TAX DEDUCTIBILITY FOR DONATIONS

454. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare:

1. When did the Minister make representation to the Commonwealth Government, seeking an urgent review of tax deductibility criteria for donations to voluntary organisations as defined under the Income Tax Assessment Act section 78 (1) (a) (ii), and what was the reply?

2. How many voluntary agencies in South Australia are disadvantaged by section 78 (1) (a) (ii) of the Income Tax Assessment Act?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The replies are as follows:

1. I last met with Mr C. Hurford (Minister assisting the Treasurer) on Friday 23 March 1984. The Commonwealth is currently reviewing this Act and this matter will be given due consideration. However, there is a problem in extending the scope of the Act as many specific agencies would appear to fall outside the criteria. Further consideration needs to be given by the voluntary organisations as to what agencies and how they should come within the area of tax deductibility.

2. This figure is impossible to estimate.

SP BETTING

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

1. What is the estimated annual SP betting turnover in South Australia?

2. What action are the police taking to reduce the incidence of SP betting?

3. How many persons have been convicted of SP betting in the past 12 months and how does this number compare with each of the past five years?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The replies are as follows:

1. The estimated annual SP betting turnover in South Australia is between \$50 million and \$100 million.

2. The Police Gaming Squad is responsible for operations against SP bookmakers. Investigation of illegal bookmaking activities is the prime objective of the seven member squad and, over the past two years, special attention has been given to 'principal' operators (those persons at the top of the hierarchical scale that exists in SP activities).

3. The number of persons convicted of SP betting is as follows:

1983-84	24 (to date)
1982-83	27
1981-82	36
1980-81	13
1979-80	1

Until legislative changes took effect in 1981 it was extremely difficult for police to obtain sufficient evidence to obtain a conviction against persons involved in SP betting offences. This accounts for the disparity in the number of persons convicted in 1979-80 as compared to 1981-82.

CLASSIFICATION OF PUBLICATIONS BOARD

470. Mr BECKER (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare:

1. Who are the current members of the Classification of Publications Board and what are the remuneration, date of appointment, term and qualifications of each?

2. How many meetings were held by the Board during the past 12 months?

3. How many publications were presented to the Board for classification during the past 12 months, what were the countries of origin, how many were refused and how do these statistics compare with each of the past three years?

4. What is the estimated value of such publications currently available for sale in this State?

5. Approximately how many copies of each publication required to be submitted to the Board and approved for sale are available for sale at appropriate retail outlets?

6. When will the Government take action to strengthen section 33 of the Police Offences Act as recommended in the Annual Report of the Board for the year ended 30 June 1983?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The replies are as follows:

1. The current members, their qualifications, remuneration and date of appointment of the Classification of Publications Board are:

Mrs M.A.C. Robinson, LL.B. (Chairman), \$100 per meeting, 9.6.83.

Professor R.S. Kalucy, M.B., B.S., F.R.A.C.P., M.A.N.A.C.P., M.R.C. (Psych.), \$85 per meeting, 9.6.83.

Mr J. Cross, B.A. (Hons), B.Ed., A.U.A., Dip.Ed., \$85 per meeting, 9.6.83.

Mrs J.R. Wood, B.A., B.Ed., B.D., \$58 per meeting, 9.6.83.

Mrs J.M. Taylor, B.A. (Hons), \$85 per meeting, 9.6.83.

Mr J.N. Holland, M.V.O., A.U.A. (Com.), A.U.A. (Public Admin.), \$58 per meeting, 9.6.83.

All members have been appointed by the Governor for a term of three years.

2. Fourteen.

3. From July 1983 to March 1984, 3 085 publications were classified by the Board; information on the countries of origin is not kept; 95 were refused.

Classification of Publications from July 1980 to March 1984.

	July 83- March 84	82-83	81-82	80-81
Total classified	3 085	2 917	2 050	1 936
Classification refused	95	30	67	48

4. The Board does not keep statistics on the cost value of publications for sale.

5. Not known.

6. Amendments to Police Offences Act (No. 114/83) implemented the Board's recommendations on section 33.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE FUND

473. Mr. BECKER (on notice) asked the Minister of Local Government: Has the Government received requests from the South Australian Council of Social Services Inc. for the Local Government Assistance Fund to be increased from its current level of \$520 000 in 1983-84 to at least \$800 000 in 1984-85 and, if so, will the Government accede to the request and, if not, why not?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The Minister of Local Government has not received a request from the South Australian Council of Social Services for the Local Government Assistance Fund to be increased to at least \$800 000 in 1984-85. Should such a request be received, it would be taken into consideration in the Department of Local Government's negotiations with Treasury in determining funding allocations for 1984-85.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN COUNCIL OF SOCIAL SERVICES INC.

474. Mr BECKER (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare: Has the Government received requests from the South Australian Council of Social Services Inc. for—

(a) grants for non-government welfare activities (principally the Community Welfare Grants Fund) to be increased from their 1983-84 level of \$1.297 million to at least \$2.3 million in 1984-85;

(b) grants to non-government children's and youth homes (including the Community Welfare Residential Care and Support Grants Fund) to be increased from their 1983-84 level of \$1.25 million to at least \$2 million in 1984-85; and

(c) the State Government to increase its current commitments in matching Commonwealth funds to be made available to South Australia in 1984-85 under the proposed Crisis Accommodation Assistance Act (expected to take effect from 1 July 1984) and to direct 100 per cent of these funds to non-government agencies;

and, if so, how much would the requests cost in 1984-85 and will the Government accede to the requests and, if not, why not?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The replies are as follows:

(a) Yes.

(b) Yes.

(c) Yes. Regarding the proposed Crisis Accommodation Assistance Act, the Commonwealth Government is currently formulating another set of proposals which will be presented to the States. Until the Commonwealth proposals are received, it is not possible to examine their costings and other implications.

DEMOLITION OF RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY

477. Mr BECKER (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. Why did the E. & W.S. Department demolish the residential property situated in the south-eastern corner of the Glenelg Sewerage Treatment Works, Anderson Avenue/Military Road, Glenelg North?

2. What was the cost of demolishing the property and how much did the Department receive for the sale of demolition materials?

3. What redevelopment will be undertaken in place of the property demolished and how much will such development cost?

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

1. The house was demolished for a combination of reasons, viz:

- no longer required by the Engineering and Water Supply Department for housing Departmental personnel,
- it was in need of extensive structural rehabilitation and electrical rewiring,
- it was considered unsuitable for sale because it was affected by vibration, noise and occasional odour, due to its proximity to the formal part of the works, particularly the engine room, as two extensions to the works have been constructed since the house was built.

2. The demolition was carried out by a private contractor at a cost of \$1 600. The demolition materials became the property of the contractor.

3. Provision has been made for landscaping the area and the erection of security fencing at an estimated cost of \$5 000.

GLENELG TREATMENT WORKS

478. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education representing the Minister of Agriculture:

1. How many tonnes of salvaged pine logs from bushfire affected forests have now been deposited in the grounds of the Glenelg Treatment Works?

2. How much reclaimed water is required daily to keep the logs moist?

3. How long will the logs be retained at the Treatment Works and how many persons are required to supervise the continual moisture of the stacks?

4. Is the project of continual watering of the logs working satisfactorily and what problems have been experienced to date?

5. Does the Department of Agriculture propose to repair or bituminise the unmade road from Military Road to the northern entrance of the treatment works and, if not, why not?

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

1. 41 580 tonnes.

2. Reclaimed water daily=approximately 2 megalitres (440 000 gallons) per day.

3. Logs will be retained until approximately January 1987. Removal of logs has already commenced. Supervision of watering only requires half of one person's time.

4. Project is working satisfactorily. Problems experienced to date are only two; namely, high wear rate of sprinkler head (currently being corrected) and effects of strong on-shore winds.

5. The road from Military Road to the northern entrance of the treatment works is actually owned by the West Beach Trust. It was upgraded by Woods and Forests Department before log deliveries commenced, and is to be refurbished within the next fortnight. The expected traffic level over this road is only 20 truck loads per week, and this would not justify bituminising the road.

COMMONWEALTH GAMES

481. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Recreation and Sport:

1. Has the Government given consideration to applying for the next Commonwealth Games due to be allocated to

Australia and, if so, why and for when and, if not, why not?

2. Has a master plan of required major Olympic standard sporting venues been prepared for the metropolitan area and, if not, why not?

3. How many suitable sporting venues are now available in South Australia to meet Olympic Games or Commonwealth Games standards, where are they located and for which sports do they cater?

4. What major Olympic standard sporting venues are planned for South Australia in the next 12 to 36 months?

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

1. No. Consideration is being given to applying for the 1994 Commonwealth Games.

2. No. A list of projects in priority order has been prepared for International Standard sporting venues. It is proposed that a more detailed plan be prepared in the next financial year (1984-85).

3. None. A small number of venues may be suitable for Commonwealth Games events if temporary seating and additional or upgraded facilities are provided: e.g.

Olympic Sports Field
Adelaide Oval
Football Park
Wayville Showgrounds
West Lakes Rowing Basin
Hindmarsh Stadium
Apollo Stadium

4. Investigations are under way in order to develop the following venues. Whether construction commences on any or all venues is dependent on the availability of funds, a suitable site and design work being completed.

State Aquatic Centre
Multi-Purpose Indoor Sports Centre
Cycling Velodrome and Road Racing Circuit
Small Bore Rifle Shooting Complex
Weightlifting Centre

ACCOMMODATION FACILITIES

482. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism:

1. How many international standard beds are there in hotel/motel accommodation in South Australia?

2. How many convention centres are there in South Australia and what is the largest number of convention delegates that could be accommodated in any one venue?

3. How many conventions will be held in South Australia this calendar year and how many organisations have registered their intention to hold conventions in 1985 to 1987, respectively?

4. What positive and direct action is being taken to promote South Australia as a convention centre?

5. What level of financial support is available to assist conventions to be held in South Australia and, if none, why not?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

1. Figures detailing the number of beds are not available. However, the number of rooms can be provided. Adelaide has two international hotels providing a total of 529 rooms. In addition, a further 352 rooms could be described as of international standard.

2. There is no facility that is exclusively a convention centre in South Australia although there are many existing facilities capable of staging successful conventions. Many major hotels throughout the State have convention facilities while the two universities and the Festival Centre are capable of holding conventions. In addition, there are several privately owned function centres. Several venues in Adelaide

can accommodate very large numbers of delegates in plenary session but cannot accommodate delegates in break-out meeting rooms. The Hilton Hotel is the largest self-contained convention facility and can accommodate 750 delegates.

3. In 1983, 286 conventions were recorded by the Adelaide Convention and Visitors Bureau in South Australia. This year the Bureau estimates the number to be up almost 8 per cent at this stage. Forty-five conventions are currently registered with the Bureau for 1985, 185 for 1986 and seven for 1987.

4. The Adelaide Convention and Visitors Bureau exists as a specialist organisation to promote South Australia as a convention destination. The Bureau both markets the State and offers an advisory service to organisations wishing to stage conventions in South Australia. The Bureau's marketing strategy employs direct approaches to target organisations and associations and backed-up by direct mail-outs to a wider market. In 1983-84 the Government contributed \$120 000 to the Bureau's activities. This was backed by member subscriptions of \$80 000.

5. There is no scheme set up to provide direct financial assistance to conventions in South Australia. Occasionally, where the subject matter of a convention is of particular relevance the Government may make a direct grant to the convention. The general promotion of the State as a convention destination with the aim of increasing awareness of the State's convention facilities and attributes amongst target groups has been regarded by the Government as the first priority in developing the convention industry.

BRUSH FENCING

485. Mr LEWIS (on notice) asked the Minister of Education representing the Minister of Forests:

1. What are the botanical names of the species of brush which currently are being or could be harvested for commercial fencing material known as 'brush fencing'?

2. What research has been or is being done into the development of a commercial industry based on these species for the production of brush to meet the expanding demand for that material in South Australia and interstate?

3. Are there any publications available for interested members of the public about the way in which such species of brush could be grown commercially?

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

1. The botanical names of the species which are currently, or could be, harvested for 'brush fencing' are *Melaleuca uncinatum* and *Baeckea behrii*.

2. The Woods and Forests Department planted a small trial area at Murray Bridge in 1979 to assess the growth rate of *Melaleuca uncinatum* under natural rainfall conditions. Apart from this, no other research or trials are known of by the Department.

3. There are no known suitable publications for members of the public interested in commercially growing brush species.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE

491. Mr BECKER (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare representing the Attorney-General:

1. What is the policy for issuing application forms for prospective Justices of the Peace?

2. Is the system discriminatory and time consuming and, if so, does it discourage applications?

3. Is allocating Justices of the Peace by suburbs misleading when commerce and industry need such persons on their staff where domicile bears no relationship to sphere of employment?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The replies are as follows:

1. Application forms for appointment as a Justice of the Peace are issued on request where:

- (a) a vacancy exists in a respective location; and
- (b) where the initial inquiry indicates that special circumstances may exist.

2. No.

3. No. Appointments are made on a residential basis in accordance with a given formula. The exception to this rule is if a Justice of the Peace is required to service a need in other than a residential area where reasonable access would not normally be available.