

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 22 August 1984

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

### PETITION: SIMS BEQUEST FARM

A petition signed by 434 residents of South Australia praying that the House support the retention of the Sims bequest farm, Cleve, in its current form was presented by Mr Blacker.

Petition received.

### PETITION: KINDERGARTEN UNION

A petition signed by 18 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to reconsider its intentions to disestablish the Kindergarten Union and to allow it to remain under the care and control of the Minister of Education was presented by Mr Baker.

Petition received.

### PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

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

*By Command—*

1. Corporate Affairs Commission—First Interim Report on the Investigation into the Swan Shepherd Group of Companies.

### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: GREYHOUND RACING

The **Hon. J.W. SLATER (Minister of Recreation and Sport)**: I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. J.W. SLATER**: During the adjournment debate in the House yesterday, the member for Alexandra made remarks which I consider a reflection on the integrity of the Greyhound Racing Control Board, its stewards, and the Adelaide Greyhound Racing Club. The member for Alexandra made allegations over an incident at Angle Park, and also made claims that security was not good enough. He went on to say that there were multiple allegations surrounding our racing industry in its several codes, and called on me, as Minister, to put together a panel and arrange for a legitimate and independent investigation of their various activities.

Since the member for Alexandra made his remarks, I have discussed with the General Manager of the Greyhound Racing Control Board the incident referred to by the honourable member. I am convinced that the stewards acted correctly in all the circumstances surrounding the incident. There is no evidence that other than the proper procedures were adhered to by the stewards and the Greyhound Racing Control Board.

I do not propose to set up an inquiry, as suggested by the honourable member, based on rumour, hearsay, or newspaper comments. I have confidence in the boards and the South Australian Jockey Club in the conduct of their respective codes, and assure the public of South Australia that the industry is being conducted in an honest and fair way. I

challenge the member for Alexandra to provide any evidence to the contrary and not to make wild allegations of the nature he made yesterday.

### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: SWAN SHEPHERD GROUP

The **Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Community Welfare)**: I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. G.J. CRAFTER**: On 15 April 1980, the former Attorney-General and Minister of Corporate Affairs, the Hon. K.T. Griffin, appointed the Corporate Affairs Commission as inspector to investigate all the affairs of the 25 companies in the Swan Shepherd group. The appointment was made pursuant to section 170 (1) of the Companies Act, 1962. The appointment of the Commission as inspector pursuant to the Companies Act followed upon the well publicised collapse of certain companies within the Swan Shepherd group and the appointment of liquidators in respect of these companies.

Initial inquiries by the Commission disclosed that a number of companies within the group (being principally the companies that were in liquidation) engaged in mortgage broking, that is to say soliciting and receiving funds from members of the public for the purpose of investing those funds by way of loans secured by registered mortgages of real property. Initial inquiries disclosed that these companies had received several million dollars from the public for this purpose and that part of these funds had been advanced to other group companies, apparently without security. For this reason, the Commission felt that the activities of these and a number of related companies ought to be investigated first.

The first interim report on the investigation into the Swan Shepherd group of companies, which I have tabled, deals principally with these companies. The companies are: Swan Shepherd Pty Ltd (in liquidation); R.W. Swan Nominees Pty Ltd (in liquidation); E.C.R. Shepherd & Son Proprietary Limited (in liquidation); Interfranc (S.A.) Pty Limited (in liquidation); Westland Finance Company Pty Ltd (in liquidation); and Finbro Limited (in liquidation).

The inquiries conducted into the affairs of these companies have disclosed that over the period the subject of the investigation, namely, January 1978 to April 1980, these companies received and administered more than \$7 million of public moneys. These funds had been solicited from the public upon the basis that the companies concerned would invest the funds in loans secured by registered mortgages of real property. Notwithstanding this, by the time the group collapsed a substantial part of these funds had been advanced to other companies within the group without any security. Of those funds that were advanced to group companies with the benefit of security, a significant proportion of these advances was, in the opinion of the inspector, inadequately secured.

The group as a whole was in serious financial trouble for the financial years 1978, 1979 and 1980. The group as a whole lost approximately \$500 000 in the 1978 financial year; it lost a further \$1 million in the 1979 year; and until April 1980, when the group collapsed, it lost an additional \$1 million. The inspector has found that public funds were used within the group to enable the group to continue trading in the face of these serious losses. The report is being carefully considered by the Legal Division of the Corporate Affairs Commission, and further action is being taken in respect of some of the matters reported therein.

## WINE TAX

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move the following motion without notice:

That this House believes:

1. That the general sales tax on wine imposed in the Federal Budget, despite assurances to the contrary which were given to the wine industry, unfairly discriminates against South Australia;

2. That the tax will not only have a disastrous effect on the growth of a key South Australian industry, but will also disadvantage regional economies within the State and particularly hinder the redevelopment and reconstruction programme which the South Australian Government has initiated in the Riverland,

and therefore calls on the Federal Government to ensure:

1. That the inquiry into the grapegrowing and grape product industry which it has announced will fully consider the short and long-term implications of the new sales tax for the wine industry in South Australia;

2. That financial assistance is provided to the State for redevelopment and adjustment programmes in wine grapegrowing areas whose viability is threatened by the imposition of this new tax.

**Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition):** The Opposition opposes the suspension of Standing Orders, and it does so for reasons which I will list to the House today. I note that, in the daily programme printed at the direction of the Deputy Premier, my request for an urgency motion to be debated during Question Time today does not appear. This morning, on behalf of the Opposition, I gave notice that we intended to move an urgency motion in the Parliament today on the subject of the wine tax, its imposition, and its devastating effect on South Australia.

**Mr Mathwin:** What time was that?

**Mr OLSEN:** About 10 o'clock, or shortly thereafter. I advised the media about the Opposition's intention to take this course of action. It is interesting that, having advised the media of that course of action, the Deputy Premier then advised my Deputy that it was the intention of the Government to take over Question Time by suspending Standing Orders in order to move a motion, thus denying the Opposition its right to move an urgency motion.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** Did you say afterwards?

**Mr OLSEN:** No, I did not; just listen carefully and you will get it straight for once. The Opposition has well and truly indicated publicly its position on this matter, namely, that it was a matter of urgency and that the Opposition wanted to debate it.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr OLSEN:** I will get to that in a moment. The Government does not want to debate this motion on our grounds; it wants to debate it on weak grounds, as its motion indicates. The motion does not refer to the Prime Minister at all. I can understand why the Premier does not want to draw to the attention of the South Australian public the fact that Prime Minister Hawke has broken an election promise. Because the Premier has broken so many himself, it would be hypocritical of him to draw the attention of Parliament to that.

Question Time in this Parliament traditionally is a time for the Opposition to use and it is the Opposition's prerogative to use that hour in the way that it sees fit in order to bring to the attention of the House and the public of South Australia issues of importance. There is no doubt that the imposition of a wine tax is a vitally important issue to South Australia.

**An honourable member:** The Premier is smiling!

**Mr OLSEN:** The Premier can smile about it, but he will not smile at the results in the ballot-box in due course.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr OLSEN:** Because a principle has been breached by the Government, that is, the principle of giving the Opposition the right to debate an urgency motion in this House. Not only are we being denied the right to debate it, but it does not even appear on the Notice Paper as a matter of courtesy, by direction of the Deputy Premier. The fact is that the Government's motion is weak. It does not tackle the core of the problem—Prime Minister Hawke.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Clearly, the honourable gentleman is now debating the substance of the matter. The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr OLSEN:** The reason for the suspension of Standing Orders is to allow the Government to debate its motion, on carefully constructed and narrow grounds, not wide enough to take into account matters pertaining to Prime Minister Hawke and the Federal Government. The motion put down by the Opposition this morning relates to clearly drawing to the attention of the South Australian public the broken promise of Prime Minister Hawke to the people of South Australia, and to the weak, insipid and narrow motion moved by the Premier, and also to the breaking of a basic tradition of this Parliament by denying the right of the Opposition and by trying to gag and narrow debate by the Opposition. On that basis the Opposition opposes the motion.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (24)—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 Mayes, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (20)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, Ashenden, Baker, Becker, D.C. Brown, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Ingerson, Lewis, Mathwin, Meier, Olsen (teller), Oswald, Rodda, Wilson, and Wotton.

Majority of 4 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I move:

That the time allotted for this motion be until 3.15 p.m.

Motion carried.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I move the motion accordingly. I will not read it again, because—

**Mr Lewis:** Why not? Are you ashamed of it?

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I will not read again the motion that I have moved because it is on the Notice Paper for members to see. I really thought that the performance that we have been witnessing for the past 10 minutes is the height of childishness and really makes—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr EVANS:** I rise on a point of order. I believe that it is against Standing Orders to refer to another debate in the same session and that the Premier is doing that.

**The SPEAKER:** As I understand it the honourable Premier was referring to the self same debate that the House is now engaged in. Perhaps the honourable member could explain.

**Mr EVANS:** I believe that the Premier is referring to the debate regarding the suspension of Standing Orders, and that is a separate debate to the one in which we are now engaged.

**The SPEAKER:** I rule that the two are joined together, and I do not uphold the point of order.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I rise on a point of order. On what precedent or basis can you reach that conclusion?

**The SPEAKER:** I am not relying on either a precedent from the Standing Orders or from *Erskine May* but on the third thing that one uses, namely, common sense. I do not uphold the point of order.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I rise on a point of order, and give notice that I dissent from your ruling, Mr Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** Bring it up in writing.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I will do so.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Light has brought to the table the following reason for disagreement:

The decision of the Speaker seeking to tie a suspension motion to a substantive motion is against all previous practice of this House.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I move accordingly and find it unfortunate that it is necessary to rise in this place to criticise a ruling of the Chair. But I believe it is important that once and for all we know where we are going in interpretations of the Standing Order and of the manner in which this Parliament will be conducted by the current Speaker. Sir, it would be wrong of me to do other than indicate that we had a statement from the Chair yesterday which was completely against all precedent. It was suggested, for example, that a member of the House should take a warning which would be effective for the balance of that Parliamentary session. If we look at Parliamentary Standing Orders, we find that the Parliament itself has indicated that on the first occasion during the course of a session when a member is questioned by the Chair to the point of being put out of the Chamber it is for one day.

**The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT:** I rise on a point order. The honourable member took a point of order against your ruling, Sir, concerning the two debates being linked together. He now seems to be wandering completely away from that point of order. He is talking about what happened yesterday in this House and about what may or may not—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT:**—happen when you, Sir, warn someone. I do not think that that has anything to do with the point of order that he has taken in exception to your ruling. I ask you to bring the honourable member back to the point of order that he took in the first instance.

**The SPEAKER:** I simply call on the member for Light and ask him to proceed in accordance with the Standing Orders.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. An element of confusion has arisen, which is doing nothing for this Parliament, nor for the public debate that should ensue from this Parliament. Your statement, Mr Speaker, this afternoon that a motion which had already been decided on and disposed of as being part of an entirely new debate is to me completely at variance with any decisions that have been taken in this House on previous occasions. Yes, there is a need for a suspension of Standing Orders for the purpose of moving a motion. It is not necessary, unless the request is made (although it is the practice), to indicate what the suspension is going to be for. But, if the Government or a group has the numbers, a suspension of Standing Orders can be gained and then the House is advised what the suspension is for. That has happened in this place.

A free-standing motion to suspend Standing Orders has been decided in the affirmative. The debate that is now ensuing is on an entirely different subject matter, namely, that which appears on the green paper—a motion in the name of the Premier. It says nothing about the suspension that has already been disposed of. It is therefore an entirely different matter and cannot be held to be tied one to the other. I rest my case on that reality.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Too much is being made out of this, and a very technical point indeed has been taken.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** It is a pity that such a technicality is taken because we are about to embark (although I have only been allowed to get out two sentences) on what I thought was agreed on all sides to be an extremely important matter that should be put to the Parliament.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** That debate having commenced, a point of order was taken by the member for Fisher.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. Jennifer Adamson:** You think you can ride roughshod over us.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I was referring, in the course of those remarks, to the procedure which had set the ground work for this motion, and it is an extraordinary technicality (because it was simply a passing reference to that ground work) to take a point of order of that nature. As I understand it, the Speaker's ruling referred to the way in which I had produced that passing reference. I find it very surprising that the member for Light then stands up and makes the sort of fundamental issue of it as he seeks to do, particularly as it will waste the time that the House has allotted to debate this important issue.

**The Hon. B.C. Eastick:** Would you gag a member?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** No, I would not gag a member. But, surely the honourable member knows the difference between gagging a member and saying that what he said was out of order and not very relevant. That is done by members opposite all the time. What is wrong with saying that I disagree with the member for Light? Apparently, if we stand here and say that we disagree, we are gagging the Opposition. What an extraordinary concept. I disagree with the point made by the member for Light. I believe that he has misinterpreted the Speaker's ruling and taken a totally trivial point and elevated it to a major issue. I do not deny the honourable member his right to do that. If he wants to waste the time of the House doing that, that is up to him. His colleagues may not appreciate it, but bad luck. At the moment it appears that they are quite happy to waste time. On this issue, in the way in which this matter was introduced, the triviality of the point, and the way in which the Speaker interpreted it, we must support the Speaker's ruling. Let us do that and get on with the debate.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I would like to make a comment or two. First, I do not take kindly to remarks being made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition implying that I am running the place like Rafferty or with Rafferty's rules and somehow with an animus against the Opposition. I believe that I have given the Government and the Opposition an equal go on all occasions. I do not intend to labour the point, but it is like trying to argue with the Pharisees, with all due respects to the members for Light and Fisher.

It is a highly technical point and the plain fact of the matter was that this was a passing reference made by the Premier in relation to a matter and, even though there were two separate motions (I agree with that)—or there was a separate motion which was passed and we are now embarking on a discussion of the other—the two are so enmeshed in my opinion that common sense dictates that there is no point of order.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** On a point of—

**The SPEAKER:** Do you have a point of order?

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** No point of order was raised, Sir: it is a motion against your ruling.

**The SPEAKER:** I understand, yes.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (21)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, Ashenden, Baker, Becker, D.C. Brown, Chapman, Eastick (teller), Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Ingerson, Lewis, Mathwin, Meier, Olsen, Oswald, Rodda, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (24)—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 Mayes, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Members opposite must make up their minds whether we are trying in this debate to do something serious and important about the South Australian wine industry and the impact of the Federal tax on it or whether we are merely involved in some sort of political grandstanding. If, in fact, the motion is structured in such a way—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I understand that the proposition is that, if the Opposition has complaints about the wine tax and, as a result, wants to move a motion, especially attacking and condemning the Prime Minister and making other political points, that is not grandstanding but legitimate. However, if the Government that is responsible for governing this State wishes to move a motion that addresses itself to the issue, that is political grandstanding. That is an extraordinary double standard. Surely, on this issue if on no other, we could have a bipartisan approach and unanimous support. I welcomed statements concerning the wine tax made by the Leader of the Opposition last evening. In most respects they were in line with my statements, and I should have thought that at least on this issue we had something on which South Australians, whatever their Party political complexion, could agree and that the best way to ensure that we agreed was to move motions to try to get something constructive done about the matter and not to revert into some sort of political bunker by trying to use the motion for other purposes.

That, I regret to say, is the sort of working that the Opposition would prefer. It would appear that members opposite are not so interested in the issue of the wine tax: they are more interested in making political capital and points against the Hawke Government. I understand their desire to do that. It is a legitimate desire for the Liberal Party, in Opposition and disarray in most States and federally, to try to bolster Mr Peacock in his vainglorious attempts—

**Mr LEWIS:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker. To what extent have the Premier's subjective opinions on Mr Peacock's views and position anything to do with the motion?

**The SPEAKER:** There is no point of order, but I ask the Premier to link his remarks more closely to the motion.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Certainly, Mr Speaker. I see the legitimacy of the Opposition's desire to attack the Federal Labor Government, but not in this debate, which is about a common cause. Surely, for once members of both Parties can join to look at this matter in practical and effective terms. I had just 20 minutes prior knowledge of the announcement last evening, and I guess that in my discussion with the Prime Minister this morning I complained vigorously about that aspect. I believed that I could have been trusted with some kind of confidence on this matter, especially in view of the assurances I received earlier this year. The Prime Minister responded, 'As this is a revenue measure, you know the dangers of letting it out to anyone, especially

as it was something that would apply at the time of the Treasurer's announcement. In any case, your reaction to it could have been a direct one.' Indeed it was: I was flabbergasted by it.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy:** You've got a lot of clout, so—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the Deputy Leader to refrain from interjecting.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** That sort of interjection I will not respond to because it is yet another attempt not to address the issue but to try to make some sort of internal political capital out of it. For goodness sake, let us look at this as a national impost that must be worked out and discussed by the State as a whole. Let us not run around making cheap cracks about who has clout or who has not, whether relating to Mr Hawke or anyone else. Let us deal with the matter directly, which is the purpose of the debate. Let me outline some of the steps taken since I heard the announcement last night. We have done quite a lot in terms of getting together material from the industry and ascertaining its reaction. I have spoken to the Prime Minister this morning about the matter, and I conveyed to him directly and firmly the attitude of South Australians to this matter and the sense of disappointment we feel at the way in which this decision was announced. It is all very well to have an inquiry into the industry, but to do so after a tax has been imposed surely is a nonsense, and I made that clear to the Prime Minister.

I think that the way in which the Federal Government has dealt with this matter (which is not very different from the previous approach of the Hawke Government) is quite scandalous. I have used some strong language about it, but if we descend to the kind of gutter abuse of the Opposition that would be totally unproductive. I make that point as it is important and must be remembered in trying to look after the interests of South Australians. Our vulnerability on this issue must be borne in mind. It should be borne in mind that for the Eastern States this is not a major issue because they do not have a component in the wine industry, and also that there is strong support for the argument put forward by the brewers that if beer is taxed so also should be wine. All those points should be borne in mind. We have a case to put forward. The onus is on us, because in South Australia it closely affects us; we understand the situation and have argued and lived with it. The fact cannot be ignored that we have a big case to put at the national level. However, we will not be able to do that if we resort to cheap abuse and, certainly, that will not pick up any votes.

The Government has also ensured that the terms of reference of the inquiry and its composition have been discussed with the office of the Minister of Agriculture. I have written to the major industry organisations in South Australia offering them every assistance, particularly in relation to the inquiry that has been announced. I have signed a letter forwarded to the Treasurer setting out our position on the matter in the very strongest terms. I will refer to that in a moment. The Federal Treasurer will be in Adelaide next week, so motions demanding that various Federal Ministers, the Prime Minister and others visit South Australia are unnecessary. The Treasurer will be in Adelaide next week at which time our views can be put strongly to him.

It is certainly true that by imposing a sales tax on wine the Federal Government has discriminated against South Australia and for a totally spurious reason, namely, that the wine industry needs equity with the brewing industry. I reject that argument, and I think we should all reject it. There are very great differences in structure and in economic vulnerability and, indeed, in regional input between the brewing and the wine industries. The wine industry is vital

to the South Australian economy. We have an extremely large regional presence in that industry, and thus any tax on it is discriminatory in a way that a tax on beer is not. It is linked with our tourist industry and various other aspects of our economy. Therefore, its effects must be discriminatory in a way that the existing liquor tax and traditional long-term taxes are not.

I cannot see that connection which is made and which has been urged so vigorously by the brewing industry. Indeed, I would have thought that the Federal Government would not accept that. It would be easy to simply take refuge behind this argument of equity if one simply argued that on an emotional basis wine should not be taxed, as opposed to an emotional argument that it should be taxed at the same level as beer. Matters such as employment in the industry and the structure of retailing of the industry must be considered. Admittedly, of all the various taxes that have been imposed and withdrawn in the industry over the years, at least this tax has some greater equity than some have had in the past, and I refer particularly to the iniquitous liquor spirit tax that was introduced and removed following very strong lobbying by this Government, for which we got no credit from members opposite. On that occasion no motion was moved to congratulate the Government on its success in that area which was unprecedented.

In fact, as it turned out and as I have said publicly, the respite was short. But, it is very symptomatic of their attitude that that was greeted with (if I may use the phrase), 'sour grapes' and a deafening silence. Opposition members were all yelling and shouting when it came in but they did very little to assist the efforts we made through reason, logic and argument to get that removed, and eventually it prevailed. We are confronted with a similar situation today, and I would hope that on this occasion we will get more than rhetoric, bombast and abuse from the Opposition in the course of it.

I find that some of the other arguments which have been adduced to support this are quite wrong. For instance, reference is made in the Budget speech to imports. It states:

This reduction in protection is not expected to result in any significant increase in wine imports.

I would suggest that a great vulnerability is being opened up in respect of wine imports. There is a well authenticated wine lake in the European Economic Community. Already the Italian wine industry has made massive inroads into the United States markets. They are poised to come here, and unless some kind of protection and monitoring is afforded, then our wine industry, particularly in that bulk, high volume low cost area, will be under very, very severe threat, and that is something from which we cannot shrink.

I suggest that the Treasury is again making one of its assertions without the proper backing and support, in terms of fact, to see whether that assertion is right, just as it made the assertion that the liquor spirit tax would not really harm the industry. It was not until a number of those involved in making fortified wines began to announce that they were going out of business that the message finally began to be hammered through. That is the same with imports. I hope it will not be only when the imports start flooding into this country that they wake up to the fact that there will not be any significant increase, as it is put in the Budget. That situation has to be monitored very closely, and we need the assistance of the industry to do that. We have to ensure that imports do not compound the threat to consumption that will be present by the imposition of the tax itself.

It is very hard to estimate in precise terms at this time the economic effect of the tax. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics I understand made a calculation that a 10 per cent sales tax could result in a 4 per cent drop in sales in the short term. Bearing in mind that there has been a steady

increase of 4 per cent or 5 per cent growth in consumption over time—admittedly, in most industries that would be seen, particularly in the past few years, as a sign of prosperity—the problem is that that increase in consumption has not found its way back in tangible benefits to the grower and wine makers. However, that aside, that sort of growth has been present, so that effectively means that there will be no growth and over time the Bureau suggests something like a 13½ per cent drop in sales. If that happens, if indeed there is that kind of displacement of the wine drinking effects—and there are those who argue that that is exaggerated—then that could cause very severe problems indeed.

Exercises within the Department of State Development in the past—again, very much rule of thumb and difficult to quantify—suggest that in the short term about 300-odd jobs could be lost; in the longer term it could be about 1 300. That is vastly different from the 4 000 that the Leader of the Opposition was suggesting. I am talking about multipliers, not direct jobs: the direct jobs are very much less, but let us look at the multipliers, which is the sensible way of looking at it. One has to be careful not to make alarmist statements or quote alarmist figures because all that will happen then is that the industry will drop its bundle.

People will walk off their blocks and properties. I believe that we have to tackle this in a realistic and sensible way. So, those estimates will have to be made. They will have to be looked at and monitored very closely indeed. But it is certainly true that it will have an employment effect in the industry. When it does, it will be regional—particularly pronounced in the Riverland, I would suggest; hence that part of the motion which makes specific reference to the Riverland and its problems and the fact that I believe the Federal Government has not been sufficiently supportive of the Riverland redevelopment propositions which this State Government has been advancing.

I would hope that in this context it can, in fact, provide the structures and financial assistance that are necessary. The key to that, of course, is the inquiry. I would hope that all members, and indeed the industry as a whole, make sure that out of that inquiry we get the hard data, the facts, which will make the Federal Government reconsider the matter. That is the challenge that faces us. It is the only realistic way in which we should tackle it.

I am not going to stand here, jump up and down, fulminate and carry on. I think it would be futile, the day after the Budget, to suggest that we can completely turn over the Budget and its strategy. We were successful last year on the fortified wine tax. It took us a long time. It was not through rhetoric that we did it; it was through putting the facts fairly and squarely to the Federal Government. It was not by grandstanding in this Parliament or any other venue. Whatever the temptations, I am not going to be involved in that. If that is regarded as some kind of failing, I believe that there is a strong misreading of how things can be done.

I conclude by pointing out that in my letter to the Federal Treasurer I have outlined arguments. I have indicated not only that I am astounded that the Federal Government could have made this decision, but that the arguments are very clear. Let me conclude with them, because this will have to be the basis of our continuing case. We have put those arguments so many times in the past; we have to put them again. Reference has already been made to the discriminatory impact on this State. As we produce more than 50 per cent, it will have a greater effect here than anywhere else.

The problem of imports, the European wine lake, and the threat that that poses to us is another argument against imposing such a duty at this time. Indeed, it is an argument to look at the whole question of imports and how they are taxed. In the Riverland region with its particular problems,

clearly there will probably be a greater effect because of the impact on bulk wine sales. We will have to look at that in terms of finding adequate markets for its range of products and ensure that there are proper incomes and prosperity in the area.

The wine industry is a very important decentralised employment industry and a focus for tourism in this State is another argument that should be used in terms of the general question of taxing wine in this country. I have also referred to the fact that there was a succession of reports. I think that the most recent was in 1976-77 by a Senate Select Committee into the wine industry, its structure and its fragile nature. All those reports have recognised that this industry is vulnerable in a way that the brewing industry or any other industry that one seeks to associate with it is not. Therefore, it means that special care has to be taken if one is to try to put any kind of levy on it. The simple argument of equity that is used is not valid in this case.

Once again, we are confronted with a wine tax. Such a tax has been imposed before and has proved to be disastrous in the past. I believe that it is up to all South Australians, on a basis not of political grandstanding or personal abuse, to get on with the job of trying to do something about reducing or eliminating such an impost on this very important industry in South Australia.

**Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition):** The Premier advised the House that he telephoned the Prime Minister this morning to express his disappointment on behalf of South Australians. It is about time that the Premier recognised that 'softly softly' does not work and has not worked for South Australia. It is about time that this Premier stood up for South Australia's interests in Canberra. He said during the last election campaign that he wanted South Australia to win. Some win today, with this wine tax that has been imposed upon South Australian industry!

In his motion, the Premier refers to the inquiry—an inquiry after the tax has been applied—the cart before the horse, as the Premier well knows. This motion is not about equity between taxing the beer industry and other sections compared to the wine industry; it is about honesty in Government—that is what the motion is about. The Premier says that we have had a win on fortified wine and that the tax on fortified wine was removed earlier this year. What a hollow victory for South Australia! The fact is that Bob took the Premier to the cleaners and well he knows it now. If that is the benchmark of success, the negotiations of this Premier, of this Government, with its counterparts in Canberra, heaven help South Australia over the next 18 months! Let it well be known in South Australia that the last time there was a tax on wine it was applied by a Labor Government—the Whitlam Labor Government in 1974. So much for Labor's interest in South Australia! So much for Labor's interest in the protection of the wine industry—a major employer in South Australia!

This debate is about 14 words uttered by the Prime Minister on 20 February 1983. In giving his policy speech at Griffith on that date, Mr Hawke stated:

Labor is pledged not to impose a sales tax or excise tax on wine.

So, the Prime Minister cannot be allowed to change his stand and dump South Australia like that. What about the Premier? What about Johnny come lately? When it comes to tackling Mr Hawke he exhibits all the reluctance of a gigolo being pushed into an arranged marriage. He has made as much of an impression on the Prime Minister as would snow in the Sahara. I remind members of what he said a couple of years ago: that Roxby Downs was nothing but a mirage in the desert. They were the words of this Leader fighting for South Australia. Let us look at the pre-election

promises for South Australia under Federal and State Labor Governments. Let us look at how their promises have melted away.

We got less money as a result of the Premiers' Conference than did any other State. The Alice Springs to Darwin railway line has evaporated—abandoned. Funding for water filtration was cut last year. The Berri bridge is not going ahead. We have lost uranium mines and the uranium enrichment industry. We now have a sales tax—a discriminatory and savage tax for South Australia that will cost jobs for South Australians. The front page of the *Australian* summed it up with the headline, 'Something for everyone', but then in brackets was the sting for South Australia when it said, 'except for South Australia'—except for the wine industry in South Australia. Mr Keating talks about Australia as a sea of prosperity, but all the while his Government is cutting South Australia adrift like an island of stagnation.

So much for the importance of Mick Young in the Federal Cabinet! Clearly, he has had about as much influence on this decision as a Paddington bear. I am surprised that he did not leak the decision in advance. I can understand that this Government's Federal counterparts have dumped it on a main issue affecting an industry and jobs in South Australia, as everybody along the Government benches and, indeed, the Premier well knows. While last year this Premier took a high profile on the question of wine taxes and charges (which was only partially successful), this year he has been silent.

It is interesting to note the total silence from this Premier in recent weeks and months in the lead-up to this Federal Budget. One could ask, 'Why?' I believe someone passed the message on to him not to go out on a limb because it would get chopped off. He got chopped off, anyway, in the Federal Budget. The Premier said nothing, obviously, because his colleagues made it known to him that a wine tax was to be introduced. Instead of presenting a submission to the Federal Government again this year, instead of co-ordinating all South Australia's Senators, and instead of bringing all bipartisan forces together in South Australia in recent months to ensure that there was no wine tax, there was not a word from the Premier in the lead-up to this Budget.

The question still is, 'Why?' We well know the reason why. The Premier's silence has been in complete contrast to the activity of the Liberal Party, which has consistently fought to ensure that this matter was kept before the public and that no tax was imposed. A number of my Federal colleagues have made statements in recent months urging that this tax not be imposed. It is sadly ironic that at the top of today's Notice Paper is a private member's motion from the member for Chaffey referring to the depressed state of the wine industry and the plight of grapegrowers, and calling on Canberra not to impose on the industry any further forms of taxation. How ironic that that is the first item on the Notice Paper today in private members' business, and it has been on the Notice Paper for weeks. Let it be known that the Liberal Party has stated consistently and persistently its opposition to a wine tax. The Manager of the Australian Wine and Brandy Producers Association, Mr Nettlebeck, has said:

The grapegrowing section cannot afford such lost income as evidenced in the recently released draft report of the IAC on dried vine fruits in which various tables show the difficult situation which many grapegrowers already face, even before the threatened collapse of dried fruit export markets and the imposition of this untimely sales tax. The Association had hoped the Government had realised the fragile nature of the industry as evidenced by the Government about-face on the grape spirit excise.

The Manager of the South Australian Wine and Brandy Producers Association, Mr Stephens, said:

I've got one thing to say to the Hawke Government—thanks very much for nothing.

Also, the Wine and Grapegrowers Council spokesman, Mr Allan Preece, said that the tax would leave one hell of a hole in the industry.

The effects of a tax of this nature on wine—not only on jobs but also on the industry in South Australia—are well documented. There is no need for an inquiry. It is well and truly documented, just as it was well and truly documented in a submission the former Liberal Government put to the then Federal Liberal Government to ensure that no tax would be imposed on the wine industry. Indeed, a submission was made last year along the same lines. It is well documented evidence beyond doubt that this tax will have a devastating effect on South Australia. The impact on grape-growers in particular has already been highlighted by the Vice President of the South Australian Co-operative Wineries Association, Mr Klinberg, who has said that wineries will sell wine in stock before buying grapes to produce more.

The wine industry is largely decentralised and provides significant investment in this State and employment in a number of South Australian regional centres, particularly the Barossa Valley, the Riverland, the Clare Valley, Southern Vales and the South-East. Also, of course, employment opportunities increase during harvest periods. The South Australian tourist industry is also dependent in many important ways on the wine industry. One has only to visit the Barossa and Clare Valleys to see their importance to tourism in South Australia.

In 1982-83, the last year for which figures were available, South Australia processed 55 per cent of the grapes used in wine production around Australia and 60 per cent of the national wine output. Those figures demonstrate the completely discriminatory nature of the tax on South Australia. It has been estimated that the imposition of this sales tax will lead to a drop of 24 million litres annually in wine production in South Australia. That is 2.5 million cases of wine; that is the quantity about which we are talking. The estimated reduction in intake of grapes from South Australian growers is put at about 39 000 tonnes annually, a 16 per cent drop based on the latest figures for material used in wine production.

The loss in payments to growers is estimated at about \$9 million annually in the longer term, and that loss is being faced by those who can least afford it. According to the latest statistics, about 1 730 establishments in South Australia are classified as grapegrowing, with an average cash operating surplus of \$11 896, but with a quarter of those growers having surpluses below \$1 877. That is the bottom line for those grapegrowers: that is the cash left in the kitty after expenses. Now we have a Government that is going to take \$9 million out of the pockets of those people in the industry.

People with incomes like this were hit only last year by the Bannon Government with a massive hike in water rates. The blockies in the Riverland area well know the effect of the impost of the Government's taxes and charges and now, coupled with what the Hawke Government has done, it is delivering the knock-out blow.

The South Australian industry has been taking a far sighted and positive approach to correct recent downturns in wine grape production. For example, vine improvement committees have been established in all growing areas and, with the use of modern technological methods, they have been encouraging the introduction of new grape varieties to meet the anticipated changing demands of the wine market. What has to be recognised is that grapegrowing is different from barleygrowing. Before one can bring something on production and get returns, one must wait seven years for the vines to mature. However, the barleygrowers can grow wheat, oats and a variety of other products on their properties, and in addition to that they have markets for their produce. There is an alternative for them. However, for the wine-grape

grower there is no alternative. The grapes either go into wine production or they wither on the vine: that is the alternative.

It is not a question of equity. It comes back to a basic question of honesty—an honesty of Labor leaders that this State has unfortunately come almost to accept; that is, until the next election day, when it is realised that their promises are not worth the paper they are written on—that their words, commitments, and clear unequivocal commitments to the electorate are not worth anything. The taxpayers of South Australia are well and truly aware of the broken election promises made by this Labor Government in this State and the impact of that on the household budget, the hip pocket nerve of every household—whether on a low income or on a high income, or whether it involves a small business or a big business. The impact of this Government dragging funds from individuals and businesses in this State is retarding this State and will in the long term create a major problem in relation to the competitive nature of goods produced in South Australia.

Wine producers also face the challenges of a volatile market place. Production in EEC countries is on the increase while internal consumption of wine in those countries has declined. This surplus situation in Europe will only give further impetus to efforts to dump wine on the Australian market. During the past 12 months there has been increased activity in particular from the champagne houses of France, to the extent that the day of French champagne being available in Australia at under \$10 a bottle is not far away. This is occurring at a time when some South Australian producers (and I refer to Orlando, Yalumba and Wolf Blass) are breaking new ground in the production of premium champagne.

But this sales tax will do nothing to encourage or to help their efforts to lift the standing of the South Australian industry even further. All the self help that they have shown over recent times will go down the gurgler because of this decision. Indeed, it is double jeopardy, because the sales tax on imported wine in this Budget has been reduced from 20 per cent to 10 per cent. Not only do we have a tax of 10 per cent placed on the wine industry but also the importers have had the sales tax on imported wine reduced from 20 per cent to 10 per cent. It is an insult to the wine industry and the growers in that industry in South Australia.

The credibility of this decision involves more than the words of the Prime Minister. His Minister for Primary Industry, Mr Kerin, also made a series of statements before the last Federal election, saying there would be no sales tax. At the height of the Federal election campaign, during a meeting at McLaren Vale, Mr Kerin said, 'Industry will welcome Labor's pledge not to contemplate a wine tax.' Of course, that was a promise, a deception, designed to help Labor win the seat of Kingston. Labor leaders will say anything to win: 'It doesn't matter how you get there, just get there; and once you get there, run it how you want to.'

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr OLSEN:** And well there might be some response from the other side! Obviously, Government members, in their door knocking, are getting their message back from the electorate right now.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I had assumed that this was a serious matter.

**Mr OLSEN:** I also refer to the Premier's policy on wine and grapes, issued on 7 July 1982, when he said, 'For the first time the Australian Labor Party in South Australia has issued a separate election policy on wine and grapegrowing.' No doubt, that will be the last time the ALP will distribute such a policy in this State. The Prime Minister must be prepared to come to South Australia immediately and debate his sales tax with the industry, with the people who will be

most directly affected, with the people who will be hurt: in particular, the grapegrowers whose livelihoods will be further jeopardised. The Premier should demand that Mr Hawke come here as a matter of urgency to face up to what his Government has done to this State. It is about time the Premier did what he said he would do in his policy speech, when he said, 'We need to stand up to Mr Fraser and make South Australia's voice heard again in Canberra.' That is a direct quote from the Premier's policy speech, but those words ring hollow today. For three years, the former Liberal Government of this State successfully resisted any Federal imposition of a tax on the wine industry. That is what standing up to Canberra means. Indeed, I have today received an assurance from the Federal Leader of the Opposition (Andrew Peacock) that—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr OLSEN:**—a coalition Government will abolish the tax. Let that attitude be known in the grapegrowing districts of South Australia, because the track record of the Liberal Party in respect of wine tax compared with that of the Labor Party is now well documented. Those people will know how they have been deceived by this Labor Government. There is talk about an inquiry, but there is no need for an inquiry in this industry.

**The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy:** They had one into the railway.

**Mr OLSEN:** Yes, and what did it produce? The Premier sent his tough negotiator, the Deputy Premier, who was going to show Bob Hawke and the Federal Labor Party what they must do. They were to add an input into the terms of reference for the inquiry into the proposed railway from Alice Springs to Darwin. What did that input do in relation to the terms of the inquiry? We got no railway line. Any tactician knows that, if one wants to get rid of an issue from the front page and put it away for a while, it should be sent to an inquiry. That action will break down the inquisition and criticism. Send it to an inquiry and hope that it goes away. This Government says, 'Mr Hawke, we are disappointed.' However, it is about time that the Government got rid of its 'softly, softly' approach, got into the bunker, and stood up and fought for South Australia's interests, because there has been no indication of the Government's willingness to do this on behalf of the State. I move the following amendment to the Premier's motion:

To strike out all words after 'that' first occurring and insert the following:

- because the general sales tax on wine imposed in last night's Federal Budget unfairly discriminates against South Australia;
- and because the tax will cause widespread disruption and loss of income and jobs in our grapegrowing and wine producing industries in particular;
- this House condemns the Prime Minister for breaking the promise he made on 20 February 1983 not to introduce such a tax;
- calls on the Prime Minister to immediately visit South Australia to review the decision in consultation with grapegrowers and wine producers;
- and calls on the Premier to communicate this motion forthwith to the Prime Minister.

**Mr EVANS:** I second the amendment.

The House divided on the Leader of the Opposition's amendment:

Ayes (21)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, Ashenden, Baker, Becker, D.C. Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Ingerson, Lewis, Mathwin, Meier, Olsen (teller), Oswald, Rodda, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (24)—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 Mayes,

Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negated.

Motion carried.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION: RACING INDUSTRY

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN:** This afternoon the Minister of Recreation and Sport stated that yesterday in this House I made allegations about racing industry practices, and in his circulated statement the Minister challenged me to provide any evidence that I might have which contradicts his claim of proper procedures being undertaken throughout the industry. During the adjournment debate in this House last evening I identified my personal interest and participation in and, indeed, my high regard for the three racing codes, namely, horse-racing, horse-trotting and greyhound-racing. I acknowledged the importance and the enormous magnitude of employment opportunities provided by the racing industry. I personally made no allegations at all. I expressed my interest in the industry.

I love the sport, and for generations my family has been involved and interested in the activities of the three racing codes. I deny the validity of the matters alluded to in the Minister's statement. My sole purpose in bringing the matter to the Minister's attention was to incite some semblance of activity from the Minister to assist the codes in their endeavour to stamp out the occurrences referred to in the media recently. I expressed grave concern about the spate of recent media reports referring to alleged unsavoury practices with implied criticisms including security, lack of operational intention and dissatisfaction amongst some of the clubs about their share of TAB funding, etc. To reinforce my position following the claims made by the Minister I refer again to what I said last night:

I do not profess in these few minutes available to me to express a view on these rather unsavoury reports about our racing industry and its respective codes . . . I repeat my call on the Minister to put together a panel of independent professional people who can investigate the allegations and reports surfacing so often in recent days (indeed, too often), and I do so in the interests of the industry and without prejudice or without reflecting on those who are working very hard and very long hours, many times for little or no remuneration, to make the industry successful.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION: PREMIER'S REMARKS

**Mr LEWIS (Mallee):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**Mr LEWIS:** The Premier misrepresented me grossly today when he said that I and other members of the Opposition had given the Government no credit for the small part it played in having the tax on fortified wine removed. I am demonstrably on the public record as having commended on more than one occasion the part that the South Australian Government played in having that tax removed.

**The SPEAKER:** Call on the business of the day.

#### WINE INDUSTRY

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey):** I seek leave to amend the motion standing in my name.



**The SPEAKER:** Will the honourable member indicate to the House the motion as amended.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** The amended motion is as follows:

That this House, recognising the depressed state of the wine industry, the plight of the wine-grape growers and their inability to meet mounting costs, condemns the Federal Government for imposing a 10 per cent sales tax on wine and calls on the Federal Government to withdraw the tax forthwith.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** I move the motion accordingly. Never have I seen in this place such a weak stance taken by a Premier when defending an industry of such key importance to South Australia. The Federal Budget can only be described as a cowardly attack on South Australia's comparatively small grapegrowing industry. The Prime Minister knows only too well that his action will have little consequence on the forthcoming Federal election. It is despicable, because he knows that electorally it will have little effect. Further, this action is disgraceful, because during the past 18 months the Federal Government has already attacked the industry by imposing an excise on rectifying spirit for the production of fortified wines. Now it has imposed a wine tax of 10 per cent across the whole industry. That is disgraceful when one considers that the Federal Government was elected on a pledge to not introduce any further sales taxes or sales excises during its term of office. I can only describe the Prime Minister as a disgustingly dishonest little wretch.

In regard to the consequences for South Australia as a result of the Federal Government's action in relation to the wine industry, first, it could cost up to 4 000 jobs in South Australia. The Premier made a lot of noise about 2 000 jobs having been created since the Government's coming into office, although he has said very little about the 2 100 jobs that have been lost since that time. In fact, in South Australia we now have fewer people employed than there were when the Government assumed office in November 1982. Secondly, there will be a drop in demand for wine grapes to the value of \$15 million throughout South Australia. That figure is verified by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Thirdly, there will be a direct loss of \$5 million in farming income of Riverland wine-grape growers. Fourthly, this action makes an absolute farce out of the proposed Riverland Development Council to which the Premier has referred so often and to which he referred again this afternoon. The Steering Committee report presented to the State Government recently on the proposal for a Riverland Council for Redevelopment states at page 10:

The annual gross value of Riverland horticultural production is around \$100 million, and after multiplier effects are considered the value of income generated in the region by fruitgrowers alone is around \$250-350 million per year... What is known is that horticultural crops are the largest contributors providing an estimated 'gross value' in 1981-82 of \$111.2 million. Grapes contributed \$44.45 million...

However, it also states:

In regard to personal incomes, a higher proportion of the Riverland population is in the lower income brackets (up to \$10 000) than in the State as a whole: that is, 71.3 per cent in the Riverland compared with 65 per cent Statewide.

That is a very telling point, and the Premier's action in moving a motion to block the precise motion put forward by the Opposition can only be condemned in the strongest terms.

In this morning's *Advertiser* the Premier said that he would demand compensation from the Federal Government for the effect that the tax will have on the South Australian industry and those employed in it. The industry does not want compensation: it wants to be able to get on with the job and not be destroyed by ill conceived taxes and charges. The first of those taxes and charges was the devastating

brandy excise, imposed in the early and mid 1970s, which virtually destroyed the brandy industry. That having happened, we then saw cheap imports coming in from France, heavily subsidised, and that has continued the problem for Australia and particularly the Riverland in South Australia, because it used to represent 80 per cent of Australia's brandy production. A document presented by the Chief Executive Officer of Berri Estates at a conference held in the Riverland earlier this year states:

Our capacity for manufacturing brandy has not diminished but the declining demand caused by increased excise duties being levied by various Governments and exacerbated by the deluge of cheap dumped French brandy has brought our massive stills to a halt. My company in its two plants in Renmark and Berri has sufficient capacity to manufacture over 3 million litres of pure alcohol brandy during a vintage. Australia's total consumption from the latest ABS figures to August 1983 was just under 3 million litres of which over 25 per cent was imported from France at landed prices of less than 50 per cent of our cost of production.

For brandy to be landed in Australia from France at 50 per cent of the cost of production in this country is absolutely absurd. It cannot be done without massive subsidies applying. However, the Federal Government has allowed that situation to continue over the years, and the massive stills at Berri Estates wineries remain idle when they have the capacity to produce more than the total brandy requirements of this country.

The next charge was a wine tax in the early 1970s, another disaster for the wine industry. Then there was the excise recently on rectifying spirit for production of fortified wines, which was referred to again today. That tax was recently removed. Now there is the massive across the board wine tax which was introduced yesterday and which will come into effect immediately. I do not believe the Premier when he says that he received no indication of this tax from the Federal Government. Last year he made a big song and dance about the matter, and certainly many other people in the industry and the community have foreshadowed the likelihood of the Federal Government breaking its promise and imposing a wine tax. However, the Premier claims that he had no knowledge of it whatsoever. I totally reject that statement by the Premier, and the fact that he has said absolutely nothing in the weeks leading up to the Federal Budget clearly indicates that he was well aware that the Federal Government would impose a tax in the Budget. What he was doing was just lying low.

If any further evidence of the contempt for which the Labor Party holds the wine industry, and the wine-grape growers in particular, in this State is necessary, then it has certainly been provided by the Hawke Government on this occasion. The industry cannot afford the imposts that have been foisted on it by the Federal Government. I have highlighted the economic circumstances of many growers in the Riverland and it is clearly documented in the reference that I made earlier. It is a reference that cannot be refuted. A steering committee established by the Government to report to it has set out the financial situation of most wine-grape growers in this country. The hardship that will be caused and the added demands made on the Community Welfare Department and the Department of Social Security will be very significant indeed.

The Minister opposite would be aware of many of the financial problems confronting wine-grape growers in the Riverland. The sorry state is that the horticultural industries, the wine industry and the wine-grape growing industry, all employ a large number of people in this State. Some other industries are highly mechanised and automated and whilst their production in gross value may be significantly higher, the employment generated is nothing like that generated in the horticultural industries. Some 8.6 per cent of the total value of agricultural production in South Australia, by value,

is generated and produced in the Riverland: that is no small proportion and if one takes the horticultural industry as a whole one is talking of a figure nearer 15 or 16 per cent of the total agricultural value of this State. The wine-grape growing industry is a significant part of that, and when growers' incomes are reduced by about \$5 million the effect will be dramatic, and the Minister of Community Welfare would be aware of the effect that that will have on a community such as the Riverland.

It is an absolute disgrace; it is blatant dishonesty on the part of the Prime Minister. It is the second time that he has tried to attack the wine industry in 18 months, and it is high time that he acted with a little more honesty and stood up for some of his election undertakings. Many election promises have been wiped out in South Australia by the Bannon Government, and many more have been totally disregarded and abandoned by the Hawke Government. This measure is devastating and I call on the support of this House in condemning the Federal Government and call for an immediate withdrawal of the wine tax.

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

### PEDESTRIAN LIGHTS

**Mr BECKER (Hanson):** I move:

That this House urge the Government to immediately install pedestrian activated traffic lights opposite Christ the King Church at 458 Henley Beach Road, Lockleys, for the safety and protection of schoolchildren attending St Francis School, parishioners, senior citizens, residents and all visitors who use the school and parish facilities.

Shortly after the opening of this current session of Parliament I presented a petition from 1 347 residents of South Australia (most of whom are my constituents) which reads:

That pedestrian activated traffic lights opposite Christ the King Church at 458 Henley Beach Road, Lockleys, are urgently required for the protection and safety of schoolchildren, parishioners, senior citizens, residents and all visitors who use school and parish facilities, seven days a week. Your petitioners therefore pray that your honourable House will urge the Government to install pedestrian activated traffic lights opposite Christ the King Church, Lockleys, forthwith.

In considering a proposal for the installation of pedestrian activated traffic lights where schools are involved, the Highways Department will assist the location on the basis of a flashing-light school crossing. The normal policy where a school is involved on an arterial road is that the Board would normally approve pedestrian activated lights in line with the warrant determined. If no school was involved, warrants involved on their own would be much higher. If a school is involved, a reasonable proportion of children would be crossing and, if justified, the Department would install pedestrian activated lights. General rules for flashing lights would be that, for each of two separate hours of a typical school day, the number of children observed crossing the road who could be expected to use the crossing at a single point shall exceed 50 per hour. In the same two hours the number of vehicles must exceed 200 per hour. The two-hour periods are between 8 a.m. and 6 p.m., and the two highest hourly rates of pedestrian movements are considered. I consider these to be broad guidelines for the use of determining pedestrian activated lights, whether for a school crossing or simply for the guidance and protection of pedestrians. These rules are extremely severe when they relate to the safety of individuals.

The location to which I refer in the motion is extremely busy. There is a church, behind which are sporting facilities such as tennis courts and an oval, and there is also a school. We find that the church and the various meeting places and

sporting activities are used by the Catholic Women's League, the St Vincent de Paul Society, the Italian Didactics Centre (for Italian classes on Wednesday nights), the Woodville District Junior Soccer Association on Saturday mornings, the Lockleys Tennis Club, the Maltese Queen of Victories Band (which uses it three or four times a week), religious education classes, out-of-hours activities on Tuesdays for State schoolchildren and regular congregations who attend various mass services. The facilities located there are also used by the parish altar boys on Friday nights and by various social groups and those who hire the tennis courts on a regular monthly basis. The oval is leased to the Italian community for processions, feasts and cultural displays. The hall is hired every week for wedding receptions, 21st birthday parties, and so on.

Forward planning is to include, on a block of land behind the pre-school property, 25 units to be built in conjunction with the Housing Trust in the next 18 to 24 months to provide residential accommodation. The whole community contained within the church is a very busy and active one, held in extremely high regard by local residents. Apart from some of those uses I have mentioned, there is the St Francis School. The church, I suppose, would be busiest on weekends with normal church services and use made of facilities provided by the church. We have not included the unfortunately large number of funerals or, on happier occasions, the large number of weddings and christenings. But for normal church activity it is far busier than most religious establishments within the area.

Henley Beach Road itself is a notorious piece of roadway. The police have been in the area on many occasions at my request to establish radar surveillance and also surveillance of the zoned school crossing area. Presently, there are two signs warning of the school. Flags are placed there to warn motorists that the school is in session and that the speed limit is 25 km an hour. It is very difficult to get motorists to slow down past this location when the flags are attached to the posts. Unfortunately, because of vandalism during school hours, the flags have been stolen on many occasions.

The school has been told that it will have to wait about two weeks to replace the current set of flags. These are the difficulties being experienced. Also, a large number of retirement units are established on either side of the school. So, it can be seen that others who also use Henley Beach Road are elderly citizens. Presently, parents taking their children to school use a street (Arcoona Avenue) at the rear, simply because they will not use Henley Beach Road, as it is too dangerous. However, forcing parents to use Arcoona Avenue at the rear of the school leads to undue traffic on a very quiet residential street. Ideally, the children should enter the church and school properties from Henley Beach Road. Parents will not even let their children use public transport, because of the danger of having to cross Henley Beach Road at peak traffic times. Representations have been and are continuing to be made to me by aged citizens who live in the locality to provide some form of protection when crossing Henley Beach Road from the public transport bus stops.

The situation has come to the point where the Government must now take action. It is a matter of high priority from my constituents' viewpoint and from my viewpoint that the residents and those attending the church and school be given every protection. On 17 August I received the following letter from Aldo Floreani, the Principal of St Francis School:

As you know, the residents of the Lockleys area together with the school and parish communities are concerned about the lack of safe road crossing facilities on Henley Beach Road in front of the Christ the King Church. As Principal of the St Francis School, I wish to add to this concern and point out to you that one of our year 1 children was in fact run over by a motor vehicle last week in front of the church at the above location. The child had

the sense to roll between the wheels and was lucky that the car was travelling slowly or he could have been seriously injured if not killed. As it was, he suffered shock and a few minor bruises.

This accident confirms my fears and the fears of the communities mentioned above that the inadequate road crossing facilities have resulted in cars manoeuvring in restricted spaces to pick up/drop off passengers. The church frontage is not very wide, so it seems important to me that cars should be able to be parked along both sides of Henley Beach Road, thus preventing the congestion and allowing a clearer view to the passengers. Most drivers will not park on the southern side of Henley Beach Road because of the traffic situation. This would be alleviated if safe road crossing facilities were present.

I do not know how you relate the cost of pedestrian crossing lights to a human life. This time we were very lucky, but it may not be so if there is a next time. I trust you will bring this incident to the notice of the appropriate authorities.

Yours sincerely,  
Aldo Floreani,  
Principal

One of the mothers actively involved on the school board also wrote to me on 14 August, and stated:

As a parent and a member of the board of St Francis School, Lockleys, I urge you to stress to your colleagues the need for pedestrian lights at the above address. Last week a grade 1 boy was involved in an accident at the front of the church. Whilst it was not serious it could have been. It is not just for the children I ask but for the senior citizens living in the units next door adjoining the church/school.

Yours sincerely,  
Joyce Bayne

As far back as September 1979 the school board made representations to me seeking some action in regard to road traffic lights. I refer to a letter of 18 September 1979, signed by Michael Beerworth, Secretary of the school board, in which he states:

At a recent meeting of the school board concern was expressed at the safety of children crossing the Henley Beach Road on their way to and from the school. At the present time flags are used to warn motorists that there is a school nearby and to watch out for children. The board believes that this arrangement is not very satisfactory.

In recent years several attempts have been made to obtain a light controlled crossing but without success. Consequently, your assistance and advice is sought in a further attempt to get this facility provided.

So, I passed on that letter to the then Minister of Transport, the Hon. Michael Wilson, who replied as follows:

I refer to your letter dated 3 October 1979 concerning the installation of pedestrian actuated traffic signals for children attending the Saint Francis School at Lockleys. I have asked the Commissioner of Highways to carry out an investigation into the need for pedestrian actuated signals at this location and I hope to be in a position to provide you with the details of such investigation in December this year.

The then acting Minister of Transport, Hon. Jennifer Adamson, wrote to me in December 1980, stating:

I refer to previous correspondence relating to the installation of pedestrian actuated traffic signals for children attending St Francis School at Lockleys. The Commissioner of Highways has now completed his investigations into the need for pedestrian actuated signals at this location and has provided me with a report.

The investigation found that pedestrian activity in this area is very low in comparison with other locations. Traffic signals at Tapleys Hill Road-Henley Beach Road and May Terrace-Henley Beach Road-Douglas Street provide gaps in the traffic flow to enable pedestrians to cross Henley Beach Road in relative safety.

Whoever wrote that garbage and nonsense has no respect for the people who have to use that location on Henley Beach Road. I was livid when I received that information. To say that, because some distance away (I have not measured it but it would be at least half a kilometre or more) there are traffic lights which create a gap in the traffic is absolute rubbish. Any cold-blooded callous person who could write that sort of information for the Minister to pass on to me has no regard for the individuals who use that area. The letter continues:

The Highways Department considers that the existing protection afforded by the large 'school' signs and the use of 'children' flags

is appropriate at this location. Under the Road Traffic Act, when children are in the zone, motorists are obliged to travel at a speed not exceeding 25 km/h.

Few motorists would understand that traffic rule. I have witnessed, as have members of the board, parishioners and children at the school, motorists speeding through when the flags are there. Tragically, because of vandalism by louts using Henley Beach Road (not necessarily living in the district), flags are stolen and warnings cannot be given. The letter continues:

The Commissioner of Police has been requested to arrange for patrols to police the area with regard to excessive speed.

In fact, several police motor vehicles have been seen speeding through the location when the flags are up. That matter was drawn to the attention of the Police Commissioner recently. I understand that he was not happy about it and that the police are not happy with me, either. So what? As far as I am concerned the police have to abide by the road traffic rules the same as anyone else. The letter further states:

During the five year period, 1974-78, there was only one accident involving a pedestrian within the section of Henley Beach Road between Kenton Street and Rutland Avenue.

Having regard to the effectiveness of the present protection, the low pedestrian activity, the scarcity of resources and the higher priority of many other locations of greater pedestrian movement, the Commissioner of Highways does not recommend the installation of pedestrian actuated traffic signals at the present time. However, I have asked him to keep this matter under review.

There has been an accident, and to say that there has only been one accident involving a pedestrian in five years, and that, therefore, pedestrian traffic lights are not justified is a cold-blooded assessment of the situation. I agree with the Headmaster of the school that we cannot measure a person's life in dollars and cents. Any health provider in this State, this country or overseas will tell us that the emphasis must be on the prevention of accidents, injuries or conditions that are likely to cost the community many hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of dollars.

Here is our chance, and I appeal to the Minister on compassionate grounds to establish pedestrian actuated traffic lights so that we will not ever be placed in the situation where there will be an accident with someone being killed, maimed for life or seriously injured to the point of being a quadriplegic or paraplegic. I am not prepared to accept that that type of situation could occur in the future.

The Secretary of the Parents and Friends Association wrote to me on 26 June in regard to the traffic lights and stated:

Our organisation is concerned at the lack of pedestrian lights at the church and school located at 458 Henley Beach Road, Lockleys. Numerous schoolchildren and elderly people use this main road as an access to the church and school. We ask you to lobby on our behalf to the Highways Department for the installation of pedestrian lights. You may be aware of petitions that have been organised previously in relation to these lights. We look forward to a favourable reply to our request.

A letter from Father Felix Mansueto, of the Lockleys Parish Pastoral Council, dated 4 June, states:

Please find enclosed a petition containing the signature of many parishioners concerned at the lack of safe road crossing facilities in front of the parish church at 458 Henley Beach Road, Lockleys.

As you are no doubt aware, the parish church and parish facilities are used every day of every week in the year in one way or another. Not only are we the spiritual centre for the Catholic community in this area, but we are also the spiritual centre for the Maltese community in South Australia. We are therefore available to our community for virtually 24 hours a day.

In addition, we have a parish school, tennis club, religious education classes, Maltese band, Catholic Women's League, St Vincent de Paul Society, Italian classes, altar servers and sporting teams making frequent use of the area. The Parish Hall is frequently used for wedding or birthday receptions, the elderly citizens units alongside have a definite need for the facility as do the residents of the village at 460 Henley Beach Road.

The Lockleys Parish also holds many religious ceremonies, religious festivals and religious processions all of which necessitate the crossing of Henley Beach Road in one way or another by the participants.

We are extremely proud of the use made of the Lockleys Parish facilities at the above address but, at the same time, are most concerned that the vast numbers of people involved may be at risk when it is necessary to cross Henley Beach Road.

We therefore humbly submit this petition and pray that you will act on our behalf to ensure adequate and safe road crossing facilities are provided.

We all know and appreciate the tremendous amount of work that is done by the church in that area. I have received other letters from students at that school and some of the clubs that use the premises. One such letter from a Trish Marangon, President of the Mother's Club, states:

I am writing on behalf of the Mothers' Club of St Francis School, Lockleys, to draw your attention to the dangerous situation which exists for children attempting to cross Henley Beach Road adjacent to Christ the King Church.

Parents cannot allow their children to walk across the road because of the danger involved. This results in congested traffic on the city-bound side of the road due to the large number of cars concentrated in a very small area. The danger would be removed if children could cross the road using a pedestrian crossing.

We hope that you can help in this matter and that some positive action can be taken before a serious accident occurs.

The Maltese Queen of Victories Band of South Australia wrote to me on 4 June saying:

Enclosed please find a petition containing the signatures of many parents of young members of our band who are concerned at the lack of safe road crossing facilities in front of the Parish Church at 458 Henley Beach Road, Lockleys.

As you are aware, many of these youngsters have to travel by bus unless their parents bring them in the evenings for music classes and band practice. Many of our adult members have to assist them to cross the road.

We, therefore, humbly submit this petition, and pray that you will act on our behalf to ensure adequate and safe road crossing facilities are provided.

I have received many touching letters from the students at the school, such as the one from Kerry Aston, who said:

I used to be the flag monitor at St Francis School. I am concerned about the safety of the younger children of this school coming and going to and from school. My mind would be at ease if you could generously help support us in getting pedestrian lights on Henley Beach Road. It would be much appreciated for your help.

Another letter from Michael Rosato said:

I'm the flag monitor and I'm concerned about pedestrians crossing. The flags are just not enough for the cars to notice to slow down. Some day it's going to lead to an accident so I'm asking you to help us get the pedestrian lights so people will notice people crossing.

Simone Pedler said:

I live near St Francis School and I see many old people crossing Henley Beach Road in front of our school. Would you please help us to get some lights to help them cross the road safely.

A letter from Gabriella Bertocchi said:

I attend St Francis School and I am concerned about the old people and children who have to cross Henley Beach Road. Would you please help us by having pedestrian lights near our school?

I have received many similar letters from students of St Francis School. Members know as well as I do that young people can very easily and simply express concern for one another and for the aged people within the community. One such young person is Travis Smith, who said:

Would you please consider the safety of people? I was thinking of having pedestrian lights for our school, St Francis, Lockleys, in front of the church. The year 7s put up flags but no-one takes any notice. The lights won't only be used on week days, they will be used for sport on Saturdays and church on Sundays.

Another student, Annmarie Backmann, said:

My name is Annmarie. I would like you to consider helping us to get a pedestrian crossing in front of our school because people don't take any notice of the flags.

Another student, Souraya Abraham, said:

Hi, my name is Souraya and I am writing to ask for your help to put pedestrian lights in front of St Francis School, Lockleys. Thank you for your time.

Letters from the school go on and on, requesting support not only for their fellow students but for the aged people who live near the church and the school.

I appeal to the Department and to the Minister on humane grounds to consider the plea of the 1 347 people who have signed a petition, the various groups and organisations, Father Mansueto on behalf of the priests of the church and the church community and on behalf of the elderly citizens (a large number of whom live near the site where we request the pedestrian crossing to be established). I do not want to be placed in the situation of having to come to this House again and saying that I warned the Minister and I warned the Parliament that had those lights been there there would not have been an accident. I hope it will be possible to erect the lights to prevent an accident. After all, prevention is far better than cure.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER secured the adjournment of the debate.

## AUSTRALIAN OLYMPIC TEAM

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

That this House records its appreciation of the performance of South Australian members of the Australian Olympic team in Los Angeles; recognises the assistance which the South Australian Sports Institute has given to our Olympic athletes; and urges the Government to continue to give full support to the Institute, which is making a significant contribution towards lifting the standards of sporting performance in South Australia.

In moving this motion, I do so in a bipartisan manner in the hope that the Government will support it. Sport is an extremely important part of the lives of most South Australians, whether through active participation or by observation. This interest is generated by our many achievements in sport, not only at the Olympic level, but in hundreds of other arenas.

It is evidenced by the thousands of South Australians who, in the fortnight during which the Games were held, kept odd hours to watch our athletes compete. At this point I would like to commend particularly channel 10 and also the ABC for the excellent coverage provided throughout the Games. As I understand it, the channel 10 coverage ran at a significant loss. I commend them because I think it was a wonderful thing for Australians, even though they did put on a McDonald's advertisement just as Anna McVann was coming down the second to last lap.

During that time I am sure that all South Australians felt a sense of pride in our flag, in our country and in the sportsmen representing it. Certainly, it was an exciting period in which one would be less than human if one's heart did not stop occasionally when watching the Australian athletes perform, to see the team colours of green and gold come to the fore. I found that moving. I am sure any South Australian or any Australian who had that national pride would have felt equally moved to see the achievements of our athletes.

I have moved this motion to note the achievements of those South Australians who participated in the Olympic Games, which finished last week. Most of the Olympians have now returned home. However, some have stayed on in the United States, and they certainly deserve some rest after years of training, and especially after the past few months of intense hard work. Our medal tally as a nation was exceptional, especially when compared with that of other countries that have larger populations and greater resources to spend on sports development than we have.

In fact, Australia managed to achieve far more medals per head of population than the United States, which is a fantastic effort. South Australian athletes performed brilliantly as a group and as individuals. We saw Glynis Nunn, Dean Lukin, Mike Turtur and Glenn Beringen triumph with their medals. Other athletes from South Australia gave the performance of their lives and kept Australia's name up there on the world stage. Some athletes, little known to the rest of the world 18 months ago, have carved out a place for themselves in the future of Australian sport. One of these is Anna McVann, the 15-year-old schoolgirl who won the hearts of most Australians and who is now acknowledged as having the potential as one of our best ever swimmers. We all wish Anna and other athletes the very best for their future participation in major sporting events.

One aim in moving this motion was to point to the need to continue supporting the pursuit of sporting excellence. In South Australia we are fortunate to have the Institute of Sport at which, in concert with the work done by the National Institute of Sport in Canberra, new methods of training are constantly being explored and tried. I seek to take nothing away from our Olympians in mentioning that the former Federal Liberal Government established the Australian Institute of Sport and the former Liberal State Government, and my colleague Michael Wilson, set up the South Australian Institute of Sport. Both of these have played an important part in encouraging and assisting our athletes. I commend the present Government for continuing this work. I do not think that Australia's achievements would have been as good had it not been for the work done by these organisations.

We can no longer just rely on the natural athletic ability that some people might have over others. In today's world, where a split second here or there can mean the difference between a world record and a creditable performance, the pressure is on to try to match the methods used by other countries whose achievements might be better than ours. The former Liberal Government, through the then Minister of Recreation and Sport (Michael Wilson), approved the establishment of the South Australian Sports Institute from 1 July 1982.

Announcing the venture, my colleague described it as one of the most important ever developments in South Australian sport. Its first Sports Science Co-ordinator described it as a breath of fresh air. Operating along the lines of the National Institute of Sport in Canberra, its work is based upon co-ordinating all the sports science resources for the benefit of our best sporting talent. The development of the South Australian Sports Institute was significant because it brought together and co-ordinated programmes, methods of training and people involved in sport as never before. Programmes were made far more comprehensive, and complete in themselves. Various training frequencies, physical conditioning and medical tests could now be co-ordinated to produce the best programme for individual athletes and teams.

In reading through the first newsletter of the Institute published in December 1982, it is interesting to see the names that have put Australia's image as a sporting nation on the world stage. Names such as Glynis Nunn, her husband Chris, Bruce Frayne, Michael Turtur, Gary West, Scott Wooden, Andrea Chaplin, and Sue Tonkin are all there among the names of the first South Australian sportsmen and women to benefit from the founding of the Institute. Those people have gone on to perform and often win medals at national and international events and to even better their past performances. Through the continued development of the Institute, South Australia's and Australia's reputation as a sporting force has continued to occur. That is a role that the Government can safely play in sport and one with

which I am sure the majority of South Australians would agree.

Furthering the interest of people in sport can only be a good thing, especially where it acts as an inspiration for them to take up some form of recreation themselves. The work done by the Institute can only benefit the development of our store of knowledge about various aspects of sports science. For example, the Institute very early on conducted tests into training programmes for several different types of sport. Recognising that sports science has much to offer the aspiring athlete, the Institute has been able to conduct tests into things like maximum intake of oxygen, output per kilogram of body weight, and even questions as complex as blood analysis.

While the Institute has concentrated on using previously tried and accepted testing methods, it has also been able to develop its own procedures. Every sport has different physical and psychological needs, and assessing individual sports demands on the individual athlete has become a major part of the Institute's work. Although most athletes, in themselves, know their own training capacities and needs, training methods can often be improved to achieve a better performance level. The Institute has been careful to avoid the image of being an 'over tester', realising that too much laboratory testing and too little concentration on practising methods would be detrimental to the athletes.

Of course, the most important element in any training programme is the willingness of the individual athlete to perform. It is they who must do the hard work and to give up time with their families and friends. They often make significant financial sacrifices, especially when they desire to keep their status as non-professional athletes. The recent Olympic games is proof, however, that the end can more than justify the sacrifice of those individuals. The Institute, while devoting much of its time and resources to the training of athletes whose sport is a major part of their life, also has a great involvement in sports development at a much wider level.

Early in its history the Sports Institute became the official agency in this State for the coach training courses under the National Coaching Accreditation Scheme. This took place from the time that the Institute itself came into being. The Institute undertook, through this appointment, to provide assistance to 12 sports: namely, athletics, basketball, baseball, cricket, gymnastics, hockey, rugby union, soccer, squash, surf life saving, underwater activities and volleyball. I understand that that number of sports has now risen to 19. This element of the Institute's work is really one which can have a major effect on the development of participation, in sport, by ordinary South Australians. According to the Institute's Second Annual Report, there are now 2 730 qualified coaches under the scheme. Such a large number indicates the success of the Institute's involvement in the coaching area.

Another major part of the Institute's work is the degree to which financial support is given to athletes through the scholarship scheme. About 150 individuals and teams benefited in 1983-84 from this scheme. The list of recipients, which reads like a *Who's Who* of Australian sport, covers 32 sport categories. It is also significant that all five of the wheelchair athletes who received scholarships in the 1983-84 year were selected to represent Australia at the Paralympics in the United Kingdom a few months ago. These people (Libby Kosmala, Barbara Caspers, Julie Russell, Eric Russell and Robert Turner) have all trained extensively under programmes conducted by the Institute.

It is important to acknowledge that the Sports Institute covers the development of sports over a whole range, especially the Paralympics and the people who participated in those games. The Institute is to be commended for taking

into account their needs, their involvement, and their active participation in these sports. No doubt, they have all been rewarded for the time and effort that they have given in the past few years. To see the looks on the faces of those people on their return to South Australia with medals gained at the Paralympics was certainly an emotional and heart-rending experience, especially when one remembered their achievement in overcoming their physical disabilities to participate actively in their sports. One must really admire them for the dedication and determination that they have shown.

The Institute itself has become the focus of national scrutiny as a model for other sports institutes in other States of Australia. In fact, all other States except Queensland have looked closely at our Institute as a blueprint for setting up similar organisations. This will form a national network of State sports institutes which will strengthen Australia's growing reputation and provide better co-ordination between the States. I trust that in due course Queensland will see the wisdom in establishing an institute in that State.

Of course, any organisation like the Institute must spend a fair amount of time and effort in planning for the future so that, when the challenges are laid down, our sports men and women are able to meet them. Future planning involves taking account of changes and improvements in training and testing methods, in sports psychology (an area which has become more and more important), as well as access to proper equipment and facilities. The Institute must constantly monitor changes taking place overseas and interstate so that its methods are right up to the minute. Our athletes must be able to take part in training methods and experiments which can ensure their ability to compete as equals with rivals from elsewhere.

Future development of the Institute of Sport in South Australia to a very large degree depends on the level of future Government support. While much of the funding for the Institute comes from the South Australian Government, it is highly desirable that far more Federal Government support should be forthcoming for the Institute. Last night the Federal Government announced a 29.8 per cent increased allocation to sport and recreation projects in Australia; that is a very welcome injection indeed, and one which, if administered correctly and fairly, will go a long way towards improving performances by individuals and raising sports awareness. The Institute is now at a critical stage of its development. We must build on the successes at Los Angeles and at the Paralympics so that our sporting prowess continues to grow. The degree of support now given by private enterprise to sport generally in South Australia is welcome and in many ways has become a necessity.

The Institute enjoys some degree of private enterprise support, from the Coca-Cola company particularly, which is a very generous allocation indeed. At the moment the needs of the Institute are related partly to a need to expand the present Underdale campus, where it is now situated. While budget constraints must be given consideration, in the case of the Institute the investment has well and truly paid off. The member for Torrens showed foresight in establishing this authority. The Institute has founded the basis of a three-year plan, and after two successful years is in need of a total reassessment of its present administrative and material facilities. Given all this, I call on the Government to make urgent representations to the Federal Government to ensure that from that fund, which has been increased by 29.8 per cent in the Federal Budget, we in South Australia obtain a fair proportion of that funding.

Capital funds are needed to improve facilities in the areas such as weight training, lighting, hard surface areas, batting cages, as well as pool facilities and hydrotherapy areas. Before the recent Olympic Games it was necessary for many

athletes to travel to Canberra for some training at the Australian Institute of Sport. While such a practice might be seen as necessary in terms of team events, there is no reason why, if athletes had the proper facilities in South Australia at their disposal, they could not have stayed in their home State until it was time to leave for the United States. In fact, some athletes who went to the Australian Institute of Sport in Canberra returned home to complete their training here rather than remaining at the Institute in Canberra.

Some athletes had to spend more than eight weeks away from South Australia, and such an absence can result in disruption to family life and means that athletes are often training in unfamiliar circumstances. It would be far preferable for athletes to remain here until it was time to go to the actual event in which they were due to compete. That would be facilitated by improving the facilities offered by the South Australian Sports Institute. We would also be able to offer more high performance scholarships, as well as sports science support and training facilities.

I mentioned earlier that I have moved this motion to point out the achievements of South Australian athletes at Los Angeles and to emphasise the need to continue and expand support for the South Australian Sports Institute. In doing so, in no way do I wish to ignore those sporting achievers who have not received scholarships from the Institute but who have received assistance and some training from it. We are all aware of the achievements of Dean Lukin, who trains in a tin shed at Port Lincoln for six months of the year and then goes tuna fishing for the remainder of the year. Perhaps tuna fishing is almost equivalent to some rigorous sports training programme. Such training methods might not suit all athletes, but in Dean Lukin's case he achieved his aim of winning Olympic gold.

The Sports Institute was set up by Government to focus on the continuing development and pursuit of excellence in sport in South Australia. It is there for all South Australians who are seriously involved in a sport and as such is our primary point of reference for the pursuit of increased achievement levels. Therefore, I call on the Government to look seriously at the role of the institute and to consider the Opposition's plea that it make representations to Canberra for increased Federal Government funding for the facility.

Honourable members can be assured of bipartisan support for that objective to ensure that we get a fair share of the funds, particularly as the level of funding has been increased. Our sporting achievements in the Paralympics clearly indicate that we have taken the initiative. It has paid off. Therefore, South Australia deserves greater support from the Federal Government than has occurred in the past. In recognising the achievements of South Australian Olympians and officials at Los Angeles, I seek leave to incorporate in *Hansard* a document (although it is not a statistical table) giving details of South Australian participants and officials in the 1984 Olympic Games.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Whitten):** As it is not of a statistical nature, I would like to peruse the document before giving a ruling.

**Mr OLSEN:** It is a list of all the athletes who participated at the Games and the officials who accompanied them. In recognising the achievements of the individual athletes, I think it is important also to recognise the officials who behind the scenes spent an enormous amount of time backing up and supporting the athletes who are overseas.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Whilst the document is not of a purely statistical nature, leave is granted for it to be incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

*[Leave subsequently withdrawn when Chair resumed by Speaker.]*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer):** I am glad to hear that this is a matter on which the Opposition feels that we can take a bipartisan approach, and I welcome that and support the motion, although I will propose a minor amendment to it. I must say that I am a little diffident in joining this debate after reading the words of Mr Des Colquhoun in the *Advertiser* of 9 August 1984. I certainly do not want to 'lard our fund with ritualised verbiage', as Mr Colquhoun suggested that we would be doing in this place; nor do we want to have 'a meaningless gabfest' or to indulge in 'a turgid succession of repetitive homilies'.

Mr Colquhoun certainly did not have a high opinion either of the standard of debate or the purpose behind such a motion being moved. I can see the point he was making, but I think it is appropriate to have on record a motion of appreciation. So, I certainly support the motion that has been moved by the honourable member. The Minister of Recreation and Sport at some stage in this debate wants to say a few words himself, so I do not intend, particularly in the light of the homilies of Mr Colquhoun, on this occasion to spend a lot of time in registering our support for the efforts of the Australian Olympic team, and our pleasure in and congratulations, particularly to those athletes from South Australia, for the creditable way in which they performed. I include in that recognition the Australian Para-Olympics team, which again had considerable representation from South Australia and also considerable gold medal success. The appropriate public tributes have been paid and this formal motion of the House simply recognises that great event.

The Leader spent considerable time talking about the role of the South Australian Sports Institute, and that was very appropriate indeed. I acknowledge the contribution made by the institute, and the initiative taken by the previous Minister (the member for Torrens) in establishing that institute. As it has developed, it has certainly demonstrated its great role and the influence it can have on lifting the standards of excellence of South Australia's sporting achievement and, in turn, of Australia as a sporting nation. In last year's Budget that was recognised by the fact that we increased the grant allocation to the Sports Institute by 46 per cent, a very considerable increase, to enable it to continue and develop the important work that it is doing.

There is considerable bipartisan support for the institute. It is well and truly able to claim that it has demonstrated that it can get results. I am aware that not only are other States looking very closely at it and attempting to discover the key to its success, but it has also certainly caused a reconsideration of the role that the Australian Institute of Sport might play. One of the things which has been highlighted is that it is all very well to have elite training for elite athletes but to transport them for considerable periods of time—in fact, have a residential qualification—out of the environment in which they may have their own support, can sometimes be counterproductive. That suggests that the scientific training approach of a body like a State Sports Institute can be a very useful supplement to the work of a national institute. Equally that suggests that we should expect support from a national institute for carrying out those functions, and my colleague has been talking to the Federal Government on that matter. Decentralisation of particular sports and functions is another area being pursued, and again I would see South Australia taking part in such a programme.

So, there are a number of options and ways of seeing the ongoing development of the institute and it will play a very

central role in our sports and recreation input over the next few years. I support the remarks made about it, and my colleague who has direct ministerial responsibility for it will have something to say in more detail about that body.

*The Hon. Michael Wilson interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The honourable member will have to wait for the Budget. There was some irony in this motion being moved by the Opposition in the light of events that took place in 1980. I hope that the attitude taken to our Olympic participation in 1984 indicates a change of heart and attitude on the part of the Opposition because, as I said at the time and it is worth putting on record now, the behaviour of the then Premier and the Minister of Recreation and Sport (having praised him for the Sports Institute I had better blame him for this area) were quite culpable on that occasion. That Government launched and played a major part in the Olympic appeal and promoted the participation and development of our athletes in the Olympic Games, but come the Fraser Government's decision to try to boycott them, after some weeks of prevarication, this was eventually, shamefully I believe, supported at the State level. In stark contrast—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:**—to the attitude taken on this occasion, that Government refused to be associated with the Olympic athletes. Whether at a national level the boycott was opposed or supported, it was a fact of life that certain sports and athletes from Australia participated in those Olympics, and a number came from South Australia. It was pretty rough to see the way that they were treated by the State Government, which did not have to slavishly follow what was being done at the national level. Indeed, my colleague, and I paid from our own pockets to hold a reception on behalf of the people of South Australia; we could not do it on behalf of the Government, because we were in Opposition, and we could not get the Premier to attend. I am not surprised, of course, because he was probably very ashamed that he did not have the decency to do something. I hope that this motion and the way in which the Opposition has supported our athletes on this occasion indicates that it is not prepared to accept that sort of exercise in future.

I support the motion, for which the Leader of the Opposition obviously wants to get credit. I do not accept all of Mr Colquhoun's strictures on the matter. We ought to have a full and complete record about this attitude to sport and sports participation by Australians. I put firmly on the record that I do not believe that one can dismiss politics from sport. For instance, in the case of South Africa, with its apartheid policies of discrimination, there are strong and firm reasons why the international boycott should be preserved and maintained. So, there will obviously be areas in which there is some kind of consensus on the part of the international sporting community that we have some strong moral imperative to support. One cannot unfortunately separate politics from sport.

It is interesting to note that the last two Olympics have been those where boycotts have occurred, and it is interesting to note further that the host city on each of those occasions was based in one or other of the two major powers. It is the responsibility of the International Olympic Committee and those who support the Olympic movement and its ideals to try to ensure that they do not get caught up in those sorts of political situations. The suggestion of a permanent neutral site for the games, whether it be Greece, the traditional home of the games, or somewhere else, is an area that ought to be fully explored. Failing that suggestion, if it is to be on a rotational basis, the host cities should be chosen for the overall international neutrality that those

host cities can generate, and resources should be contributed by some of the great powers in order to help the staging of the games by those cities. It is not just a question of Games being held in an atmosphere of political tension. As in the case of Moscow and Los Angeles, it was clearly the two super powers playing each other off and using the Games for that purpose. It was tragic that it occurred. It robbed the Games of something on both occasions.

In 1956 at the time of the Melbourne Olympics there was a period of incredible international tension. It was only a few years after the war. The Cold War was in full swing. The Soviet invasion and suppression of the Hungarian revolution had occurred. The Suez invasion of Egypt by France and Britain was going on at the same time. I think it was very fortunate for the Olympic Games and the future of the Olympic movement that it so happened that the Games were held in Melbourne and all the countries came here. There was certainly some tension throughout the Games, but in fact the Games being held—

**The Hon. Michael Wilson:** Especially with the Soviet invasion of Hungary.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Indeed; despite that background of international tension, I believe that the Games were actually a major contribution to settling those situations, and at least preventing them (particularly in the case of Hungary) from being a spark that could have led us into another disastrous world war. So, the Games can certainly play that function.

But, clearly, the problems of holding them in any one or other of the sites of the great powers, or indeed in any highly controversial political sites, has to be addressed. I think it will be vital for the success of the 1988 Games in Seoul, in South Korea, that the Koreans as a whole can feel some identity with the Games. Because of the partition, even within Korea, between north and south, and the background of the terrible war that was fought there, we do not want to see the Games used as some sort of political forum either for internal purposes in Korea, or internationally. All the signs are quite good. I understand that the North and South are having considerable dialogue. At the moment, there is no threat to the Games. Let us hope that that remains so. But, if we are to give any serious import as politicians to a motion such as this one, these questions should be raised.

It is not just a question of saying 'Hooray, it's sport' and 'Congratulations to our athletes. Let us give them good training facilities.' We have to look at the international significance of sport, its potential to attract attention and develop interest in a country and ensure that it is put into that proper context. My amendment to the motion is to add after the words 'Australian members of the Australian Olympic team in Los Angeles' the words 'and the Para-Olympians in Britain'; and further, to delete the words 'urges the Government to continue' and to replace those words with the following words, 'commends the Government for continuing'.

That is certainly what is happening and what will happen in the future. There is no argument about that. I do not think that there is any point in my supporting a motion that urges me to do something if we are already doing it. So, with those amendments (which do not affect the substance of the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition), I commend the motion to the House.

**The SPEAKER:** Before calling the member for Torrens, I inform the House that I have looked at the statistical table for which leave was sought by the Leader for it to be incorporated in *Hansard*. It is quite clear, that apart from a few figures here and there, it is basically a list of names. I would not want, nor would any South Australian want, the exclusion of those names. I suggest that the Leader reads those names when he replies at the end of the debate.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** I rise on a point of order. As I understood it, the ruling was given by the Acting Speaker that the names were admissible or that the table was admissible for incorporation. If they were not to be admissible, then obviously the Leader would have read them in at the end of his speech. If we are to follow your ruling, Sir, the table will be dissociated from the Leader's speech. With the greatest respect, I believe that, if a ruling is given by the Acting Speaker, I would have thought that would have been the ruling that is said to be upheld by the Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** I think it is unfortunate that it has occurred in this way. The difficulty is, if I may say so, that honourable members, depending upon the time of the day and the circumstances of the debate, demand either complete strictness and compliance with the rules, or a certain degree of flexibility. I take the point that the member for Torrens has made. But, I would have assumed that my suggestion would overcome that problem in that there would be a note in the reply. I, for one, certainly prefer a degree of flexibility (without which one cannot have a private member's afternoon), so that the Leader can read them in in such a way that it does make sense and that it is in context.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, as I understand it, the Acting Speaker told the House that leave was granted. Would you inform the House whether that leave can be revoked by a decision of yours at a later date?

**The SPEAKER:** Yes. The simple answer is that it can. I would not have done it if there was, in my view, any doubt whatsoever. But, if any person cares to look at the list, he will see that there are 12 headings, of which only two have statistical material of any sort in them.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** I rise on a point of order. I do not think we want to get ourselves into a knot over this. I suggest that earlier this afternoon you, Sir, suggested that common sense should prevail. Whilst I think that the House has now appreciated the point that you are making, that because of the circumstances in which it was accepted by an Acting Speaker at the time and because it is quite obvious that the Leader of the Opposition would have read those names into *Hansard* if leave had not been granted, on this occasion it should be accepted, but that the House take the clear warning that it will not be accepted again.

The other point I raise is that I believe the list of names is statistical information. It is basic, factual information. Statistical information does not necessarily have to be in figures; in fact, it can be in names. I do not think there is any difficulty just because there are some columns of names, in saying it is no longer statistical. Basically, we are all statistics, when it comes down to the end.

**The SPEAKER:** I take the point again that the member for Davenport makes. But, the difficulty here is that it is not just a question of one or two speakers taking a point of view or adopting a practice; it is generations of them. As every honourable member here well knows there has been a strict rule practised in this House that one has tables and that statistical information is in figures, rather than in names. If the names were very much a minority component simply to explain the figures, I would not worry about the matter at all. I can only hope that the member for Torrens or the Leader, as I suggested in the first place, can still get the material in and still get it in in context.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON (Torrens):** I do not intend to speak at this stage. I will continue my remarks next week. However, I wish to add that the Leader will read the list into *Hansard* when he replies to this debate. However, I do believe (and I do not want to reflect on the Chair and am not doing that) that, if it had not been that this debate was



being carried out on a reasonably high plane and in a bipartisan manner (it is a debate which has the support of all members in this House). I would have had to consider disagreeing to your ruling, Mr Speaker. However, I do not wish to canvass the matter any further but simply say that I am somewhat disappointed that the Premier took the line he did towards the end of his speech because, until that stage, both the Leader of the Opposition and the Premier had made extremely worthwhile contributions to the debate. Unfortunately, that means that I will have to say something about the Premier's remarks, when he criticised members on this side of the House, in replying next week. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

### AUSTRALIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN (Davenport):** I move:

That this House implores the Australian Broadcasting Corporation to retain the existing ABC-FM network with its base in Adelaide and requests the Corporation to provide adequate funds to ensure this network can continue the programme excellence that it has achieved.

In moving this motion I bring to the attention of the House what apparently is proposed to be put to the Australian Broadcasting Commission Board next week. I understand that the Board meets on Monday, Tuesday and possibly Wednesday of next week to consider a range of proposals for changing procedures and programming within the ABC. I understand that two basic proposals are being put to the Board. I take these proposals from a memorandum to all radio staff released by the Corporation on 16 July this year. That memorandum states that to so-called rectify the problem (of not appealing sufficiently to younger people) they have two main options:

1. That Radio 1 should stay as it is, keeping Parliament, and Radio 3 to be local within existing resources.
2. That Radio 2 become a national remodelled network or station with sequence programming as well as set piece programmes and that this would be relayed to the regionals on the ABC-FM network until the satellite is in place.

The third part concerns me as it states:

3. ABC-FM should become a young adult—contemporary culture/music station with national input (ex 2 JJJ)—which is the Sydney popular FM station—strong local content. Metropolitan only until the satellite is in place.

That is the first proposal. The second option is as follows:

1. Radio 1 as above.
2. The young adult station on the present the Radio 2 AM network (metropolitan only until the satellite).
3. FM stereo modified to carry national Radio 2 programme.

We can see that the second option is basically the same as the first, that is, that ABC-FM as we all know and enjoy it presently throughout Australia would be scrapped, its headquarters would be moved from Adelaide to Sydney, and the existing programme structure would be largely abolished in favour of popular music to appeal to the young generation.

The motion before us quite clearly is to put to the Australian Broadcasting Corporation Board next week a clear indication as to how this Parliament and the people of South Australia feel about the so-called two options or proposals. It is important that South Australians stand up and fight for the retention of ABC-FM, not only to be based here in Adelaide but also to ensure a retention of the basic programme structure that we know and have enjoyed for so many years.

I lay before the House some details about ABC-FM and give some information on the type of programme, its listening audience, the fact that it is an efficient operation, and the

damage that would be done if the ABC Board accepted any of the two proposals or options apparently before it.

**Mr Becker:** How can the ABC be efficient?

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** I do not think I will comment on that, but I will shortly pass comment on what I see as the thrust of the new management of the ABC and where I think it is taking the ABC. I believe that it is in an undesirable direction. I stress that the recommendation it has before it is the proposal to stop the existing programme format and opt for popularity amongst youth with appropriate—or what some of us might call inappropriate—music.

At present ABC FM puts forward a unique programme enjoyed by a large number of people. Perhaps more than any other programming, ABC FM's has 70 live broadcasts each year, including concerts (both classical and other), opera, simulcasts, and its 200 recorded concerts, both Australian and overseas, have established ABC-FM as performance radio in the public mind. I would go further and say that it is programming excellence in the public mind. ABC-FM has become a show piece for Australian performance, in particular, and composition with the ABC's own orchestra throughout Australia. It is well known that it has used and promoted the use of live performance in its programmes. It would be a sad loss to see that go and to see a new emphasis away from live programming.

Secondly, ABC-FM has strongly promoted the use of stereo drama and creative sound features which have found an immediate outlet through ABC-FM programmes. The third area that they have highlighted through their programmes is the spoken word which is an integral part of any fine arts network.

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Peterson):** Order! The member for Davenport has the floor.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker, for your protection. You do it very well. I cannot over-emphasise the extent to which the ABC's programme highlights Australian culture and arts, and live performances throughout Australia. The broadcasts it records take place throughout Australia. Although it is based in Adelaide it does not restrict the live performances it broadcasts to Adelaide; it broadcasts them from each State. It has been able to build up a substantial listening audience (particularly in light of the type of programme it puts forward) throughout Australia. Surveys have shown that something like 600 000 people over the age of 10 years now listen regularly to the ABC FM for at least one hour a week. That is something like three times the present population of Canberra. The unique part of that listening audience of 600 000 is that not only do they listen but also the majority listen to that station as their favourite station.

About 45 per cent of those 600 000 people spend more time listening to ABC FM than to any other radio station. That means that 45 per cent of those 600 000 use ABC FM virtually as their sole or first preference of a radio station. I think that is a substantial listening audience considering that 600 000 people listen for more than one hour a week every week on a regular basis. The ABC will lose that large group if it changes in a radical manner the format of ABC FM programmes or if it changes the location of the centre for that station. ABC FM now operates through 32 transmitters across Australia and I understand that by the end of the year it will have 36 transmitters which will cover every capital city and many country areas.

I would go as far as to say that in many country areas ABC FM is the only station available that broadcasts that type of music. I want to stress strongly to this House and to the Corporation Board that in no way should they jeopardise the rights of that listening audience to have a choice in regard to the type of music performance and excellence.

The next point I would highlight is the efficiency with which ABC FM operates. That station, which has operated for eight years, operates on a 24-hour basis. At the time of the Dix Report it had a staff of 37, which is now down to 34, even though the number of transmitters in that period has risen from 12 to 32. It operates on a budget for the total station of less than \$1 million annually for salaries, overtime and penalty payments. In fact, the salaries bill for the station is about \$835 000. I would suggest that is a very small price indeed for that type of broadcast. I think I am right in saying that the cost of running 2JJ in Sydney is more than \$1 million, so by comparison I think Australia is getting a great deal of value and benefit out of the programmes and staff involved in ABC FM based here in Adelaide.

The next point I raise is the extent to which ABC FM promotes Australian live drama and Australian musical performances. ABC FM has never been a closed shop. In fact, in 1983-84 11.5 per cent of ABC FM 24-hour a day output was produced by specialist departments, the principal contributors being the music department and radio drama and features. The music department produces more programmes for ABC FM than it does for Radio 2. It produces 70 live and 200 recorded concert broadcasts now heard annually on ABC FM.

In 1979 there were only 27 live broadcasts and frequent special programmes. In 1978-79 less than 30 per cent of the plays broadcast on ABC FM were produced by radio drama and features. By 1982 (only about four years later) that had risen to 50 per cent. Each play was first broadcast on Radio 2. In 1983-84, 8 per cent of the plays were repeated again on Radio 2, making three broadcasts. At radio drama and features request plans are in hand to repeat on ABC FM more of the features heard on Radio 2. I highlight that point because it will be those dramas produced here in Australia and that music, particularly those concerts produced in Australia, many of which are live concerts as well as being broadcast live, that will be lost if the format of the programming of ABC FM is changed as proposed by the Corporation Board.

My concern is not with the members of the Board, because they have not yet made up their minds and I believe that they are ladies and gentlemen of standing in the community whose judgment we should at least await. My concern is with certain people in the senior ABC management who have put forward these proposals. These people who are based in Sydney, not in the other capital cities, seem to be ruled by a philosophy of popular ratings and sensuous control, and that has serious implications, especially for the smaller States.

Australia is a Federation, but I do not know whether the senior management of the ABC realises that. We have seven States, all of which deserve the right to have part of the original production and the headquarters of programme production within the ABC arena. It would be most unfortunate indeed if we saw all the ABC programmes produced, edited and managed in Melbourne and Sydney, because Melbourne and Sydney are not Australia. Let that clearly get through to those people because, if they take ABC FM out of Adelaide and base it in Sydney, that will be a retrograde step towards centralisation in Australia, in this case in respect of broadcasting. It will also build up much bitterness and resentment on the part of the smaller States, especially in the State of South Australia because Adelaide will have lost the headquarters for at least one section of ABC programming.

Thousands of people have bought specialist compact disc equipment and digital analog recordings to complement their existing preference for ABC FM. In other words, ABC FM has built up a clientele who have acquired specialist

equipment, who like to listen to specialist type programmes, and who have committed their investment to such programmes. To suddenly take away that programming from Adelaide and to alter the style of ABC FM programmes to popular music for the young would deprive those people of the democratic right, which I believe they have, to freedom of choice as to the type of music to which they listen.

Finally, people have a right to choose the type of music that they would like to hear. Many commercial radio stations, including FM commercial stations, broadcast popular music. That is where the popular demand is and where the commercial money will flow, because that is where the advertising dollar will go. However, no other FM station broadcasts fine music, drama and features as does ABC FM. So, I ask all members to support this motion so that we can get the clear message through to the senior management of the ABC and, in this case, more importantly to the members of the ABC Board so that, when they meet next week, those members may reject the recommendation from their senior management.

If this motion is carried, I intend immediately to telegraph its contents to each member of the Board so that, before the Board meets on Monday next, those members will have a chance to consider the views of this Parliament. I shall also send copies of the *Hansard* report of this debate to each Board member, because it is extremely important that we stand up and fight for what is truly a magnificent radio service throughout Australia, and we can be more proud that it is based in Adelaide.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer):** I am happy both to second the motion and to speak in support of it. The motion and the remarks made by the mover are statements with which all members could agree and identify. Since the ABC FM service was established in 1976 and subsequently developed, the programme has changed. The format has been adjusted, and that is healthy and a good thing.

I do not think any of us should be interpreted as having said that the ABC FM offering should remain as it is, pickled in aspic, unchanging. For all the changes and developments (and there will be others in future), the sort of radical proposals which have been suggested and which completely distort the role of ABC FM, we must reject. It is as well for this House to put on record, in terms of the motion moved by the member for Davenport, our feelings about that, and I fully concur in this matter.

The ABC FM network was established in Adelaide by a conscious and deliberate decision of the ABC as part of a decentralisation programme but also recognising that the needs of FM could well be served effectively from a regional centre. It was also established here because it would be operating in the sort of environment and society which had many of the values that ABC FM was seeking to represent. In this country the ABC has always played a major role in the development of fine music. It has put very great resources into it, and it has been one of its chief functions. In fact, my colleague had occasion to quote a judgment made by a former Chairman of the British Broadcasting Corporation, Lord Simon, while he was visiting Australia. This is in the general context of the ABC's involvement in the area of fine music. He stated:

The history of serious music in Australia in the last 15 years is a classic case of successful education by a Public Service broadcasting concern. The whole musical taste of the country has been revolutionised. This is certainly one of the most remarkable achievements of a development of high cultural tastes in the whole history of broadcasting. Needless to say, no commercial broadcasting system has ever attempted to do anything of the kind.

That tribute to the ABC and its work in this field from a former Chairman of the BBC I think is indicative of the respect in which the ABC is held in this field. In addition, throughout its existence the ABC has been a pioneer in areas of drama and in its offerings of what we could, in many senses, call high culture, such as the opera and other things which have supplemented the basic musical programmes. At the moment an inquiry into orchestras in Australia is being undertaken at the national level and the South Australian Government is participating in that inquiry. In fact, we are represented on that inquiry and are making a majority contribution to it.

Of course, that involves the role of the ABC in its orchestral provision and its provision of music. So, it is a very important part of the cultural life of this country. Since the establishment of ABC FM, it has acted as a sort of show case for those musical offerings in this country and has developed further the cultural sensibilities and appreciation of all Australians. I do not think there is any need to go on at length about the contribution that ABC FM has made, is making and has the potential to continue to make, provided that it is allowed to develop within its own structure and format and that it does not have imposed on it some artificial requirements in regard to appealing to certain segments of possible audiences, which one could argue are quite well catered for in other respects or, if they are not, the provision required for those other audiences could be supplied through other outlets in other ways.

**The Hon. D.C. Brown:** Not only to appeal but to be judged on the basis of their so called ratings, which I think is despicable.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Yes. There is such an increasing range (which is a very welcome development) of radio stations on both AM and FM bands, and that will continue. There is now a much greater choice available to the public of musical or other offerings from radio than there ever has been. Therefore ratings, as such, will eventually become less important, because all audiences can be catered for by different outlets. In the case of young people who perhaps want more *avant-garde* rock music and things of that kind, in Adelaide already there is radio station 5MMM on the FM band which does a very good job in catering for that audience, which apparently is one of the audiences that ABC management at least sees the ABC FM catering to. There is no point in duplicating those functions and, if the ABC sees within its programme some form of gap in that area, it should by all means move to fill it, but not by distorting the ABC FM offering.

I believe that there are two aspects that we should look at in relation to this motion. I refer, first, to the location of ABC FM, its national headquarters being here in Adelaide, in what is known as ABC parlance as one of the BAPH States. Over the years we have seen the ABC progressively tending to centralise: networking much more frequently; and basing programmes in Melbourne or Sydney. A decentralised operation servicing the national network has I think been one of the most exciting things about ABC FM. As I said earlier, Adelaide is an ideal location for it, based around the format that it has. To have that transferred from here and to see the so-called BAPH States reduced to a lower status would in many respects be a major blow, not just to South Australia.

I guess we must look at the sort of audience to which ABC FM appeals and the sort of offering that it makes. In this case it has been very encouraging to see the groundswell of protest that has developed around the suggestion that ABC FM should in some way be dismembered or changed. It has been very encouraging to see that in fact there is a large and articulate audience out there—perhaps a larger audience than the ratings have suggested, comprising people

who are touched by or affected in regard to their participation in the activities of ABC FM. I believe that perhaps out of the suggestions of change may have come that amount of good: a demonstrated appreciation of ABC FM in its current format has been promptly articulated and presented to the ABC. If ABC FM did not know of it before, it would now have received the message that indeed it is loved and is serving a major need. I must admit to something of a personal axe to grind, because I am a frequent listener to ABC FM, and have in fact subscribed to its publication since its inception, and I get considerable pleasure from it. If that was simply of a small sector the elite approach, then perhaps that sort of view should not be given too much weight.

**The Hon. D.C. Brown:** The former Premier used to play ABC FM in his office.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Indeed, many people in our community derive benefits and satisfaction from ABC FM. We are very happy to see our our tax dollar which supports ABC being put into producing programmes of that kind. Of course, spectacular events, such as simulcasts and other things, have been developed. I do not believe that the potential of ABC FM, particularly in the drama area (perhaps it has been in the music area) has yet been fully exploited. Many things can be done and many developments and experiments can take place. That cannot occur if there is a cloud of uncertainty about the future role of ABC FM. I want to quote to the House a letter that I sent to the Chairman of the Corporation, Mr Myer, on 20 July this year. I sent a similar letter to the Federal Minister for Communications, Mr Duffy, to make quite clear the attitude of the South Australian Government. In my letter to Mr Myer I stated:

I am writing to express both my personal concern and that of the South Australian Government at two reported changes in the operation of ABC FM. Firstly, I believe that a physical move of the station to Sydney has been mooted.

Adelaide, as you are no doubt aware, has a reputation as a city of the arts, and the biennial Festival is highly regarded both nationally and overseas. Recent South Australian Governments have maintained a strong commitment to funding both mainstream and experimental art forms of all types, and there is a general consensus amongst the national artistic community that South Australia is a centre of artistic activity and creativity.

For this reason, a move away from Adelaide would appear to fly in the face of good sense. Past Governments have only paid lip service to the notion of decentralisation—the basing of ABC FM at its commencement in Adelaide was one of the few actual demonstrations of a commitment to this ideal. In view of the current debate in the arts community about the heavy concentration of arts and cultural organisations in Sydney, such a move to further base activities in Sydney would no doubt be viewed as a most retrograde step.

The other change which has been discussed, namely, to alter the format of ABC FM programmes in order to cater to a younger audience, cannot be supported if it means a diminution in the amount of high-quality music and general arts programming, which is such a distinctive feature of ABC FM.

There is no other broadcasting operation in Australia which goes anywhere near to meeting the needs of Australians for this kind of radio service. There has been comment that ABC FM serves a minority and elitist audience—that the audience is small is certainly not a reflection of the quality or need for such programming, and I doubt that the number is as small as suggested. Both national and local press have been recently inundated by letters of protest concerning the reported change.

I am certainly aware of a strong groundswell of negative reaction in my own State to any change to the current FM operation.

I have taken this step of writing to you before any specific proposals have been publicly announced by the Corporation, because I believe most strongly that the general thrust of the plan is both unpopular and illogical, and will most certainly set back the path of cultural development in Australia.

That summarises the views that I have been attempting to convey to the House in the course of this debate. I would share with the House the response that I received from the Chairman of the ABC. The Minister wrote to me along

somewhat similar lines but pointed out in his response that the ABC has complete independence in programming and that it is therefore a matter for decision by the Corporation. However, he is nonetheless aware of my views and has forwarded them on. The Chairman had this to say:

I am pleased that you wrote to let me know of your concern at what, I assure you, are no more than mischievous newspaper reports which have completely misrepresented what the Board is doing.

You mention a 'physical move' of ABC FM to Sydney. Although I cannot give you an assurance that at no time will this happen, I can tell you that it is unlikely in the foreseeable future.

**The Hon. D.C. Brown:** Whom is that from?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Mr Ken Myer, Chairman of the ABC Board. The letter continues:

As to reported plans to change the output from ABC FM, at a recent conference of ABC radio staff, a variety of new ideas were advanced as to how we might operate in the future. The suggested change to FM was just one of several options to be considered within the ABC. No decisions have been made either by ABC management or the Board.

That was the position as at 27 July in a response to my letter, and that, I understand, remains the position. In saying what we have to say about ABC FM, I will not suggest that decisions have been taken or action has been pre-empted. I simply say that this is an appropriate time to continue to indicate very strongly the value that we in this State place on first, the ABC's presence here as a headquarters and secondly, on the offering in music, the arts and drama that it presents in terms of the overall cultural development of Australia.

I hope that the ABC Board gives very full consideration to those views and that Mr Myer's statement that it is unlikely that there will be any physical move in the foreseeable future means into the long term future, because I would be at a loss to understand why such a move should take place at all in view of the way in which the network has been developed from Adelaide.

As to what he calls the change of output for ABC FM, I hope we have made the point that while definitely ABC FM should develop and its format will evolve, it should remain basically in the form and appeal to the audience and the type of cultural developments that it is now because, if it leaves that field, if that field is neglected or its offerings are distorted in any major way, there will be no replacement for it. That would be a national loss and something that I hope that ABC management and the Corporation will not contemplate. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

Motion carried.

**The Hon. D.C. Brown:** Is it possible to record in *Hansard* that there was no dissenting voice to the motion?

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** I do not think we can do that.

## HIGHWAYS DEPARTMENT

**Mr OSWALD (Morphett):** I move:

That this House take note of the Thirty-third Report of the Public Accounts Committee into the Accountability for Operations of the Commissioner of Highways tabled in this House on 14 August and in particular the member for Morphett's dissension with recommendation No. 6 which refers to the abolition of the Highways Fund and which was recorded in paragraph 256 of the minutes of the proceedings of the committee dated 19 July.

In moving the motion, I would like to open my remarks by recording for the benefit of members the fact that this is the first time in 33 reports that have been handed down by the Public Accounts Committee that there has been some form of dissent on the part of a member. The committee has had an excellent record until now in bringing down reports, which have been unanimous, and at times the opinions of members have perhaps varied from those of

their colleagues, but those difficulties have been resolved in one way or another.

I felt very strongly about one issue in this report and as such reserved my right as a member of the committee to dissent from the committee regarding that recommendation. This did not mean that I felt that the whole of the report fell into that category; far from it. However, I do feel strongly about one part of the report, namely, that referring to the Highways Fund and, as such, I dissented from that recommendation. I recorded in the minutes of the committee the following notation which was taken down and which is on permanent record. I would like to incorporate that section into the proceedings of this House. I quote from the minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 19 July, paragraph 256, which states:

The matter of what the Public Accounts Committee would recommend in the Highways Report regarding the future of the Highways Fund was discussed. Mr Oswald wanted noted in the minutes that he believed the Highways Report contains many excellent recommendations and, as such, should be tabled in the Parliament. However, it was to be recorded that he objected to the abolition of the Highways Fund on the basis that a mechanism should be maintained whereby the motoring public can identify revenue collected from fuel, licences and other allied sources and can then trace this money to ensure that it is being used for road construction, maintenance and/or road safety.

The minute, which then continues, is available to members of the public. However, the point I was making is that a mechanism should be maintained whereby the motoring public can identify the revenue collected from fuel.

The purpose of the Highways Fund is to receive the net collections of designated State taxes and charges and provide the revenues to the Commissioner for the purposes of implementation of the annual programme of works and certain other activities specified in the Highways Act. These revenues are appropriated automatically to the fund and are not subject to debate in this House or review or approval by Parliament as part of the Estimate processes. It was the view of members of the committee that the money generated from roads should go straight into general revenue.

It is my view, a view shared by various road users such as the RAA and others to whom I will refer later, that that money should, in some way, be identified so that the motoring public can see that it is being used on roads. My concern has been all the more demonstrated by the move of the Government now to use motor fuel as an additional source of general State revenue. All honourable members would be aware that there is now a percentage of tax collected on motor fuel which is shifted straight into general revenue. It is not identified unless members of the public seek to go through accounting records and the Auditor-General's Reports, in which they can trace it.

But, there is no established fund any more to which the motorist, the RAA, or some other organisation can go and say, 'X million dollars was collected on roads from the motoring public and having been hypothecated being used for this purpose, that can go back into roads.' The Government has already broken an election promise, as we all know, that it would not generate any more taxes or charges during the life of this Parliament. We have had the example of the Government using fuel as a source of revenue generation and shifting it sideways. If we can get away from this principle of a Highways Fund the Government will have *carte blanche*, if one likes, to generate tax revenue from the motorist. But, the motorist will not be able to find out whether this is going back on to the roads. In other words, tax collection from fuel will become just another source of tax generation for the State Government. As a matter of policy I do not believe that we should proceed down that track.

In the evidence placed before the committee (which is in the report), when the Commissioner was examined he clearly said that he could live with the abolition of the fund, as did the Auditor-General and the Treasurer. It is typical to note that they are professional public servants in the financial section of the Public Service. They can all live without the fund; they can all adapt to keeping track of the flow of money from one account to another. But, those organisations which are concerned with representing road users, namely, the RAA, Australian Federation of Construction Contractors, Local Roads Advisory Committee and Local Government Association have deep reservations about moneys being used that are collected from the motorist and which are not being put back into roads.

I refer now to comments made by those various road users in response to the report recommending abolition of the fund. An article published in the *Advertiser* on 16 August states, in part:

Yesterday, all three organisations rejected the proposal, saying it would mean less money being spent on roads. The deputy chief executive of the RAA, Mr J. A. Fotheringham, said: 'There is a continuing need for additional road expenditure and, if the money from the State motoring taxes became available for general revenue purposes, there is every likelihood that reduced amounts will be spent on roads.'

To enlarge on that, I say yes, there is every likelihood, and if it is not being used on roads it is not possible for the organisations representing the motorist readily to identify that. The article continues:

The State director of the Australian Federation of Construction Contractors, Mrs M. J. Curry, said: 'By bringing the Highways Department funds under the control of the Treasury, it creates the possibility that they could be redirected to general revenue, which then does not provide the necessary finance towards road assets in this State.'

Mr D. C. Ross, Chairman of the Local Roads Advisory Committee and President of the Local Government Association, said road funding would be reduced if SA's Highways Fund were abolished. 'This money comes from road users when they pay licence fees and fuel tax,' Mr Ross said. He said road users needed a Government guarantee that the money they gave for roadworks was spent on roads.

This leaves the proposal that I put to the committee which I think might have been acceptable and could even have been a compromise and a way out. It was to try to cover Mr Ross's concern. He mentioned that road users needed a Government guarantee that money they gave for roadworks was spent on roadworks.

I drew the committee's attention to the Hospitals Fund where money is hypothecated into that fund. Any organisation that makes a contribution can see the money deposited into that fund. We all know that that fund is put into general revenue and that from that source the Government of the day determines its use. I asked the committee why we should not create a fund such as the Hospitals Fund, and calling it the Highways Fund, which would go to general revenue? Honourable members of this House would then have a say in its disbursement back to the taxpayer, which I believe is a perfectly proper process. I have no objection, nor was that the recommendation of the committee in that regard.

However, that was not accepted because the Government is already short-circuiting that process by taking funds generated from fuel, directing them straight into general revenue and not into the Highways Fund. Until the Government says it will change that system, it will no longer take fuel tax and direct it straight into general revenue but will refer it back through the Highways Department where the motoring public can identify this money, I believe we should not abolish the fund.

In summary: I object to abolition of the fund unless all moneys generated from the road user can, in fact, be placed in the fund and can be seen by the motoring public to be

placed in the fund. It will then go from that fund into general revenue. When it is in general revenue the Parliament and the Government of the day, of course, have every right to appropriate it for its use. It would be on the head of the Government of the day if the money spent on roads did not equate to or was not greater than money collected for road use.

I would have thought that such a proposition could have been accepted by the Government, but it has not been picked up by it. Perhaps it is not too late for that to happen, because the Government has not publicly said whether or not it supported the recommendation. Perhaps in the time between now and when Cabinet studies this matter, if we could all come to a general broad agreement that the Government create a Highways Fund along the same lines as the Hospitals Fund so that all the motoring public can see the money hypothecated into it, that could then go to general revenue, as happens in hospitals. The Government of the day can then determine its use.

I refer now to the evidence presented by the RAA to the committee because those people put a differing view to that of public servants. The RAA representatives were asked to state their views about the Highways Fund. Part of the evidence is as follows:

... Would you state your Association's view on the retention of the Highways Fund? ... (Mr Waters): We believe that the road construction authority cannot work on a year-by-year basis. ... One cannot decide to build a major road, plan that major road, and have it constructed on an annual basis ... it seems essential to us that the road construction authority should have some guarantee of funds to it to enable long-term planning, research planning and so forth ... it would seem to inhibit the proper planning of roads if the amount of money allocated to the road construction authority was subject to Parliamentary approval on an annual basis.

The RAA has a very real concern about that matter. Its representatives picked up the point that quite clearly there needs to be more than just an annual allocation of money. The Public Accounts Committee then sought evidence from the Auditor-General and the Treasurer, both of whom were quite strongly in favour of the abolition of the fund.

As I explained earlier, that is not unpredictable, in that they are professional public servants trained to adapt to whatever system is adopted. I would urge the Government to give serious consideration to hypothecating all moneys it collects into a highways fund. It can then go into general revenue, and at least the motoring public will be able to identify that money and we will get away from this change of policy that has recently been brought in by the Premier whereby he is now using the tax generated from the sale of fuel to the motorist as a source of general revenue. If the Government goes down that track it will receive, through the Opposition, a vast amount of criticism, and I do not imagine that it will be very long before the motoring public picks up that criticism. It is the way to go: all the money into a fund and then into general revenue.

Mr KLUNDER secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### WINE INDUSTRY

Adjourned debate (resumed on motion).  
(Continued from page 465.)

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** I emphatically support the motion. We have seen a disgraceful attack on the wine industry by the Federal Government, and it is disgraceful on two counts. It is becoming commonplace for the Labor Party to make promises and then blatantly break them. That is precisely what

has happened in this case. The Prime Minister of Australia gave an unequivocal promise to this industry that there would be no wine tax—no ifs and buts about it. It was a clear, unequivocal promise before the election that there would be no tax on wines.

I do not know how long is the public memory, but the track record of the Labor Party in this State and federally in terms of the promises they make with their eyes open is appalling. For a man who is now Prime Minister to make that promise (and to hear the Premier of this State saying that it was broken without any consultation with him) and then to break it indicates how much he values the support of the Premier in this State, who runs around behind him like a little lap dog. 'Fight for South Australia,' he says and suggests an inquiry.

What was the Premier's record in relation to the railway? This was another promise by the present Prime Minister. He promised to build the railway to Darwin—a South Australian and Northern Territory project. The Premier said today that, because there are no votes in it and because the voting power is in the Eastern States, the project has been sacrificed. Integrity goes to the wind for political expediency. That is what the Premier said today: the votes are in the Eastern States, in Victoria and New South Wales, and that is why it happened. What a pathetic defence! It is a clear admission that the Prime Minister in this country is prepared to front up to an election, lie to the public and then reverse the promise because there are no votes in it. The Labor Party has sacrificed South Australia on the altar of political expediency. That is nothing new for the Labor Party.

We know the stance it took on the uranium issue. It was a completely immoral stance. It is still a completely immoral stance and that Party knows it. The stance it has taken on this issue is completely cynical and immoral. The history of the wine tax is that in 1974 Whitlam thought he would sacrifice the Riverland, the Barossa Valley and the Southern Vales in South Australia.

**The Hon. Jennifer Adamson:** And the Clare Valley.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Yes, and the Clare Valley. However, they realised then what damage it would do to the economy of that part of this State. The industry was well organised and the Government backed off, but it has mucked around with the industry ever since. What has the Government done now? The Premier says that he wants South Australia to win. It has brought out a tax and has reduced the tax on imports. If anything is designed to kill the industry here it is this tax. The Government has given overseas wines an advantage against an industry which is struggling, as we who come from those areas well know. We know that the people on the land who are at the end of the chain are getting down below subsistence level.

What has happened in this instance is absolutely disgraceful and disgusting. The Premier says that we have been successful in getting rid of the excise on fortified spirit. What nonsense! The Government's sums were wrong from day 1, and the end result was a net loss. The Premier says that we have got rid of that. Instead, we have something that is a darn sight worse. The Government did not raise enough money and found that it was costing just as much to collect the tax and doing damage to the industry to the point where there was a net loss. It now has a grab bag and thinks it is going to fill it.

The point most disturbing to me in the long run is that all integrity has gone out of politics and has gone out of the Labor Party regarding its colleagues in Canberra. How can the public have any faith in this institution if this continues? We get a clear unequivocal promise, and it is then breached. My electorate covers some of the major winegrowing areas of the State, as do the electorates of some of my colleagues, and we are absolutely appalled, especially

when we reflect on the track record of this Premier in South Australia who came to the election with a grab bag full of promises. Whatever the Liberal Party was offering, his Party went one better. They stated that they were not going to raise any taxes, that there would be no back-door taxes and no increase in taxation. The Labor Party had all the facts and figures at its disposal.

After the Premiers Conference it was stated that there would be no new taxes, but we have now had an increase in a whole range of taxes and charges, especially in relation to the motor vehicle industry. Where does the public turn for truth and integrity in politics? It cannot turn to the Labor Party. People say that the Liberals in Government did not keep their promises. I would be prepared to debate that in any forum or place and at any convenient time. The record shows that when we were elected we honoured our promises, although it was not without a great deal of very hard concentration and effort. It is all very well for the Premier to say that we will have an inquiry. We had an inquiry into the railways.

**The Hon. Jennifer Adamson:** It would be a post mortem, not an inquiry.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Of course it would be. The inquiry is under way and yet they introduce a tax. The Premier says he was not consulted. That is a slap in the eye for the Premier. The Federal Government must have a high opinion of South Australia's Premier. It must think he counts for a lot if it does not even consult him! If what he says is the truth—and it is hardly credible or believable—that must add to his chagrin and sense of shame in relation to this whole seamy exercise. All we can do now is hope that we can get this Government, which has overspent and is running record deficits (and the job will not be easy), to have second thoughts and to bear in mind that it will be throwing people out of work.

The Government maintains that it is creating jobs. It is spending hundred of thousands of dollars of taxpayers' funds on temporary jobs, but it is intending to throw permanent workers onto the dole queues. The Government maintains that it wants to do something about unemployment but it is striking a death blow for one of the basic industries in this State. All we can hope for is that the Government comes to its senses quickly. I do not hold out much hope for this poor little Premier that we have. I really do not hold out much hope that he will achieve what he wants to achieve. He has been steam-rolled, and I refer to this consensus approach, the quiet 'let's sneak up on it' type of approach.

This is the man who was going up to tell Joe Bjelke-Petersen how to act. He was going to tell Joe Bjelke-Petersen that he must send oil down here to South Australia (when a pipeline to Brisbane had just been opened). I know whom I would want as captain of my team if I were trying to fight a battle. I would not line up behind this little fellow before going into battle. It is a disgraceful situation. Unless the Premier is prepared to get up and fight and do something to restore his lost credibility, there is no hope for this State.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Education):** I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak on this very important matter for South Australia. I noted the comments about the Premier that the Deputy Leader made towards the end of his speech. His comments about whom he would like to line up behind were interesting; we did not hear the Leader of the Opposition's name mentioned in regard to his being someone behind whom the Deputy Leader would like to line up, but rather he referred to the National Party Premier of another State. That suggests that maybe the Deputy Leader is forming an alliance with the member for

Flinders, and maybe the terrible things that happened in Queensland not long ago may happen here.

It is interesting to note the disarray that the Opposition is presently feeling on a number of fronts, and even on an issue such as this it is not prepared to look at it with a bipartisan approach. It is a matter on which both Parties should be making strong representations to the Federal Government. In regard to the motion moved by the member for Chaffey this afternoon, it is a pity that the proceedings of the House did not permit this matter to be debated by the Legislature earlier than today, because I think it would have been useful to have established a bipartisan position on this matter that could have been conveyed to Canberra before the Budget was brought down. During the debate which took place this afternoon which followed the suspension of Standing Orders and which replaced Question Time, there was quite a lot of grandstanding from the Opposition on whether it was appropriate for us to be debating a Government motion as opposed to an Opposition motion that apparently was to be moved. In talking about honesty, integrity and all the other things that were referred to a lot this afternoon, it seems that memories are rather short.

I can recall an important set of events taking place in regard to the motor industry in South Australia in reaction to Federal Government policies under the Fraser Government. That occurred when the former State Government was in office under the premiership of David Tonkin, at which time something rather similar happened. On that occasion the Opposition let it be known that it wished to suspend Standing Orders and to use Question Time to debate a matter of urgency. But, on that occasion the former Government used its right to take the time normally allocated for questions to pursue and debate a motion of its own, and therefore the motion of which the Government of the day had been advised by the Opposition was not allowed to proceed.

I might point out that advice of that proposed motion had been given to the Government of the day prior to its indicating that it wished to pursue a motion of its own, and that is quite different from what happened on this occasion. As soon as the Government was aware of this matter it determined that today it would move a motion indicating the concern of the whole House. We heard the Leader of the Opposition say that the communication with the Government on the Opposition's motion was at 10 a.m. today. The Government had determined before 10 a.m. that it should treat this matter with such urgency that Standing Orders should be suspended so that there could be a debate on the matter.

It is appropriate that we analyse the issues involved here, because not only does this concern the industry itself but also there are questions involving regional economies within South Australia (and of course I appreciate that there are other regional economies in Australia that likewise will be seriously affected). There are questions of the restructuring of industry that need to be taken into account, as well as matters of foreign trade issues. I regret very much that it has not been in the minds of those officers who advised the Federal Government on this matter or indeed in the mind of the Federal Treasurer to closely analyse all these questions before imposing such a tax. I note, of course, that the Federal Treasurer has indicated that an inquiry will be undertaken, but I honestly believe that that inquiry should have taken place before any tax was imposed.

May I say that this is a point that mars what I believe is an otherwise commendable Budget; it really does stand out as a sore spot in a document which otherwise is providing a lot for the whole of Australia over the next 12 months. The impact of this matter will be serious indeed for South Australia and for the regional areas within South Australia.

I support the comments made by others about the matter of overseas wine in the debate either on this motion or on the urgency motion debated this afternoon. I cannot accept that there will not be an increase in the penetration of overseas wines in Australia as a result of the decisions handed down last night. We were advised that the decision to keep the taxation on imported wine at 20 per cent was in line with obligations under GATT, and the *Financial Review* reports the Treasurer as having said:

As a result the reduction in protection is not expected to result in any significant increase in wine imports.

I do not believe that any evidence sustains that argument. First, there is the situation presently occurring in the United States whereby the wine lake (as the Premier referred to it) that presently exists in Europe is indeed starting to flood the United States market, and the impact of that is being felt particularly by Californian wine producers. An example cited was in regard to French champagne, but certainly it applies equally, if not more so, in the case of other varieties of wine.

Exactly the same situation will apply here, because in recent years there has been an increase (albeit slowly) in penetration of foreign wines. I understand that the penetration is presently between 5 per cent and 10 per cent. However, an effort is being made by the import marketers to tap into a market in this country and to indicate to them that there is some status value, some esteem or prestige value in securing foreign wines. Clearly, there is no taste value involved in securing foreign wines, because our wines rank equally with any product in the world. That penetration will increase in terms of actual numbers of brands, but there is another issue about which I am equally worried, and that is the matter of the mixing of wines that are sold in this country.

That situation already exists in Europe, where certain regional wines of great fame are now found to have been mixed with wines from other parts or regions or countries of Europe. Indeed, the situation could well apply here, namely, that wine marketers could be using some wine product from an Australian region mixed with a cheaper wine produced in another part of the world. Already one such hybrid wine exists in Australia. In that regard the decision to allow this differential between foreign wines and Australian wines will not help at all. I believe that is a very serious aspect of this matter. I cannot accept comments made that the reduction in protection will not result in any significant increase in wine imports. It will have a very long-term effect. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

## SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 14 August. Page 233.)

**Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition):** In formally supporting this traditional Bill to pay the Public Service until the full Budget has been considered and passed by Parliament, I refer to a trend in Government spending of which this legislation seems to be yet another reflection. The Bill appropriates \$390 million. This is in addition to the \$360 million appropriated for July and August. This total of \$750 million is expected to be sufficient to cover expenditure until early November. The two equivalent Bills for last financial year appropriated an amount of \$695 million for a similar period.

In other words, this House is being asked to approve spending of 8 per cent more by the Public Service this financial year than for the equivalent period of 1983-84, while the inflation rate for 1984-85 as forecast in the Federal Budget last night is a little over 5 per cent. If this trend is taken through for the full financial year, the Government will spend about \$2 218 million from the recurrent account in 1984-85, requiring revenue raisings of at least that amount just to keep the deficit at its present level of more than \$60 million. What is particularly concerning about this trend is that there is no control being exercised by the Government to limit or prevent departmental overspending.

While we will have to wait until next week for the presentation of the final detailed figures in the Budget, the Premier has not so far disputed my estimates that departmental spending in 1983-84 was about \$36 million in excess of budget estimates. Put another way, the Public Service overspent last financial year at the rate of \$3 million a month. If the household budget was to balloon out in similar proportions, there would be many more individual bankruptcies. If companies, whether small business or big business, exceeded their expenditure targets in the same way, there would be many more company failures.

The Government has failed completely to demonstrate to this Parliament and the taxpaying public of South Australia that it is capable of exercising financial control and responsibility. The former Government insisted that any significant departmental overspending during one month of the financial year must be compensated for by savings in subsequent months, so that actual outgoings were balanced with the allocations approved by this Parliament as far as possible. We sought to run the Public Service as efficiently as any viable private company, recognising our responsibilities to our shareholders, the taxpayers of South Australia.

I can well recall as Chief Secretary responsible for the Police Department budget that, if there was an over-expenditure of \$250 000 or \$500 000 in one month, the Budget Review Committee would require reasons from not only the Minister but the departmental head as to why that over-expenditure had occurred and a strategy whereby the over-expenditure could be recouped in the succeeding quarter or monthly period. That was exercising good management principles, financial restraint, responsibility, and accountability. As far as this Government is concerned, there has been none of that and, as a result, during the period about which I indicate there was accountability and responsibility of Ministers and departmental heads, between 1979-82, State taxation fell to the lowest per capita in Australia.

This was a record underlined in an article in the *Advertiser* last Wednesday by Malcolm Newell, which showed that State and local government taxation in South Australia increased 52 per cent between the 1977-78 and 1982-83 financial years. An analysis of the same data used for this calculation covering the three year term of the former Liberal Government shows that between the financial years 1979-80 and 1981-82 (the life of the Tonkin Government) State taxation increased by 19.3 per cent. Relative movements in other States for the same period were: Queensland 50.8 per cent; New South Wales 35.6 per cent; Victoria 34.3 per cent; Western Australia 33 per cent; and Tasmania 31.7 per cent.

When the Government raised this matter by way of a Dorothy Dixier last week the Premier neglected the contribution of the former Government in keeping State taxation down, and it is interesting to look at the tax record. Between the financial years 1979-80 and 1981-82, the three years of the former Liberal Administration, State taxation increased by 19.3 per cent. This Government has been able to amass 21 per cent in one 12-month period to 30 June this year. That is the record of the Bannon Labor Government that said that it would not increase State taxation, introduce any

new taxes or use charges as a form of backdoor taxation. It is interesting to note that the Minister of Transport belatedly announced increases in bus fares yesterday amounting to an increase of 60 per cent over the past 18 months. That happens to make 129 charges that this Government has increased since it occupied the Treasury benches in this State.

**The Hon. R.K. Abbott:** That's according to your calculations.

**Mr OLSEN:** I am willing to stand those calculations before the Minister or anyone else. Not one Government Minister, including the Premier and Treasurer of this State, has to this time denied, criticised or taken me to account publicly on those figures I have put down.

**Mr Gunn:** What about the Subordinate Legislation Committee? Every week there is a list.

**Mr OLSEN:** That is a good example. I am pleased that the member for Eyre has drawn that to my attention. The Government cannot argue because it does not have facts on its side.

**The Hon. R.K. Abbott:** You won't ask the question.

**Mr OLSEN:** I do not have to ask the question. I have put it down publicly time and time again for the past 12 months and the Premier and Treasurer of this State has not denied the figures on one occasion, and the reason he has not denied it is because he has no ground to stand on, as well the Minister of Transport knows. This Minister of Transport will go down in history: he has been able to increase transport fares at a greater rate than has any other Minister of Transport in South Australian history. That is a record that any Minister could be proud of: 60 per cent in 15 months!

**The Hon. R.K. Abbott:** You're wrong.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Minister is inviting interjections which are not needed.

**Mr OLSEN:** It is interesting to note there are two on the Government side to respond to this important Supply Bill debate.

**Mr Mathwin:** One was a train man—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Glenelg is also inviting interjections.

**Mr OLSEN:** The Premier, in answering a Dorothy Dixier last week as it related to Malcolm Newell's column, omitted that the reason that we had the lowest State tax per capita in Australia was because of the Tonkin Liberal Government's policy which kept State taxation down. Typically, the Premier and Treasurer turned what one could call a Nelson's eye to that truth.

*The Hon. R.K. Abbott interjecting:*

**Mr OLSEN:** Not at all. The member for Brighton and the member for Unley ought to enjoy their time here, because they have but 562 days or less from now to enjoy the benches in this Parliament. After that time they will be returning to their former occupation bases, whatever they may be.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! After that homily, I hope that the honourable Minister will not interject and that the honourable Leader will address the Chair and deal with the subject matter at hand.

**Mr OLSEN:** Thank you, Sir. Once the Budget process has been completed, there is very little further opportunity for this Parliament to scrutinise departmental spending. Taxpayers must rely on the willingness of the Government to accept and exercise responsibility to oversee departmental spending and to ensure that it does not exceed Budget estimates without some sound reason. This is a responsibility which this Government is either completely unable to accept or which it deliberately ignores. As a result, we have seen total overspending since the Government came to office



and now amounting to well over \$50 million. That is almost equivalent to two FID taxes.

Time and again the Premier has refused to address this fact because he has no answer, in the same way and for the same reason that he has consistently refused to debate figures that I presented to this House in December 1982—figures based on Treasury advice which was legitimately available to the former Government before the election and which proved that a continuation of a Liberal Government, including election policy promises, would not have run up the record deficit that we now have. It is interesting to note, and I think this House ought to note, that to this day the Premier and Treasurer of this State has never questioned or attempted to debate once—

**The Hon. Michael Wilson:** He could not question them because they were the figures of the Under Treasurer.

**Mr OLSEN:** Indeed, the documents were signed by the Under Treasurer of South Australia, Mr Ron Barnes, a public servant for whom both sides of this House would have the greatest respect, in that he is an honest, genuine and sincere public servant and his veracity could not be called into question by any individual.

**Mr Mathwin:** He lives in my district.

**An honourable member:** He is well represented.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Whatever the case may be with Mr Barnes, I hope the honourable Leader of the Opposition will address the Chair.

**Mr OLSEN:** Indeed, I would be very pleased to address the Chair and point out to the Chair that in fact this Government has run away from that argument. It has said publicly out there in the arena where it cannot be questioned that the former Liberal Government ran up a record deficit in this State. The Treasurer of this State does not choose to bring those facts to this House because he knows that he would be decimated, because the facts are there and he knows from the facts that have been presented to this House that that was not the case under the former Administration.

We face this situation because the Premier and his Ministers are prisoners of their own financial irresponsibility at the time of the election rather than being protectors of the taxpayers' interest, and we had another dose of that when the Federal Budget was brought down last night in relation to lack of responsibility and accountability in fulfilling specific, clear and unequivocal election promises of Labor Governments. Not only is this Premier unable to curb overspending within existing programmes, but also he is unable to resist claims for new spending. He is still paying the bill for the Labor Party's largesse in November 1982.

State Government employment in South Australia is now at the ratio of 7.7 public servants per 100 residents, and of the mainland States only Western Australia has a higher ratio. I invite the Premier to explain to the House why South Australia needs a larger public sector per head of population than Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland. The bottom line for South Australia, South Australians and taxpayers is escalating taxes—21 per cent more in tax revenue for the Premier last financial year, compared with three years of a Liberal Government at 19.3 per cent. That is the difference in track record on taxes.

One can legitimately ask how much more it will be in 1984-85. While we will have to wait until next week for more information in relation to that question, this House will have to seriously consider to what extent it will be prepared to accept the Premier's Budget estimates. After all, the Premier told us in April that receipts from stamp duties in 1983-84 would exceed original estimates by \$20 million. Take note of that. That was in April, but it now seems that even that revised estimate will be out by another 75 per cent.

The escalation in tax raising in South Australia is eroding South Australia's competitive position and, looking at the effect of selected State and local government charges on the consumer price index for the 12 months to the end of June, these charges were responsible for 12.6 per cent of the rise in the Adelaide CPI. That was nearly three times the contribution of selected State and local government charges to the national CPI over the same period, and we can ill afford to be in that position. Our Government is getting fatter while it has asked companies and workers to tighten their belts.

The March national accounts figures for Australia show that the gross operating surplus for trading corporations stood at 16.2 per cent, the highest level that this profit indicator has reached since late 1973. This improvement in profitability has been reflected in employment growth, but it appears that the trend is not to be sustained, and one of the major reasons will be Government imposts and regulations. I will deal with this matter in some further detail in debating the motion when the House moves into Committee of Supply. However, the impending results of bigger Government and more Government interference justifies this House in being concerned about the Bill that we now have before us, because it is another indication that the escalation in Government spending will continue unabated in South Australia in 1984-85. The bottom line to that is that it will hit the hip pockets of the average South Australian, and more particularly those South Australians who can ill afford to pay the increase in taxes and charges that have been thrust upon them in the past 12 months particularly, but since this Government took office in November 1982.

Bill read a second time.

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

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

**Mr GUNN:** I am sure there will be some excellent contributions, which I would not like members to miss. I therefore draw your attention to the state of the House, Sir.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**The SPEAKER:** Before the Deputy Leader commences his address, I ask him to indicate whether he is the lead speaker.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** No, Sir. We all well remember the lines in the Premier's policy speech in which he proclaimed to the world that he intended to get that Jackson oil flowing into South Australia and that he was dissatisfied with the efforts of the former Premier in relation to this matter. Rightly or wrongly that oil would flow to Adelaide. So, it is with some interest that I picked up a journal a week or two ago in which it was stated, 'Premier opens Jackson field'. A photograph appears of the Premier turning on the tap for oil to flow from the Jackson field. The only hitch is that it is not the South Australian Premier. I read from that journal:

Australia's largest on-shore crude oil development was opened by the Queensland Premier, Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen on 31 May. That is another one of the Bannon promises out the window. The list gets longer and longer. I read that with interest because that was one of the clear promises of the present Premier when he was campaigning for the election.

**An honourable member:** He really stood up for South Australia!

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** He wanted South Australia to win, and one way in which we would do that was to get that oil from the Jackson field flowing into the pipeline from Moomba, which the former Government had got up and running, because that line was under capacity

and could easily handle the oil from the Jackson field. Everyone wanted it to go there.

The former Government was doing its best and getting on quite well negotiating with the Premier of Queensland. The present South Australian Premier said that he was not satisfied with those negotiations, but that he would make sure that it came to South Australia, rightly or wrongly. There it is in black and white in his policy speech. The Premier turned on the tap, all right, but the only problem was that it was the wrong Premier. He did not even go near the Queensland Premier in relation to this matter because he knew that again he had deliberately misled the South Australian public and that he had not the slightest hope of getting that project for the State.

While I am on the question of hydrocarbons and while we are thinking, as we are at the moment, of the taxation question, which, of course, loomed large in the Federal Budget which has just been announced under the guise of giving tax cuts, I state there is I think from memory something like a 14 per cent increase in direct income tax from this Budget. Do not let us forget that. We have these headlines being proclaimed, 'Reduction in income tax', but in fact there has been no movement at all in relation to tax rates on the income of the average Australian. Millions of Australians are in the range of between \$10 000 and \$20 000 and they have received no tax cuts at all. When one goes above that level, one sees that there is quite a marked increase in tax (talking only about direct taxation), and the overall effect is a very significant increase in taxes in this Budget. So, do not let us get carried away with the misleading statement made by the Government that there has been a reduction in taxes.

While I am on the question of hydrocarbons and tax, I want to mention some of the other taxation measures that the Government has already introduced in this calendar year. These facts appear in APEA, which is the highly respected weekly Bulletin of the Australian Petroleum Exploration Association, the leading organisation representing oil drillers around this nation. Anyone who wants to know what is happening in the oil industry reads the APEA bulletins. This bulletin was released at the end of July, and is one of the more current in the series. The heading 'Tax rises and stacked rigs' appears on the front page. The article states:

The prestigious United States *Oil and Gas Journal* recently described Australia's Federal Government as another producer country government setting its sights on petroleum self-sufficiency as it reaches for the regulatory shut-off valve of the nation's oil flow.

That opening sentence is saying that here is a Government proclaiming that it wants to work towards self sufficiency in relation to oil, but as it does so it reaches for the shut off valve to shut-off the oil. The article continues:

With the disappointing results of the latest exploration in the Timor Sea, the 'journal's' warning that Australia is at an energy crossroads comparable to that of Canada in the mid-1970's is an appropriate one.

Australia faces a situation where its production from existing 'old' oil fields—now running at just over 140 billion barrels a year—will decline to about 85 million barrels by 1989-90, and production from already discovered 'new' oil fields will not be able to make up the difference, let alone cope with whatever increased demand exists at the end of the decade.

Against this background it has been decided that Australia should have:

- an additional tax on 'new' oil onshore and in certain offshore areas in the shape of the 'new' oil excise;
- an additional tax in so-called greenfields areas (such as the Timor Sea) offshore in the form of a resources rent tax—while the RRT replaces royalties in these areas, in most cases it represents higher taxation; and
- a system of cash bonus bidding for 'highly prospective' offshore areas which amounts to a Government tax on exploration.

This new tax regime, not in this current Budget but introduced this year, strikes a body blow at oil exploration in Australia at a time when we desperately need to accelerate oil exploration if this country is to achieve anything like self sufficiency in this area.

But, I point out to the House that this Government has been supine in relation to this matter. Not one squeak of protest have we had from our incumbent Minister of Mines and Energy or indeed his Leader, the Premier, in relation to the effects that this tax will have on South Australia. One of the real incentives for a State Government to get resource development up and running is the royalty payment which flows to the State Treasury. This tax will replace it. The Federal Government will increase the tax take on exploration and deny the State's access to royalties. What incentive is there for a State Government to get on and develop our resources if Big Brother in Canberra comes in, scoops up the lot and dishes it out where he likes and when he likes?

One of the real incentives for State Governments to get on and discover our resources in development is that we get some direct benefits in terms of increased royalties. That was the incentive that drove Sir Charles Court on for many years in Western Australia. That really put that State on the map, because it had so much to gain from developing its resources. But, here is this supine Government in office not uttering a word of protest about this massive take-over of one of our taxing powers and one of the real incentives that we have to get up and develop our resources—not a squeak!

That new tax regime has dramatic and deleterious effects on the economy of this nation and on our ability to gain self sufficiency in relation to oil: it has extremely deleterious effects in relation to the income which is available to a State. So, let us not hear any nonsense that is lauded about in relation to the Hawke Government tax cuts. There are no tax cuts. At the bottom end of the scale, there are some illusory tax cuts, but further up there are none. Further up, again, where the vast majority of people are in the middle, there is no change. Overall, there is a very significant income tax slug.

Then, of course, we have the iniquitous wine tax which will cripple our struggling industry. But, on top of all this and not mentioned in the Budget papers, is this iniquitous, most damaging tax which strikes a blow at our very lifeline and our ability for self sufficiency.

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

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON (Torrens):** I wish to refer to that part of the Federal Budget papers issued last night concerning technical and further education. I wish to point out what I consider is a serious anomaly. In table 20 of the Budget papers, the Federal Government has allocated (and it is only an estimate) \$11.472 million to this State for recurrent expenditure in technical and further education. That compares last year to \$10.509 million. On the surface, that represents an increase of just under 10 per cent. One could be forgiven for thinking that it was reasonable. However, we must remember that last year South Australia received an increase of about 12.5 to 13 per cent, so we are seeing a reduction. In fact, I think it is the lowest increase we have had for some time from the Federal Government for recurrent expenditure for technical and further education.

Table 20 also reveals only a \$20 000 to \$30 000 increase in moneys granted to this State for capital works for technical and further education. When we put both figures together, we find that South Australia is to receive \$25.48 million total recurrent and capital expenditure. That compares to last year's allocation of \$24.494 million and represents an increase of about \$1 million.

The anomaly that I wish to bring to the attention of the House is that the Commonwealth granted, for both capital and recurrent expenditure for the whole of Australia, an increase of \$39 million in technical and further education. Of that \$39 million, New South Wales, is to receive \$13 million; Victoria, \$12 million; Queensland, \$6 million; Western Australia, \$7 million; Tasmania, \$600 000; and, South Australia, \$1 million. We are going to receive \$6 million less than Western Australia will receive, \$5 million less than Queensland, and so on. I find that extraordinary, and I am trying to find a reason why that should be. I hope the Minister will look at this speech in the morning and tell the House why South Australia is receiving such a small share of the technical and further education cake provided for the whole of Australia. At page 45, referring to technical and further education, the document states:

The States will be expected at least to maintain fully their own total efforts in this area.

That is in the area of technical and further education. The Commonwealth is saying that, if the States do not put in fully their own share, the Commonwealth will not advance the money. I pose the question to the House: is that why we have received such a miserly share of the increase in TAFE funding announced last night in the Federal Budget? Is it because the State Government is not putting in its share of funds for this vitally important area of education, this area which, in my opinion, has been disadvantaged over previous years and has become something of a poor relation?

The Minister will realise that last year I commended the Federal Government and, indeed, the State Government for an increase in funds for technical and further education. It is an extremely serious situation. As I go around the State in my capacity as shadow Minister, I find a tremendous need for capital facilities in TAFE, and for additional lecturers and courses.

I want to transfer from what I am saying to something that follows logically, because I have been informed by at least two TAFE colleges that they will have to cut their allocation for courses for the mentally and physically disabled. That is an extremely serious situation. Based on the forecast of budgets of at least two colleges with which I have spoken, they will have to reduce expenditure. One of the areas in which that expenditure is to be reduced is in the courses provided for the mentally and physically disabled. One of the reasons is that most of the lecturers in that area are hourly-paid lecturers. It is very simple for a college council to say that it has been told by the management or Director of TAFE that it has to cut its budget and will not get as much money as expected, thereby necessitating cuts. The easiest way to make cuts is to reduce the input of hourly-paid lecturers, who are not permanent members of the staff. Most of the courses taught in the area of the mentally and physically handicapped are taught by hourly-paid lecturers.

I have already spoken in this place about the priority that needs to be given to special education in this State. If it is not the most important part of education as a whole, it is certainly one of the most important parts. I find it extremely disturbing that there have to be cuts in any area of special education, in particular in technical and further education, which deals with the older section of the community. Concern has been expressed to me by outside organisations that, if this sort of thing continues, they will be severely disadvantaged. I wish to conclude by quoting from a report entitled 'Department of Technical and Further Education Service for Adults with Intellectual Disabilities/Handicaps'. That inquiry was chaired by Mr David Westover. One part of the report states:

If the educational needs of persons with intellectual handicaps/disabilities of this State are to be regarded as legitimate and more than mere optional appendages to college programmes and dispensable when funds are threatened, then TAFE colleges will need guaranteed funds, and appropriate staff support.

If that is the view of professionals in the field, I suggest that the Minister needs to seriously consider the matter before the State Budget is bought down next week. We cannot tolerate in this community a reduction in services to the intellectually or physically disabled.

**Mr MEIER (Goyder):** I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak in this Supply Bill debate. What a time to introduce such a Bill—at a time when the Federal Government has bought down its Budget! A lot has been said about the Budget. It will be rosy until the election comes and then it appears that early next year the so-called tax savings will disappear and we will be worse off than ever.

*Mr Mathwin interjecting:*

**Mr MEIER:** Like a wilted flower, as the member for Glenelg rightly points out. It is disgraceful that the Prime Minister and the Treasurer have not kept a promise made some 18 months ago that the Federal Labor Government would not impose a wine tax. Last night that promise was broken, adding to the many other promises that have been broken. The rail link to the north is another classic example.

*Mr Plunkett interjecting:*

**Mr MEIER:** The honourable member is laughing, but he will not be laughing after the next election when he is on the other side of the House, because I think people will wake up to the fact that both State and Federal Governments have not kept promises that were made. Tonight I refer specifically to the imposition of another back-door tax. The Premier has reneged on many promises in regard to taxes and charges—I think it is nearly 130. A further tax is to be applied through local government bodies.

During the debate in the last session on amendments to the Local Government Act it was maintained that the Government wanted to work in close liaison with local government. However, the Government is now putting the thumb on local government and saying that it will do what it wants to do. I refer to the proposed changes to the use of water hydrants by local councils. A document relating to this matter has been around for some months. Unfortunately, perhaps, some councils were unaware of the effects of this proposal. Some aspects were not brought out very clearly. I want to bring to the attention of the House the effect that this change in policy will have on the preliminary estimates involving, for example, the District Council of Clinton based at Arthurton, which is the smallest council in my electorate. I received a letter dated 9 August from the District Council of Clinton which stated, in part:

My council has used in excess of 5000 kilolitres of water in a year for consolidating road construction and if charged at the current rate would be an extra cost to council in excess of \$2 000.

The figure referred to is now out of date, because higher charges have now been imposed. The most disturbing fact about this matter is that the E&WS intends to charge 45 cents per litre of water, which is water that people have to collect themselves. It is not water that is reticulated to the homes of people; it is water from a hydrant, but the same rate will apply as that which applies to the average householder. That aspect is very undesirable.

I am glad that the Minister of Transport is in the Chamber. Funds for roads have been lacking. Many of our roads need major repairs, although we now find that an extra tax must be paid by local government in regard to water used to make roads. It might not be a serious imposition if it applied in the city, but in the country areas where there are many kilometres of roads which need regular maintenance and care, particularly unsealed roads, it will have adverse effects.

Not only will it affect roads but it will also impinge on other aspects of activity.

I refer to the so-called greening of Australia, involving tree planting. I fully support the endeavour to encourage reforestation in South Australia, and it is pleasing to see that many councils are planting more trees. I compliment the Government on its part in promoting tree planting. However, this impost will affect councils that need water for trees during their early years. When I was a member of a service club in the southern part of Yorke Peninsula, many trees were planted which had to be watered on a regular basis. We had to use council vehicles and water hydrants. At that time had we had to pay for the water for that project quite possibly it might not have been undertaken and that would have had a negative effect on the greening of this State.

I am pleased that local councils are now beginning to rally, as they like not like what the proposed increase in charges means. Quite a few areas in my electorate do not have reticulated water, and people in those areas as well as the local councils will be affected. In some cases local councils provide a tank to maintain pressure at all times in supplying water to people. However, in other areas there is simply a standpipe, and in that regard I refer to Balgowan, Moorowie, Bowmans and Watervale. People having to pay 45 cents a litre for water which is not even tapped to their homes will be seriously disadvantaged. A further negative aspect of the policy is that it is proposed to have 55 mm metered hydrants and 25 mm metered hydrants.

In the memorandum to councils it was pointed out that it was not considered that this would increase costs. However, it will take twice as long to fill a waiting truck when using a hydrant that is issuing only half the amount of water that would be provided by the larger hydrant. This means that waiting time and, consequently, labour costs will increase, because the men waiting with the truck will be there for twice as long while filling it. Overheads in the supply of water which is provided by council will increase. Further, the E&WS Department has suggested that the meters will be read every month. I appears as though it has no confidence in local councils. That would add a considerable extra cost to be paid by council. Also, the deposit will be some \$600 and the yearly rent will be \$120. That is similar to one buying a television set, for example, and then having to pay rent on it for umpteen years thereafter. I am pleased that councils are making an outcry about the regulations in regard to water hydrants.

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

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Coles):** I condemn the Federal Government in the strongest possible terms for the 10 per cent wine tax levied in last night's Budget. I refer particularly to the effect that that tax will have not only on the wine industry and the hospitality industry but also on the tourist industry generally. There has been debate in the House today and there has been much reporting in the press of the effect of this tax on the wine industry and on South Australia in particular, a State which produces 80 per cent of the nation's brandy and approximately 60 per cent of the nation's wine. It should be recognised, and I believe it is recognised, that the relationship between the wine industry and the tourism industry in South Australia is a very close relationship and an adverse impact on the wine industry inevitably will have an adverse impact on the tourism industry.

In saying that I am referring not only to the hospitality sector of the industry and the additional costs which will be imposed: I am also referring to the facilities which the wine industry in the regions provide to the tourism industry

which in themselves act as a focus for tourism and as a magnet for visitors. In tonight's newspaper the various wine companies have unanimously condemned the tax and indicated the effect it will have on consumption. It is reckoned that there will be a loss of 4 000 jobs in South Australia in the wine industry among grapegrowers, and that there will be a loss of consumption worth \$15.6 million, which is a very significant figure.

My purpose in canvassing this issue is to talk about the effect of that loss as it flows through from the wine industry to the tourism industry. When one looks at the 12 tourism regions in South Australia, one finds that at least five have wine related facilities as their principal attraction. Those regions are the Barossa Valley, the Mid-North (including the Clare Valley), Fleurieu Peninsula (including the Southern Vales and Langhorne Creek wineries), the Riverland, and the South-East. It is worth looking at the statistics which indicate the number of international and domestic visitors to South Australia and at the effect of those figures and their relationship with the wine regions.

If one looks at the places visited by international visitors in this State in 1981 (this is day visits, not overnight stays), one will find that just over half the number of international visitors to this State visited the Barossa Valley; that is, a total of 62 600 visitors, which was more even than visited the Festival Theatre complex, which was the second most popular attraction for international visitors, rating 60 200, which was 48.3 per cent of the visitors. If one translates those day visits and looks at the number of regions where overseas visitors spent one night or more, in the Barossa Valley there were 9 000 nights spent by international visitors; in the Mid-North there were 27 000 (and admittedly the Clare Valley is part of the Mid-North, by no means all of it); 49 000 visitor nights were spent by international visitors in the Riverland and 35 000 visitor nights were spent in the South-East. Similarly, referring to visitations to the regions by interstate visitors, one finds that interstate visitors spent 155,000 nights in the Barossa Valley—

**Mr Whitten:** What were those figures again?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The figures are the international visitors and I am now dealing with the interstate visitor figures. The Fleurieu Peninsula attracted a total of 97 000 visitor nights in 1981 and, as members would know, there are 40 or more wineries on that peninsula in the Southern Vales and Langhorne Creek region, and each of those wineries act in itself as a magnet to attract people to the region. They are not the sole attraction but they are the principal attractions and the wine companies have invested considerable sums in making those places attractive for visitors. It is important to notice—

*Mr Whitten interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** —that cellar door sales and wine tastings—

**The SPEAKER:** I hope the honourable member for Price is not inviting interjections.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** —are not a profitable operation for the wineries; they are not highly profitable activities. However, the wineries undertake that kind of investment and activity because it is part of the long term responsibility of a winemaker to provide facilities which enable a true appreciation of the wine in the place in which it is grown. This opportunity for visitors in the long term creates a brand loyalty, it creates an appreciation of wine, it creates educated palates among consumers, and in the long run it lifts standards of both wine and wine knowledge in the community, which can only be to the good of the industry.

All these benefits have received a devastating blow as a result of the Federal Government's decision announced last

night. What do we find today in South Australia by way of a response? Our Premier greets the news with the response that it is a disappointment. What a feeble and pathetic response that was! A child might be disappointed if it does not have a treat for tea. Someone might be disappointed if they miss out on a holiday, but one does not express disappointment when a whole industry is devastated. One couches one's words in far stronger language than that, and I believe that the Premier has sold the wine industry and the State very short indeed in the way that he has responded to this very serious damage that has been done to South Australia.

The Leader of the Opposition put the case far more effectively when he stated that the wine tax would have a devastating effect on the industry. The Premier's only response was to ask for compensation. What kind of mad economics is a request for compensation? What does the Premier honestly believe the Federal Government will do? Will it give back with the one hand what it has taken with the other? For how many years or months will that compensation be expected to last? How can people be compensated for losing their jobs? How can companies be compensated when they are experiencing such tight cash flow situations that they are obliged to discount in order to keep the cash flow going? How can one possibly make compensation on those grounds? The only possible course of action is a withdrawal of the tax and that is what a Federal Liberal Government would do.

I can assure the Minister of Tourism that out in the tourist regions of the State, where voluntary associations work extremely hard promoting the tourism product and where much is expected by the Government of these people working in an honorary activity, there is a very deep anger that a blow has been struck at part of the tourism infrastructure in these regions.

I conclude on another aspect of the Federal Budget which surprised me somewhat, and that is that the Federal tourism budget gained a mere \$3.3 million. It is true that that gain brings a substantial percentage increase when added to last year's gain but, in terms of the investment one would have expected the Federal Government to put into an industry which has the biggest potential for job creation in the nation, I consider that a somewhat puny amount, and I certainly hope it is not indicative of the amount the South Australian Government will be adding to the tourism budget that is to be brought down next week.

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

**Mr BECKER (Hanson):** I take this opportunity to express my disappointment in probably what I consider the most dismal and pathetic performance ever witnessed by any Government in this State, certainly in the past decade. Don Dunstan would not have tolerated the performance by the current crop of Ministers, let alone the remaining members of his Party, that we have witnessed recently. It is about time that the people in South Australia placed on record that the traditions of Parliament, the upholding of the principles, should be brought home to some of the newer members who are attempting to bring down this establishment by bringing down the reputation of the Parliament itself.

Yesterday afternoon during a speech by one member there were only three members present in the House. I was the only member on this side and there were two on the other side, being the Minister and the member speaking. It is not up to the Opposition to hold the quorum of this place; it is up to the Government. We were reminded on many occasions when we were in Government that it was our responsibility to make sure that the quorum was held, but I believe that the performances by some of the newer mem-

bers are bringing this place down to probably the lowest level of Parliament within the Commonwealth of Australia. I think it is an absolute disgrace. When we consider the amount of money it costs to run this House, money provided by taxes that people can ill afford to pay, then I think we should demand better.

Yesterday the member for Ascot Park in his speech took the opportunity to put forward one of his own personal pet hobbies, that Address in Reply speeches should be cut down from 60 minutes. Fair enough, he has been consistent on that topic, but I take umbrage at any member reflecting on other members and their contributions to that debate. No member has the right to put himself above his colleagues, as was done by the member for Ascot Park. He reflected on every member in this House and more particularly his own colleagues when comparing the contributions of some of those members. To pick on one's own colleagues is rather poor and very low politics. We have a system of government that I would fight for and I would die for in order to uphold it. Under that system any person can be elected to this House, and thank God they can, because the Government of the State in the past has been all the better for it. We do not discriminate against any person who takes his or her seat in this House on the grounds of intellectual ability or whatever, or that all contributions will not be equal. So if members want to put forward their own personal philosophy, and if they want to put forward what they consider is a most important issue in relation to their district or the policies they believe should be adopted by the Government of the day, then rightly so they should and I—

*Mr Trainer interjecting:*

**Mr BECKER:** I will not agree that the Address in Reply debate should be altered to suit the whims of one member of this House. The contribution was on about the level of Senator Haines and some of the—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr BECKER:** Please do not threaten me at any stage, in this debate or outside. I say, as I have said before, that the standard in this House and Chamber has fallen considerably in the past few years. It is about time proper decorum was maintained. Look at the number of members in this House: there are eight of us. As I said, yesterday afternoon when the member for Ascot Park was talking, there were three members present. It was a disgrace. Taxpayers are entitled to more than they are getting from this Chamber. I can assure honourable members that I will do something about it in future. We will have to be more generous in inviting members of the public to see their Parliament and their taxes at work. As I said, Don Dunstan would not tolerate this, not at all.

The Town Clerk of the Corporation of the City of Henley and Grange wrote to me recently expressing his council's concern at the attitude of the Department for Community Welfare in not providing satisfactory welfare services. The letter the Town Clerk received from the Minister of Community Welfare, dated 28 June, reads:

I refer to your letter relating to the closure of the Community Welfare Department's branch office at Henley Beach and, as a result of this, the perceived lack of departmental services to your area.

The decision to close the Henley Beach branch office was made in 1981 during the previous Government's administration. You will recall that the Liberal Government followed a policy of reducing the Public Service and this policy affected the Department for Community Welfare particularly hard forcing rationalisations such as the closure of your branch office.

If the Minister wants to make political capital, then let him do so, but he went on to say:

Since the change of Government we have been able to stop further reductions in staff numbers and actually increase our staffing in some areas. These gains have been allocated to those locations serving areas of highest need.

I understand that the 1981 decision to close the branch office was also due to a decrease in the number of clients using the office together with an increase in the number of our clients from your area attending the Thebarton District Office (most likely related to the Department of Social Security Office being in the same office block.)

Here we have the fourth paragraph contradicting, to some degree, the second paragraph. The Minister goes on:

Although faced with increasing demands on our services throughout the State, my Department is committed to providing the best service available to residents in your area. Services provided however need to be balanced according to the needs of all areas covered by the Thebarton District Office.

It is accepted that closure of the visiting office may have reduced community identification with the Department for Community Welfare services, with the resulting feeling of a loss of localised services and local identities. However, as well as providing normal District Office services, staff from Thebarton are involved in a number of local initiatives viz. Henley and Grange Women's Group, Family Day Care, Grange CYSS Group, Henley Neighbourhood Group and the Volunteer Youth Programme.

I appreciate your council's interest and concern in the welfare of your residents. Although at this stage I am not in a position to have the Henley Beach branch office re-opened, I understand that the Thebarton District Officer, Mr Graham Knill, is endeavouring to find ways to ensure the best possible service to your area.

The Town Clerk has pointed out that there are some errors in that letter from the Minister of Community Welfare to his council. The Town Clerk wrote to me and said:

The council is most dissatisfied with the Minister's response and you are asked to make further representations to the Minister on behalf of the citizens of this area.

Whilst appreciative of the many demands placed on Department for Community Welfare services throughout the State, the council is not satisfied that the residents and taxpayers of this area receive equitable treatment and would argue strongly that closure of the visiting office led to a dramatic reduction in service levels.

I quite agree. I support what the Town Clerk is saying on behalf of the council and the residents of the area. It is a difficult area to serve and the Thebarton office is, as you would realise, Mr Acting Speaker, heavily taxed by the demands made on it. The Town Clerk goes on to say:

The Minister suggests that as well as providing normal district office services, staff from the Thebarton district office are involved in a number of local initiatives. The council must point out that Department for Community Welfare involvement in many local initiatives is minimal. For example, the Grange Women's Group meets once a month, Grange CYSS meets once a month and, in fact, the District Office of the Department for Community Welfare has recently advised that his department will not even be able to attend monthly meetings of the CYSS Management Committee until the staffing situation improves (copy of letter enclosed). Department for Community Welfare involvement with council's own volunteer youth programme referred to in the Minister's letter is by way of telephone consultation only. The council could go on to list a number of areas where service levels are simply not adequate. The council has no quarrel with the Minister's statement that the Thebarton District Officer is endeavouring to find ways to ensure the best possible service to this area but would ask how this is to be achieved with the limited staff available.

I appeal to the Minister to reconsider his decision and to have his officers check the facts, as have been stated to the Henley and Grange council, and to check the accuracy of the involvement of the Thebarton Community Welfare Group, as he has stated. Obviously that is not so. The people in the Henley and Grange council area are being denied a service. Whether an office or branch office should be located at Henley Beach is another matter.

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

**Mr GUNN (Eyre):** I want to take this opportunity to advise the Government of some of the matters that I intend to pursue with some vigour during the Budget Estimates Committees. The first concerns the Minister for Environment and Planning and relates to the National Parks and Wildlife Service and the manner in which its officers conducted

themselves at the Mount Remarkable bushfire earlier this year.

The second matter relates to the unresolved saga of the Calpatanna Waterhole National Park. The matter was pursued with some vigour at the last committee meeting. I thought that we had the matter under control following a reply to a Question on Notice that I received in May. However, I have since been advised that this may not be the case. I intend to pursue that matter. I am pleased that the Minister of Water Resources is in the House, because I intend also to pursue the matter of those persons in areas who are not served with reticulated water. I was disappointed at the amount of money that was made available by the Commonwealth.

The other matter to which I refer is the number of roads in isolated communities that have not been sealed, and the problems experienced by parents in those isolated communities trying to give their children a reasonable standard of education. I say that so that there can be no misapprehension. Tonight, I also want to refer to those issues. I was disappointed to hear about the amount of money spent on water. Recently I and other members received a document from the Australian Asphalt Pavement Association, from which I quote briefly, as follows:

The road construction industry is one of the most effective providers of employment in Australia . . . the quality of service provided to the road traveller . . . is a matter for some considerable concern . . . the community as a whole sees the availability of a . . . road system . . . as the right of all members of the community.

I agree entirely with that. Anyone with a reasonable amount of common sense who lives in an isolated community and has to travel on some of those roads would agree with those comments. Another point raised in the pamphlet is:

Motorists already provide the funds!

They certainly do. I further quote:

Money for roadworks comes from vehicle registration, driver licence fees and fuel levies, duties, royalties, taxes and fees. With each tankful of fuel purchased, 60 cents in the dollar goes to the Government! In 1983 Australians spent \$6 000 million at the fuel pump, thereby giving Government \$3 600 million dollars!

A more realistic allocation of these funds would enable the Government to make a highly significant contribution in the vital areas of creating opportunities for employment and maintaining national assets.

Road Dollars create pay packets!

Many people forget—or ignore—an important point . . . where the road dollar actually goes. Of all expenditure on roads, some 64 per cent goes directly to the employment of labour. This means that for every \$1 million spent on roads \$640 000 goes straight into Australian pay packets! In fact, the recently published NAASRA Roads Study—prepared by experts in this field—says that \$1 million spent on roads generates 37 jobs in the road construction industry, 14 in allied supply industries, and a further 37 jobs in other industrial sectors. A total of 88 jobs!

I quoted from that document to show how a great improvement could be made to unemployment figures and road upgrading if all the money that was collected from the long suffering motorist was returned to road construction. Unfortunately, we know that the Federal Governments of both political colours have collected hundreds of millions of dollars, and that a great deal of it has gone into general revenue, and never been returned to roads. That is deplorable.

We heard recently of a decision of the State Government to siphon approximately \$15 million off the Highways Fund and into other areas. I sincerely hope that we never see a time when the dedicated Highways Department Fund is abolished and the money that is collected for road construction goes into general revenue because, if it does, I believe that, as a result of competing claims for projects and programmes, even less money will be spent on road construction in this State. Heaven help us if we get to a stage where we have less money to spend on road construction!

I would hate to think what will happen to those roads in country areas. Not enough money is spent now on rural arterial roads or on national highways construction; but, if less money was available, councils and the Highways Department would not even be able to make a mark on what is required. So, I call upon the Premier and the Minister of Transport to come into this House and say exactly where they stand on this issue, because I advise them that I will pursue this matter during the Budget Committee stages when the Minister and his officers are present before one of the two committees. I want to know quite clearly what the Government intends to do.

My second concern relates to the decision of the Planning Commission to alter the responsibility for some of the controlled areas in the Flinders Ranges. I quote from a letter that the District Council of Mount Remarkable sent to the Chairman of the South Australian Planning Commission on 11 May, as follows:

Thank you for your letter dated 5 March 1984, and received on 11 April 1984. Council has considered these proposed amendments, and has consulted with affected land owners. The following comments are submitted:

**Background:**

The Class A & B environmental areas have been of concern to council, and affected land holders in particular, for a considerable period of time. Numerous attempts have been undertaken by the State Government seeking to control development within the Class A & B area of the ranges. So as to briefly place council's concern into perspective, it should be noted that 133 land owners' families would be affected by proposals within these areas, and in all instances these holdings are engaged in agricultural and pastoral activities. It is further noted that 68 dwellings are located in class A, with some 216 persons resident in those dwellings, and 13 dwellings in class B, with 38 persons resident. The extent of agricultural and pastoral activities within these areas affects a significant number of ratepayers with the properties contributing substantially to the district. These existing conditions will continue, irrespective of the nature of controls which may be introduced or altered.

I now turn to the third page of the letter, as follows:

These comments support council's contention that the development plan should acknowledge the existing rural uses of the land, and that the principles of development control should accommodate these uses.

A further point of great concern to the community has been the management of the ranges with respect to bushfires. Council has often repeated its views that the pastoral and agricultural activities within the ranges greatly contributes to the minimisation of bushfires and the effects of such bushfires. On the other hand, Government owned parks and Crown Lands which are preserved without effective fuel control, fire breaks or provision of access tracks, have led to numerous fire disasters, highlighted by the recent major fire in January.

I sincerely hope that the Planning Commission considers in detail what the council said in its letter of 11 May. I read those passages to highlight my concern about the manner in which the National Parks and Wildlife Service has administered control, particularly in relation to fire fighting. I sincerely hope also that we never again see a repetition of the disastrous activities that took place under its administration during the bushfire earlier this year. It really reflected upon the Service's management skills. The only people who should be given authority to give directions in relation to such matters are the local Country Fire Services personnel, who are born and bred in the area. They understand it and give their time and knowledge freely. In my opinion, the National Parks and Wildlife Service did a great—

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

**The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier):** I am firmly of the opinion that South Australia should be well on the way to becoming the mendicant State once again. We are one of the most disadvantaged States in Australia—the most disadvantaged State on the mainland—and, of course, Tasmania, an island State, can be removed from calculations

because it has its own special problems of long standing. South Australia should not be comparing with the most impoverished State, namely, Tasmania. We should be holding our own. The Premier has attended a number of Premiers' Conferences and, of course, he attended one earlier this year. However, one could conclude, by a close perusal of the Grants Commission allocations and from a study of the Federal Budget handed down last night, that his visit was of very little avail. Only today we have witnessed an interesting debate, which the Government well and truly lost, on the question of a wine tax and the 10 per cent tax added to our South Australian product—a very important product for this State. We are the major producer in Australia.

What has the Government done so far? It has made a delicate and belated attack on the Hawke Government. I suspect that it will have little effect. South Australia has by far and away the highest proportion of dependants on social welfare services of any State in Australia. The Premier well knows this. He commissioned a report from the South Australian Council of Social Services earlier this year. That report was handed to him and a copy was sent to me in July 1984. It was handed to the Premier some time before then. He should have been in possession of these facts, irrespective of their source, in order to argue the case very strongly for South Australia at the Premiers' Conference.

What do the facts reveal? The Australian Bureau of Statistics and the Department of Social Security data to March 1984 (very recent figures) show that, in a whole range of areas under which people of Australia are either pensioners or beneficiaries of Government welfare moneys, South Australia had the highest number of such people as a proportion of the labour force in Australia. I will mention a few. In the case of aged pensioners and their wives, South Australia has 219 per thousand of the labour force as against the Australian average of 191 per thousand. With invalid pensioners and their wives, South Australia has 52 per thousand and Australia 41 per thousand. For widows in various categories, South Australia has 25 per thousand with an Australian average of 22 per thousand. For unemployed, South Australia has 94 per thousand and Australia 86 per thousand. For sickness benefits, we have 10 per thousand which is also the Australian average. We have 22 supporting parents per thousand as against a national average of 20 per thousand. In total, South Australia has 425 per thousand people who are recipients of pensioner and other benefits, the Australian average being 373 people. Clearly, South Australia is arguably by far and away the worst off of any State on the mainland.

Yet, what do we score at the Premiers Conference? We come out worse off on almost every conceivable count when we should have been receiving more than any other State on a needs basis. What sort of argument did the Premier present to the Prime Minister at the Premiers Conference? Obviously, it was not a very plausible one, yet he had all the facts and statistics available from reputable Federal sources. The ABS computer system is I would think the best in Australia, and certainly it has relevant, accurate and up to date statistics readily available. We fail to use them, and I would argue that the Premier has let down South Australia in not obtaining a far greater proportion of Federal funding in the Budget that has just been handed down.

In home care services, a department under the community welfare system, South Australia received the smallest allocation. Under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement two new programmes have been bought out—the Crisis Accommodation Programme and the Supported Accommodation Assistance programme. These have subsumed a number of other programmes that were introduced only last year. The crisis accommodation for families in distress, the homeless persons assistance programme, the women's emer-

gency services programme, the youth services scheme and part of the children's services programme have been subsumed by those two newly instituted programmes. It is difficult to compare what South Australia would be receiving. It is even more difficult to compare when one realises that I asked a question of the Minister of Community Welfare a few days ago and he said that I would have to wait for the information which was relevant to the 1983-84 financial year—a financial year during which substantial amounts of money were allocated by the Federal Government. However, we still do not know what proportion of those moneys South Australia received.

I suspect that our normally anticipated 10 per cent of all Federal funding was in fact less than that and that, once again, South Australia has been subjected to a considerable shortfall. We have been sold short by the Federal Government at a time when we need considerably more assistance than other States. I cannot offer any comparison until I receive statistical information from the Minister of Community Welfare on last year's grants.

Under children's services I find the situation quite appalling. South Australia is down \$2.5 million in recurrent payments under the present Budget allocation. It is up \$1 million in capital payments but leaving us down \$1.5 million in total. We can compare that with New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, Western Australia and Tasmania, all of which are up on children's services grants. In the case of three of those States, they receive between \$1.6 million and \$2 million over and above their previous payments. Can it be that once again we simply have not argued a substantial case when we really have every reason to demand Federal funds? Are we being penalised by the Federal Government for being progressive because we have the best early childhood and children's services system in Australia? Is the present South Australian Government prepared to accept that shortfall without kicking up a tremendous fuss? I know we certainly would not have accepted it when we were in Government. We played merry havoc if we were short sold on anything.

In regard to mortgage rent relief, South Australia has received the least increase of any State. In Aboriginal advancement payments there is little change in 1983-84, but we are down \$300 000 on what we received before. In the sesqui-centenary allocations, South Australia receives \$2 million in the current budgetary year, whilst Victoria received \$5 million. They are obviously going to have a better sesqui-centenary than are we.

Pensioners and wage earners are being hit by the present Federal Budget and there is no need for complacency at all. Pensioners have been deprived of normal indexation through the removal of Medicare from the CPI calculations amidst a pretence that Medicare has no effect on the taxpayer. What a farce to protect the Federal Government! Pensioners have had to meet increases in transport, gas, water, electricity, food, clothing, etc., in non-budgetary increases during the year, along with South Australia Housing Trust increases which always seem to anticipate any slight increase in pensions. I believe that they got their notices two or three weeks ago that rents were going up.

Wage earners are being given some tax remission during the present budgetary year, but we can look at the difference over the past three years. Vast sums have freewheeled their way into the Federal Treasury coffers as a result of inflation with taxpayers having their taxes brought up into the higher bracket by inflationary wages in spite of the accord agreement. Again this year, in spite of these tax remissions, we have only to look at the amount that the Federal Treasury expects to receive to find that it is greater than last year. In other words we are being sold down the drain with falsehoods by the Federal Treasurer. There are 1 million children in

poverty in Australia and 3 million very poor. There is no real evidence in the Federal Budget of any attempt to assist this very needy section of our community.

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

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey):** Tonight I refer to an example of bureaucracy at its best in regard to a matter about which there has been a lack of Ministerial discretion. On 4 April of this year (page 3021 of *Hansard*) I asked the Minister of Marine the following question about a coxswain's certificate:

Will the Minister of Marine take the action necessary to exempt Murray River fishermen from the requirement to obtain a coxswain's certificate? It has been pointed out to me that the majority of Murray River fishermen operate about a four-metre long dinghy. The present requirement of the Department of Marine and Harbors is that they obtain a coxswain's certificate to operate such a dinghy. I think that the attitude of Riverland fishermen to this matter is spelt out in a letter I received from Mr Harrip, President, Riverland Fishermen's Association, as follows:

'We agree that professional fishermen operating on the Murray River being required to have any form of coxswain's certificate is absurd. It is a fact that professional fishermen on the river have a motorboat operator's licence and after discussions we are sure there is no need for further qualifications.'

That opinion is supported by the South Australian Fishing Industry Training Committee, which stated the following in a letter to me:

'The training committee shares your concern and has made approaches to the present Minister of Marine and the Department of Marine and Harbors to have these fishermen exempted from certificate requirements. Unfortunately, our overtures have met with little success and the present Government appears intent on enforcing some kind of coxswain's certificate for Riverland fishermen in spite of the obvious ridiculous nature of the situation.'

I then described the requirements as being little more than bureaucratic humbug at its best. The Minister of Marine (Hon. R.K. Abbott) replied to my question as follows:

The honourable member knows full well the need for a coxswain's certificate—it is purely a safety measure. It is quite a simple certificate to obtain and involves a quite simple examination.

Is the Minister saying that the boat operator's licence is not a measure that was introduced purely for safety reasons? By law all boat operators must have a licence. However, the Minister indicated that he was prepared to consider the matter once again. I forwarded a copy of the question and the Minister's response to the South Australian Fishing Industry Training Committee, and the Executive Officer responded as follows:

Thank you for the copy of *Hansard* dated 4 April 1984, in which the Hon. R. K. Abbott was to reply to your question on the above certificate of competency. Has the Minister responded to the question?

The matter of coxswain certificates is a perplexing one. The Minister admits the examination is 'simple' and the Department of Marine and Harbors advises that the particular coxswain exam applicable to inland waters is basically the motor boat operator's licence with an emphasis on fuel storage. However, a person must be 18 years old before he/she can obtain the coxswain compared with 16 years of age for the motorboat licence. In addition, a person must have '1 year of approved service in small vessels' (for a coxswain) and 'experience in small boats' (for coxswain—River Murray and inland waters) before he/she can even apply for a certificate. As many marine scale fishermen are single person businesses it is difficult to see how a person can gain the 'approved' service in small vessels—considering 'approved' normally applies to actual professional fishing experience.

It is this Catch 22 situation which renders the attaining of a coxswain certificate virtually impossible for any person who is outside the industry and trying to enter it. Considering the limited areas of operation permitted a fisherman holding a coxswain certificate and the lack of limitations on a 16 year old amateur fisherman possessing a motor boat licence, the fishing industry views the current regulations as the most effective means of strangling the marine scale fishery yet devised. Your continued efforts on our behalf to have this ludicrous situation amended so as to reflect the 'real' world would be most appreciated. I would be pleased to explain the matter further at your convenience.



In a letter to me dated 6 June 1984, the Minister stated:

On 4 April 1984, you again raised in the House the question of the exemption of Murray River fishermen from the requirement to obtain a coxswain's certificate.

I have given further consideration to this matter but am not prepared to vary the current requirements. The certificates are required in accordance with the 'Examination for Certificates of Competency and Safety Manning Regulations' which were introduced by the Marine and Ports Council of Australia in the interests of safety and uniformity throughout Australia.

Whilst the examination for a boating licence and a certificate of competency as a coxswain or coxswain (restricted) are very similar, approximately half of the questions are couched in terms to suit the particular operation in order that the examiners may be assured that the applicant is familiar with circumstances likely to be encountered.

A commercial fisherman operating a motor powered craft is not subject to the Boating Act and hence a boating licence is not relevant in those circumstances.

The Minister has indicated that the fact that commercial fishermen have boat operators licences is beside the point, because there is no requirement for a professional fisherman to have one. However, the craft used by the professional fishermen who operate for example on the Murray River and the lakes areas are in fact approximately 4 metre dinghies, usually powered with a 9 or 10 horsepower outboard motor which, under the Boating Act, any 16-year-old is quite at liberty to have.

The restrictions under a coxswain's certificate are that before one can qualify to have a certificate one must have had 12 months experience. Obviously, a single operator (which applies to most of the fishermen on the Murray River) has absolutely no chance of gaining 12 months experience. Therefore, the situation is absolutely absurd. It appears that the Minister is not prepared to do anything about this matter. It is another glorious example of the necessity for a Minister to exercise a little Ministerial direction and discretion in regard to the overall requirements of the relevant department. I appreciate that, as far as the Marine and Ports Council of Australia is concerned, the agreement is in effect, but I still think it is absurd for the Marine and Ports Council of Australia to require that a fisherman has a coxswain's certificate in order that he might cross the width of the Murray River. From a very early age children have gone back and forth across the Murray River, and so have the fishermen operating on the river. This matter is a glorious example of red tape at its best, and it is high time that the Minister took a little initiative and used the Ministerial discretion available to him.

**Mr BAKER (Mitcham):** I refer in this grievance debate to the area of education and particularly the performance of the Minister and the management of his portfolio. When I first became the member for Mitcham I was quite pleased with the Minister's performance. I found that I could approach the person concerned and get ready answers. I well remember, when there was a problem at the Westbourne Park Primary School with teaching resources, that the Minister was kind enough to avail the school of a deputation. We saw the Minister, who was very sympathetic, and discussed the merits of the case and looked at the long-term needs of the school and arrived at a formula which, although it was a compromise, I thought was fair and equitable. This was a very good start, bearing in mind that this Ministry has had its difficulties over a long period. It has been subjected to the pushes and pulls involving people covering a wide range of vested interests who are basically concerned with the quality of education and opportunity, and it has been the subject of a great deal of pressure for some time.

Whilst I was willing to congratulate the Minister in his early term of office, I can no longer do so. The system is not working as well as people expected. The ALP came to Government on one of its major promises which was that it would give greater equity to children in the education

system. They were high sounding ideals, but if the Minister now took a poll of South Australian schools he would find that whilst many people are quite satisfied there is also a significant level of dissatisfaction, particularly among staff and principals of schools who have to battle through. They will remember the promises made by the ALP before it came to power in South Australia.

I have encountered two areas in the education area recently where it is obvious that the Minister has lost touch with his portfolio. The Mitcham Girls High School wrote a letter to the Minister in April of this year setting out some of the difficulties which the school was facing. To this date it still has not received a reply. It is a considerable time since the school wrote that letter, and it deserves acknowledgement. No matter how difficult the situation may be the Minister, as a matter of priority, must communicate with people who ask questions of him, who want to improve their resources or who just want to make some contribution to the improvement of the system. That is not happening today.

There are many schools in electorates that are facing the same problem. It seems as though there has been a brick wall set up between the Minister and the schools. I refer to the Panorama Community College where I am a member of the council. That college is run very efficiently, and I am proud to be on the council. However, it is being presented with a preliminary budget by bureaucrats in the TAFE area which will mean that there will be a real cut in funding of about \$94 000 in a budget of \$500 000, excluding full-time salaries. It is a very serious situation that the college is facing. There has been no real response to the request by the Principal that the matter be discussed and that some satisfactory arrangement be reached.

The college caters for a vast number of people in my electorate and in the electorate of Mitchell, but people from far beyond those boundaries go to that college because of some of the vocational courses it runs. There is also a strong catchment for the other courses which offer an opportunity for people to improve either their education or their skills in non vocational areas. The school is well run and deserves better treatment than it seems to be getting.

I do not know whether I should canvass what has happened to the Minister over a period. He started out with a great deal of zest and desire to improve the system and provide accessibility but in so doing he found that the work load was far too great. He is failing abysmally in his duty to provide some of the most basic elements concerned with good communication, and that is quite unforgivable. It does not take up the Minister's time to acknowledge a letter or to have some research done on a matter but it does take him time to respond to issues that have been looked at by his staff and, if his staff have not bothered to respond in the first place, it is rather difficult to see how the Minister will be apprised of various situations.

The other area which is close to the education portfolio and which may finish up in the hands of the Minister of Education is the pre-school and child care area about which a number of people have complained. Petitions have circulated at the Magill campus where certain bureaucrats have decided to split the pre-school course against a background of international recognition that pre-schooling must encompass the 0-8 age module.

**Mr Mathwin:** Ours is the most successful of all the States.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Plunkett):** I do not think that the member for Mitcham needs any assistance from the member for Glenelg.

**Mr BAKER:** Other States are looking at our pre-school training, because they believe it is the best in Australia, but here some people, for what I believe are political reasons of their own, are determining that they will change the system to suit themselves. The Minister of Education was

needed to provide guidance from the beginning when the issue was first raised but he is still yet to come to the party in a practical sense. Time will not permit me to cover other areas associated with pre-school and child care but I hope on another occasion to raise the concerns of parents and teachers associated with pre-schools and child care regarding changes that have taken place.

**Mr Mathwin:** What about the kindergarten teachers; they're upset.

**Mr BAKER:** They are very upset, because they do not know what will happen. The Premier has provided no information. He attended a meeting where a number of questions were asked but he failed to answer any of them. In fact, through either his lack of knowledge or lack of willingness to come clean on the matter, he fuelled speculation as to what might happen in the pre-school area. This Government is starting to run the way that we all expected it would from the beginning. It cannot cope. It has Ministers who are not able to fulfil their portfolios.

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra):** I understand that the 10 minutes granted to me to speak to the House on this occasion has occurred somewhat by accident. My colleague who was due to speak in this grievance debate is temporarily absent from the Chamber. However, I welcome the opportunity to raise a couple of issues about which there has been some discussion in this Chamber in recent days.

I note with interest that the Minister of Recreation and Sport is in the Chamber. Members present would recognise that during Question Time earlier today there was little opportunity for me to respond to his somewhat unusual and knee-jerk type of reaction when addressing the House with a Ministerial statement. I want to pick up that subject again, because it concerns me to the extent that anyone in this Chamber should suggest that my association with the racing industry in South Australia was not fair dinkum. I can assure the Minister and others present that on the subject of racing, about which I raised several matters in relation to media reports for the benefit of the Minister, I am genuinely concerned about the future of that industry.

I know that it has had somewhat of a fill up in recent years as a result of several changes in strategy within the management and within the systems that are available to industry for funding purposes and otherwise, but I am acutely aware of the depression amongst certain sectors of the patronage in relation to the occurrences to which I referred earlier yesterday. It is in that respect that I think the Minister ought to take on board my remarks seriously and not jump to the opportunity to make a public social, industrial, and indeed sporting activity, a political football.

It is disappointing when, for Party political purposes, a Minister takes advantage of his position and handles a subject of that importance in the way he did when addressing this Chamber with a Ministerial statement in my absence during the early part of Question Time this afternoon.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** You should have been here.

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN:** The Minister interjects and says I should have been here. I can assure him, as my colleagues on this side of the House well know, that I was attending to public business of some importance and my absence from the House for the first 15 minutes of the sitting today was, in comparison, unimportant. I think it is remiss of the Minister to even imply otherwise, bearing in mind that he knows, as well as I and other members of this Chamber, that there are occasions when Ministers, shadow Ministers, or indeed back-benchers are required from time to time to attend to public duty during sittings of the House.

So, yet again we see an interjection of a petty and insignificant nature about which I can assure the Minister I am not impressed. What I am seriously asking the Minister to

do is to investigate the background upon which reporters have recently raised the subject of incidents in the racing codes in South Australia and indeed assist those respective codes and their managements to overcome the stigma that always accompanies such media publicity.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** You're not helping it much, either.

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN:** It is in that situation that I make the request of the Minister. I can assure him there has been no press release or any communication or discussion with the media with a view to having a word printed or stated via that system publicly about my request to the Minister or the subject which it surrounds. In fact, I would be very disappointed if any member of the media in South Australia were to pick up a subject of a genuine industrial, social and sporting nature, as this subject is, and bandy it about for political purposes, benefiting or not benefiting either side of the House. Let me make that point quite clear. I do not play with industries of such importance as in playing with toys, as some other people do.

Let me in the last five minutes available to me (and I note that my colleague who is to speak next has now arrived in the Chamber) go to another subject. Anyone of the colleagues around me will do, but I take it that the member for Davenport has now returned from his other extraordinary Parliamentary duties and is about ready to speak. Members will recall that on 14 August, during the Address in Reply debate, I spoke about the current shipping service between the mainland and Kangaroo Island in my district of Alexandra. I also spoke about the proposed vessel to replace the *Troubridge*. A matter that I did not raise in this forum was the apparent cost of the *Troubridge* replacement as cited in the transport report dated January 1984. In that report it is indicated that the proposed replacement vessel to traverse the waters between Port Adelaide and Kingscote is to be built in South Australia at a cost of about \$11 million.

Subsequent to the production of that document and as a result of a reminder from a constituent on Kangaroo Island, it has been suggested that the same vessel with the same specifications as those proposed in the document could be built outside of Australia at near Asian-based shipbuilding facilities for half or even less than half of what it is proposed to expend on the ship if built here in South Australia.

Tonight we are debating the passage of a Bill which provides for some \$390 million for the purpose of paying the Public Service and other associated expenditure between now and when the Budget comes down. I think it is important when debating a money Bill of this magnitude to draw to the attention of the Government of the day any of those areas where money can be saved, bearing in mind that money saved is money earned. Every dollar that can be saved in public expenditure in this instance is another dollar that can go towards reducing the deficit of the State, or towards some other worthwhile project. Members of either side of the House would have no difficulty whatsoever in identifying areas of need within their respective districts to which \$4 million, \$5 million or \$6 million could be put. In the moments left I would simply ask the Minister to convey to his Cabinet colleagues the need to rethink where the replacement vessel for Kangaroo Island is to be built. I ask him to assist those employees who otherwise would have been on the job and save a significant sum for other more useful purposes within the State.

**Mr LEWIS (Mallee):** In this grievance debate I wish to draw attention to a number of matters, the first of which relates to the kind of things that members of Parliament are asked to do, in particular to present petitions on behalf of constituents to the Parliament about matters that concern them. I do not shrink from any of my duties, least of all that one. I will present a petition to this House if, as and

when anyone properly drafts such a petition, has it signed by themselves and others, and then asks me to present it.

However, in recent times it has come to my attention, by virtue of my having received a couple of petitions quite unsolicited, that there are some madcap fringe groups operating in the community on the general policy area and subject matter relating to animal liberation. I consider this to be a matter of the gravest concern, in that most of the views they are expressing are quite unfounded in terms of scientific evidence available about them and unfounded in terms of the suffering to which the animals are supposed to be subjected.

Let us look at two petitions that that I received recently. The first relates to battery caged hens and the second to kangaroo harvesting. The first petition reads:

To the honourable members of the House of Assembly in the Parliament assembled.

This humble petition of electors showeth that the battery cage system entails unacceptable cruelties to animals.

Your petitioners, therefore, pray that the honourable House will provide for:

1. Battery egg production to be phased out over the shortest practicable period.
2. Only methods of production to be allowed which cause no animal suffering, and fully permit the satisfaction of the animals' behavioural needs.
3. In particular, the banning of the practice of debeaking.
4. Labelling of free range eggs.

As usual, I wrote to all the people at the address provided on the petition signed by them and asked them in the first instance to acknowledge that they had indeed signed the petition and, in the second instance, if they had not, would they let me know. If they had signed the petition I would be grateful if they would apprise themselves of some of the facts relating to the subject.

So, I wish to place on the record the subject matter of my letter to them. Before I do so, I point out to the House that I have revealed a nefarious practice by asking people to respond to that letter which I wrote. I have discovered that a number of the signatures appearing on the petition were not of the people whose names appeared there. In other words, they are forgeries. I consider that to be of the most serious gravity. Secondly, some of the other names were those of fictitious people. They simply do not exist at that address and, to the certain knowledge of the residents of that address, have never been there. In fact, one letter was returned to me marked, 'No such address known.' Therefore, that means that these madcap fringe group members are prepared to go to any lengths to make their point and will indulge in the practice of ghost signing the petition themselves.

I read from my letter about commercial egg production and hen housing:

In some way, quite unknown to me, I have nonetheless received a sheet of this petition upon which your signature and address appears. In keeping with my obligations as a member of Parliament I will naturally have it presented to the Parliament when it resumes in August.

I received this in July. My letter continues:

Your petition claims in the first instance that battery cage systems entail unacceptable cruelty to the animals.

Upon what evidence do you base this claim?

It is a wellknown natural phenomenon that unhappy uncomfortable animals, which are in pain or suffering from stress (and the physiological disorders associated with it), will not produce or perform at their optimum—be they footballers with a nail in the sole of their boot, or sheepdogs with a thorn in their paw, or sheep with maggots in their britch, or cattle with an ulcerated throat, or school-children who are in overcrowded classrooms, or hens in unacceptable accommodation.

**The Hon. Ted Chapman:** This is an unusual mixture.

**Mr LEWIS:** Yes, they were all animals which are said to be or are indeed in unpleasant and uncomfortable situations

which then affect their capacity to perform to the optimum degree.

**The Hon. Ted Chapman:** Either in the classroom or in the paddock.

**Mr LEWIS:** Yes, that is the point I am making. However, the exception is the fact that hens in battery cages do produce at least as many as, if not more, eggs than those on other systems of housing and management and, therefore, such accommodation is acceptable to them.

**The Hon. Jennifer Adamson:** What about coloured eggs?

**Mr LEWIS:** I point out to the House that one can easily get coloured eggs if one simply uses hens which lay coloured eggshells. It is a matter of inheritance, not a matter of physiological environment. My letter continues:

You should be aware that all other systems of housing management for poultry will mean that the end product (eggs) will cost more because other systems of housing are much more expensive. I don't quite understand what you mean by fully permitting satisfaction of the animals' behavioural needs in this context. Perhaps you could write to me and explain that.

I do not quite understand what the petitioners meant by 'fully permitting the satisfaction of the animals behavioural needs' about the hens in this context. I was expecting them to write to me explaining this. Perhaps they were missing the rooster or something. My letter continues:

I know for a scientific fact that a hen which has been debeaked (that is the practice of clipping the tip of the top section of the beak) does not suffer any discomfort whatsoever. It is the same as paring your finger nails and toenails with nail scissors, or paring the hooves of sheep or cattle and is necessary for at least two reasons. The first is that the food which a hen eats in controlled environment housing is soft food. This means that the beak is not worn down by the natural process of pecking food from hard surfaces as would happen if it were an undomesticated bird. Therefore, the beak has to be pared back in some way.

You should be aware that the same thing applies to our fingernails where we do not now use our fingers (in our civilised state) to scratch and dig for our food, such as grubs or tubers in the ground or in rotting timber etc. We therefore have to clip our nails. The other reason is quite simply that hens will innocently and innocuously peck at objects around them. These objects could and will include other hens. This behavioural phenomena (of one hen indifferently or deliberately pecking at another hen) not only occurs in populations of hens accommodated in battery cages, but also amongst hens wherever they are.

I pointed out that I agreed with the petitioners that free range eggs should be labelled. I believe that the Egg Board is remiss in that respect. My letter continues:

I agree with you that free range eggs should be labelled. I would buy them myself because I know they have much higher vitamin A content in the yolk anyway. The other reason why I would like them to be labelled as such as is that it will enable people like you and me who wish to choose free range eggs (for our various reasons) to do so. By paying a higher price (through the market price mechanism)—

**The Hon. Ted Chapman:** You're not against the structure of egg marketing, are you?

**Mr LEWIS:** Of course I am not. I further read from the letter:

... we can thereby encourage their production. This will cost more to produce because it requires greater capital investment per bird in the provision of housing/land; the hens eat more food per egg produced and they produce fewer marketable eggs per year because of a higher rate of rejection which is a consequence of more of them being 'soiled' or 'dirty'; and the hens' mortality rate from diseases in open range is higher (i.e. they will probably have a shorter average production life expectancy).

I should point out—

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr PLUNKETT):** Order! The honourable member's time has expired. I call the honourable member for Murray.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Murray):** I take the opportunity in this grievance debate to refer to a number of problems associated with a matter that causes great concern to a vast number of people every day of the week. I refer

particularly to problems associated with the South-Eastern Freeway and Mount Barker Road at Glen Osmond. Ever since I first came into this Parliament back in 1975, I have taken up various matters with different Ministers of Transport in relation to this stretch of road. I have referred in recent times to the massive build-up of traffic at the Cross Road and Mount Barker Road intersection early in the morning and late in the evening as those who commute between the Hills area and further out and the city move to work and home later in the evening. I am aware that some changes have been made in regard to the lanes that one hopes would improve the situation. There has been no evidence of that up until this time.

Problems are brought to my notice day by day relating to drivers of motor vehicles who will, at a slow speed, continue to use the right-hand lane. We are all aware that, when one travels down a freeway, the roadside signs indicate that people overtaking should use the right-hand lane. I have spoken to different Ministers about this matter. I do not believe that that is the appropriate advice or direction to be given to motorists. Only those who travel in slow vehicles or at a slow speed should use that left-hand lane and the right-hand lane should be freed up. Although I have referred on a number of occasions to the need for some form of regulation in regard to this matter, I have been continually told that it is not possible. Problems and accidents are being caused. I do not have the statistics and doubt that it would be possible to obtain them. A number of problems are caused by people who will continue to block the fast flow of traffic by using the right-hand lane.

The problem that has caused me more concern than any other is the section of road, which is not part of the South-Eastern Freeway but below it, between Eagle on the Hill and Cross Road. It is generally referred to as the Mount Barker Road. I have written to a number of Ministers and people in the Highways Department regarding that stretch of road, and I certainly have not received satisfactory replies to date. Towards the end of June this year, I wrote to the Minister of Transport and called on the State Government to instigate, as a matter of urgency, a full inquiry into the increasing number of spillages occurring on the section of Mount Barker Road commencing at Cross Road and ending at the section of the South-Eastern Freeway at the Crafers turn-off. I referred particularly to the area between Cross Road and Eagle on the Hill.

I urged the Minister of Transport to conduct this inquiry as a matter of high priority. I suggested at that time—and will repeat—that, if something is not done about the situation, somebody (or more likely some people) will be killed in the very near future. I have asked numerous questions about this matter, and I am far from satisfied with the answers with which I have been provided. In fact, the problem has worsened considerably since I first asked the question of the then Minister back in 1978.

The public has been inconvenienced on many occasions in recent times, for example, whilst mopping up operations were being carried out by the Highways Department. On one occasion very recently, whilst travelling from Adelaide, I observed at least three warning signs advising motorists of hazards ahead relating to slippery conditions. I am advised also of an increase in the number of minor accidents as a result of drivers losing control of their cars in these conditions. It is only a matter of time before a serious accident occurs with a resultant loss of life. I hope that the Minister will recognise that. A number of people who travel regularly on this section of road have raised this matter with me in recent times, hence my request to the Minister for further investigatory work to be carried out and some appropriate action to be taken.

Only yesterday I received from the Minister a reply, which, again, was most unsatisfactory in its content. It stated:

I refer to your letter of 13 July 1984 expressing concern over the number of spillages occurring on the Mount Barker Road between Glen Osmond and the Crafers interchange, the increase in the number of minor accidents as a result of these conditions and the need for a right turn lane in the vicinity of the Eagle on the Hill Hotel.

While it is acknowledged that there are a number of spillages occurring on this section of road, there is no evidence to suggest that they are becoming more frequent. There is evidence to suggest that many of the spillages are a function of vehicle deficiencies and incorrect loading. However, the sharp bends and nature of the road do tend to exacerbate these problems.

As this section of road is a part of the national highways system, it is intended that a preliminary study to determine the level of improvements warranted on economic grounds will commence in the near future.

I repeat that that reply is most unsatisfactory, and the Minister will have a very red face if a serious accident does occur and lives are lost in the very near future, because again (and I cannot emphasise the point enough), during the winter months, with the vast increase in the number of vehicles now using that road, there is bound to be a serious accident.

Since I provided a press release to my local paper I have had numerous people contacting me supporting the points that I made in the release, and offering advice and statistics to support the call for the Minister to take some action. I do not have the time now to refer in detail to those letters. I received one from a person who lives on the Mount Barker Road at Glen Osmond. It is a very lengthy letter of some nine or 10 pages and is very descriptive in explaining some difficulties that are being experienced. The letter states:

I read with great interest in the *Courier* that you were showing an interest in the condition of the Mount Barker road and pondering when the greasy, slippery surface will cause a death. In my opinion, it already has. Since living on this road for the past nine years, I can only say that, if it was a person causing so many deaths, maiming and damage to property it would have had something done about it years ago. Only a few days after reading your letter a semi-trailer went over, damaging a family home and causing tremendous delays to Hills dwellers on their way in to work, as, first, the road was restricted and then completely closed. Semi-trailers go over with such monotonous regularity that they are only rated a mention if the media is desperately short of news. Since the road was constructed, the traffic it carries has dramatically risen. The freeway makes the Hills within commuting distance of the city, but the Mount Barker Road is not considered to be a freeway.

The writer goes on with statistics pointing to the number of accidents in which that person has helped those involved. Some accidents were quite horrific, as the person describes. She explains some of the difficulties being caused by incorrect loading and the loss of fuel by semi-trailers, and indicates that telephones are needed along the road so that vehicles breaking down can contact the RAA, as is the case on the freeway.

I only wish I had the time to refer to the letter in detail and to the many other letters that I have received on this important subject. On a future occasion, I will read into *Hansard* the comments that have been provided so that the Minister is aware of the seriousness of this matter. Again, I call on the Minister and the Government to take some action in this serious matter.

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

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

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MEMBER'S REMARKS

**Mr TRAINER (Ascot Park):** I seek leave to make a brief personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**Mr TRAINER:** A few minutes ago the member for Hanson made certain allegations that I wish to refute concerning my remarks at the conclusion of the Address in Reply debate. First, I point out that I am not opposed to the Address in Reply, as such. My remarks implied that I sought only to reform it, as the honourable member would realise had he read the section of my speech, wherein I said:

Without abolishing the Address in Reply debate, we could reduce the time allowed by half the current one hour and allocate that time more fruitfully to enable members to have more frequent opportunity for grievance debates during the course of the year.

**Mr Whitten:** Adjournment debates.

**Mr TRAINER:** Adjournment debates or grievance debates. Secondly, I did not reflect on my colleagues, either collectively as members of the House as a whole or in a partisan manner. I was not criticising members on either side of the House. As I had done on previous occasions, I pointed out that the Address in Reply debate had used an inordinate amount of time over the past three weeks. I also complimented some of the members of the House. I stated:

Members have made some endeavours to use the time wisely. A few members tend to deal with one subject at length—a manifesto of their own political philosophy or some important issue.

That is exactly what the member for Hanson suggested as being desirable. Thirdly, I did not try in any way to downgrade back-benchers. In fact, becoming the Government Whip has given me certain responsibilities on behalf of back-benchers on both sides of the House, so I have often spoken up on their behalf and on the need for them to be able to carry out their roles, as is clearly evident in the remarks that I made yesterday afternoon.

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** I draw to the attention of members of the House a matter referred to in the *Motor Trade Journal* of November 1983 about vehicle modification problems. This matter concerns me and was brought to my attention in a rather humorous fashion, if you like. Some time ago a person told me that he had taken his car to have modifications made to the muffler system but that when he subsequently went back to the garage to pick up the car he found, much to his horror, that the original wheels were no longer on it. He asked the proprietor where they were and a somewhat red faced proprietor apparently said: 'Look, mate, we got chatted the other day by the cops who put a sticker on the car, and so we borrowed your wheels to enable us to take the sticker off so that we could take the car to get it fixed. As soon as the car comes back we will return your original wheels to the car.'

That is certainly an abuse of the system and a matter that I would have liked to draw to the attention of the Minister in another way, but I am using this opportunity to do so now. One can imagine other people with unroad-worthy vehicles who are unlawfully using this system and then treating it as a joke. Many people could get caught this way. Clearly, detection of any such practice should be tightened up, although how that can be done is beyond me at this stage. However, I have given the matter some thought, and perhaps some measures could be implemented. Such practices are contrary to the law designed to protect road users.

Further on the matter of safety, I read in the *Commonwealth Record* of 9-15 July 1984 (and this matter has been

publicised in the press) an article concerning motor cycle safety measures. The Federal Minister for Transport has applauded the endorsement by the Australian Transport Advisory Council (ATAC) of proposals aimed at reducing motor cycle fatalities. It is stated in the article:

Over 400 motor cyclists are killed each year and the risk of a fatal crash for experienced riders is two to three times higher than that faced by car drivers. For novice motor cyclists, the risk is up to 20 times higher. This attempt to reduce these horrific statistics must be supported.

I agree 100 per cent with that. Another recommendation is:

The removal by States and Territories of any legislative constraints to the day time use of running lights.

Having worked in the railway industry, I know that a practice undertaken by the IFULE workers was to leave on the headlight of the engines at all times, particularly when running on long sections of track. In doing so the engine was clearly visible to motorists, particularly in hazy conditions, during twilight hours or in the early hours of the morning. So, I certainly agree with that view. Another recommendation relates to the promotion of voluntary use of running lights or headlights in daylight hours and the use of other conspicuous and protective aids. I certainly agree with that.

Another matter referred to in the *Commonwealth Record* concerns the review of the effectiveness of the 260 cc limitation for novice riders. This is somewhat of a joke today, because a person with no identification can simply walk off the street (perhaps, a young buck of 16 or 17 years of age who has a licence) and buy an 1100 cc motor cycle, having never previously ridden a motor cycle. Such a person, with no appropriate qualifications, can buy the bike, take it out and roar up the street on it, and in such circumstances, he is indeed a road hazard. Furthermore, if such a person was killed, and if as is probable that person had no insurance, who must cough up? Such a person could insure that bike, saying that he had the proper licence, but who then would be responsible? I have had experience of this. I knew a person whose son had a 750 cc motor cycle and, after having had a prang (which was not his fault), the father had to pay for the costs involved.

It concerns me that a person without qualifications can walk in off the street and purchase a high powered motor cycle, with no constraints whatsoever. To the best of my knowledge, no checking is done by the retailer. This matter must be addressed by this Government or any other Government in terms of safety of people on the roads.

The 260 cc limitation for novice riders was referred to in an article that appeared in *Motorcycle Revs News* of August 3-16, 1984. This makes the whole issue of the 260 cc limitation a joke. The report to which I have referred states:

The suprising thing about the KR, and the same goes more or less to the other two-stroke 250 twins, is the immodest pace it is able to maintain on country roads. Speeds in the range of 120 to 140 km/h are easily maintained, and there will be more than a few lads out there on bigger bikes who won't be able to hack the pace this little green meanie is capable of maintaining.

It should be remembered that while the KR may not match an RG in its handling prowess, it still has a considerable advantage over bigger, heavier bikes when there is anything like swervery to be negotiated. Add to that an exceptional turn of speed to 160 km/h, with another 20 km/h available with some patience thereafter, and you start to wonder why sports bikes should ever be bigger than 250 cm!

The point is made: 250cc is a joke. Limitations have been placed on it. I am not knocking any motor cycle clubs in this State or elsewhere, but it is a matter that needs to be addressed. When one buys a motor cycle one should produce proper identification and there should be restrictions on lads who have not ridden a motor cycle previously. I saw many lads in my time as a youth jump on a big bike and think that they were one of Hell's Angels, and it was not

long before they could be found in hospital with a broken limb.

It concerns me not only because of injury to the lads but because of the cost to parents who have to pay when they find that the riders are covered by an insurance policy that is null and void because the lads are riding a cycle bigger than permissible in terms of their licence. Many lads riding motor cycles come from middle or lower income families because of the modest fuel consumption of these motor bikes. There is a responsibility on the community and the retailers to check that the lads have appropriate licences for the proper motor cycle until such time as this legislation is changed and these various other recommendations come into effect concerning the alteration of motor cycle licences in this State.

**Mr MEIER (Goyder):** I bring to the attention of the House tonight a matter that has devastated the residents of Two Wells. It concerns a letter sent to me. An almost identical letter was sent to the President of the Two Wells Community Centre Inc. Finance Committee from the Minister of Recreation and Sport dated 8 August 1984. The letter states:

... I regret to advise you that, under the Recreation Development Grants Scheme guidelines, I am unable to authorise a grant for the project for the following reasons:

I will elaborate later on what the project is. The letter continues:

The project is not considered to be of Statewide value.

The people of Two Wells feel that they have been sat on and are not considered at all important in this State. This action has been a slap in the face for them. They feel discriminated against and they are most unimpressed with the treatment that they have received.

The matter dates back to a deputation that I had the pleasure of leading on 4 July this year to the Minister of Recreation and Sport with members of the Two Wells Community Centre. I pay a tribute where it is due; we were well received by the Minister and one of his advisers. Information was put to him, including the fact that the Two Wells area had researched the community centre for many years. The deputation precis states:

The lack of reasonable venue for public functions in the district prompted the Two Wells Football Club to apply for a grant from the Department of Recreation and Sport as early as 1975 when their application was placed on a priority list which was set up by the honourable Minister under the master, the Premier, Mr Don Dunstan. Subsequent applications were placed every year with no success. In 1983 an application was submitted on behalf of the Two Wells Community Centre Inc. through the Mallala council, again without success.

In 1983 when that deputation went to the Department of Recreation and Sport the members were told, so far as I have been informed, that they were to be commended on the work done towards this community centre, that they were showing initiative, and that the Department felt that they were meeting the necessary guidelines. The criteria for funding at that stage by the Department of Recreation and Sport stated:

Emphasis will be given to the following criteria for funding:

Developing facilities that will promote further opportunities for participation in a recreation or sport—

and the centre meets that criteria. The next criterion is this:

Areas that have the greatest needs.

In the last financial year the Two Wells area increased at a rate of 23.6 per cent compared to a State increase of about 3 to 4 per cent. The 1966 census figures pertinent to the Two Wells portion of the District Council of Mallala, compared to the 1981 figures for the same area, show an overall increase of population of 22.4 per cent; the overall State increase for the same period shows only 3.2 per cent. So, it

is an area of great need, about the greatest need in this State.

The number of existing facilities and the quality of these facilities is the third criterion. The Two Wells area is poorly served; it is shockingly served. It has an outdated institute which has had no repair work done for a long time, other than a small amount of mortar work on the outside. One would not want to use the floor for any normal function and the back area and stage are in urgent need of major overhaul. The institute committee appreciates that it would not be an economic proposition to upgrade it and even if it was upgraded, the community would not feel at home in that hall. The fourth criterion is this:

How the facility fits into the overall developmental plan for a particular sport or recreation.

A number of sports would benefit from the Two Wells Community Centre Club. The football club has more than 150 playing members as well as many supporters; the hockey club has over 110 members; the cricket club has 50 plus members; the netball club has 50 plus members; the tennis club has about 100 members; the calisthenics clubs has 60 members, and the equestrian club about 30 members, so it meets that criterion.

The next factor is the cost of the facility and financial support from other sources. The District Council of Mallala has been very supportive of the venture—supportive to the tune of \$48 000 out of \$100 000. That matter was brought up by the people who listened to the deputation last year. They said, 'That is most noteworthy, and when there is that sort of support it makes it much easier for us to give our support.'

The last criterion for funding refers to extending the use of an existing facility. There is not much facility as it is. It is almost a brand new facility that is well overdue. Because the Minister has not seen fit to give a grant to this community centre, Two Wells is finding that it will have a magnificent building of \$100 000 without any money to furnish it. What sort of money is needed to furnish it? The sum of \$70 000 is needed. It was discussed with the Minister that surely a grant could be given to the building that has virtually been completed, and the Minister acknowledged at the time that that was something that could be considered.

Yet we have now seen that he considers that the project should not be funded, one of the reasons being that it is not considered to be of Statewide value. I put to the Minister that maybe it is not of Statewide value, but it is of international value, because the 1986 World Equestrian Events will be held at Gawler, and the overflow will be coming into the Two Wells area. In fact, one of the places where people can stay at Two Wells—the Two Wells Tavern—is already receiving bookings for 1986 for the Equestrian Events. If that is not of Statewide value, it is of real national value. In any event, do we have to justify everything on the basis of a Statewide value? Look at all the former projects. We hear major projects announced every second week, by either private enterprise or some other body. I would like to know how one justifies one event as being of Statewide value over another.

In this particular case the Gawler and District Football League, with which Two Wells is associated, has unfortunately recognised that the Two Wells area does not have facilities up to standard. It needs better facilities. It needs an area where a large number of people can sit down. It needs bar facilities and proper change-rooms. In fact, I believe it is the only town in the Gawler and District Football League where an adequate community facility is not available. Surely that also adds weight to the importance of this town on a Statewide basis, or are we not going to consider that as part of the argument? Let us look at the parochial value, if we want to—

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable member for Henley Beach.

**Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach):** I wish to refer to a problem that is causing great difficulty in the western districts, and that is the high level of unemployment in that area which has been continuing for several years. The growth industry in job creation all over the world is tourism, so any increase in tourism would help alleviate the very vexed question of unemployment in my electorate. The Henley Beach area was one of the most visited seaside beaches in years gone by.

**The Hon. Ted Chapman:** It's a lovely spot.

**Mr FERGUSON:** I agree with the honourable member: it is a lovely spot. Photographs of the beach areas taken in the 1920s, 1930s and 1940s reveal that there were many more people visiting the Henley and Grange area during that time than visit the beach now. The popularity of the Henley and Grange area as a seaside resort has slipped in recent years. In considering that question, on my recent overseas tour I took particular note of what beachside areas were doing and of the steps being taken in overseas countries to overcome this problem. The Henley and Grange area is a natural setting for a day-tripper, and this is an area that could probably be most fruitfully promoted. It would appear to me that long holidays to the beach in this area have been declining and will continue to decline. It is logical to assume that short holidays and one-day trips could, with promotion, be increased.

There is no use, however, in increasing the number of day-trippers unless there is a corresponding economic return, especially to the local population. This is a question in which I have taken a keen interest. The beachfront of my electorate compares more than favourably with most beach environments throughout the world. I was surprised to find that most beach environments in the countries that I visited did not compare favourably with South Australian beaches. Many of the beaches were stony and polluted. Very few people were able to swim in the sea on the Italian Riviera, for example, because the water was so badly polluted. It was impossible to walk on many of the beaches in the famous Greek Islands without some covering on the feet. This is because of the rocky and stony nature of the beaches, many of which are most uncomfortable to lie on.

The beaches in my electorate are both clean and comfortable by world standards. Many people from other countries would be happy to sit on the sands of Henley and Grange and enjoy the West Beach environment. It is interesting to note that many of the beaches in Italy and Greece are not free of charge. An entry fee must be paid by all people wishing to use the beach in question. This system has advantages and disadvantages. The advantages are that the caretaker must make sure that his section of the beach is clean and free of rubbish. He has a vested interest in the area he controls and usually makes sure that no misbehaviour occurs. The caretaker is usually the supplier of hire equipment such as umbrellas, *chaise* lounges, beach mats, canoes, skis and a variety of other equipment.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Do they charge for it?

**Mr FERGUSON:** Yes, and this in itself is a job creator. I would like to see more of this activity occurring on the beachfronts here. A tourist can visit the beach knowing that most of the equipment is available to him or her through the hiring system and needs only to bring a pair of bathers and a towel. This system of gaining the tourist dollar and creating work is something in which local government should be taking an interest, including the possibility of allowing more concessions on the beachfront for hiring equipment than is now the case.

One of the interesting aspects of the problem concerning beachfronts throughout the world is the transport used to

and from beaches. It is apparent that most holiday-makers reach their holiday resort by the use of private cars or hire cars. Some beach resorts vigorously promote the use of public transport in order to reach the destination, but by and large most people travel to and from beach resorts by way of private or hired motor car. This has created a universal problem of parking motor cars. Overseas I was fortunate enough to be provided with a study undertaken by the Brighton Council in the United Kingdom in relation to this problem. Holiday-makers using cars were asked where the cars were parked during the day and in the street, 58 per cent during the day and 51 per cent overnight. Parking at their accommodation was used by 16 per cent during the day and 26 per cent overnight. Covered car parks were used by another 16 per cent during the day, but by just 8 per cent overnight. Open car parks accommodated 6 per cent of holiday-maker cars during the day, but just 3 per cent overnight. Many beach resorts experienced parking problems. Some towns have experimented with park-and-ride schemes to alleviate the problem. These schemes comprise car parks on the outskirts of town with regular shuttle bus services into the town centre.

The parking of the private motor car at holiday resorts is a universal problem. This has not stopped, nor should it in my opinion, tourism promotion of the Henley and Grange beach suburbs. It is interesting to note that in some beach areas parking has been prohibited entirely and the use of the motor car is eliminated as much as possible. Manly council, in Sydney, has adopted this attitude and has eliminated the use of the motor car as far as possible on the beachfront and in nearby areas, which has proved to be a resounding success. In other areas I have found it extremely pleasant to be able to walk around the vicinity of the city without having to worry about vehicular traffic. It may well be that consideration should be given to eliminating vehicular traffic altogether in some areas of the beachfront.

Many beach resorts I visited during my tour had a tourist information centre. These centres had an important role to play in providing a service to the tourist once he or she arrived at a destination. I am sure that tourist information centres would go a long way towards providing the necessary promotion for tourism for the day-tripper to the Henley Beach and Grange beachfronts. To a certain extent, there is a feeling that there is insufficient to do on a day trip to the beaches in my own electorate. Well located information centres with up to date information on what is on could help to offset this misconception.

Many overseas information centres contain the most modern computer based technology to provide a first class service for booking of accommodation for visitors to the area. This may be a way in which this system could be utilised for booking accommodation in the large number of holiday flats and accommodation available in the Henley Beach and nearby areas. After having inspected many of the information centres on my study tour, it would appear that they are the front line of tourist promotion. If tourist promotion can be taken seriously, then tourism information centres would seem to be a prerequisite for activity in this area. During my tour I was able to gain first hand knowledge of the way European countries have been able to utilise the tourist dollar in the area of good restaurants and eating places. I have been able to observe the sale of liquor and food in these overseas countries. With the limited time at my disposal, I would say that this is an area that we need to look at.

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

Motion carried.

At 10.23 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 23 August at 2 p.m.