

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 18 September 1984

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

PETITION: EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

A petition signed by 55 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to ensure that the course in early childhood education at Magill campus of the South Australian College of Advanced Education be retained in its present form was presented by the Hon. P.B. Arnold.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the following written answers to questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in Hansard: Nos 20, 23, 33, 42, 66, 67, 70, 72, 75 to 77, 81, and 90.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

- Pursuant to Statute*
 Planning Act, 1982—Crown Development Reports by South Australian Planning Commission on proposed—
- i. Ranger Housing at Balcanoona Homestead.
 - ii. Erection of Classroom at Grange Primary School.
 - iii. Police Radio Tower, Gawler.
 - iv. Upgrading of the Mount Gambier Community Mental Health Centre.
 - v. Borrow Pit, Hundred of Archibald.
 - vi. Construction of a Replacement School for Gawler East Primary School.
 - vii. Construction of the Noarlunga Health Village.
 - viii. Police Radio Tower and Communication Building at Hundred of Riddoch.

By the Minister of Lands (Hon. D.J. Hopgood):

- Pursuant to Statute—*
- i. Registration of Deeds Act, 1935—Regulations—Fees.
 - Real Property Act, 1886—Regulations—
 - ii. Fees.
 - iii. Land Division Fees.
 - iv. Strata Titles Fees.
 - v. Roads (Opening and Closing) Act, 1932—Regulations—Fees.

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

- Pursuant to Statute—*
- i. Citrus Board of South Australia—Report for year ended 30 April 1984.

By the Minister of Tourism (Hon. G.F. Keneally):

- Pursuant to Statute—*
- i. Committee appointed to examine and report on abortions notified in South Australia—Report, 1983.

By the Minister of Local Government (Hon. G.F. Keneally):

- Pursuant to Statute—*
- Corporation of Tea Tree Gully—By-Laws—
 - i. No. 45—Swimming Centres.
 - ii. No. 49—Inflammable undergrowth.

By the Minister of Mines and Energy (Hon. R.G. Payne):

- Pursuant to Statute—*
- i. Pipelines Authority of South Australia—Report, 1983-84.

WALLAROO HOSPITAL REDEVELOPMENT

The **SPEAKER** laid on the table the report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Wallaroo Hospital (Redevelopment).

Ordered that report be printed.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr **KLUNDER** brought up the 35th Report of the Public Accounts Committee which related to Post Implementation Review of Computer Systems in public sector departments and agencies.

Ordered that report be printed.

QUESTION TIME

HELLS ANGELS

Mr **OLSEN**: Can the Deputy Premier, as Minister responsible for police services, say what evidence there is that the Hells Angels motor cycle gang is involved in organised crime in South Australia, and is the Police Force still able to gather intelligence on groups such as this despite the abolition of Special Branch? Today's Melbourne *Sun* has published extracts from a report prepared by the Australian Bureau of Criminal Intelligence which says that members of the Hells Angels gang have been involved in many crimes of violence—most of them of a very serious nature.

In relation to the presence of this gang in South Australia, the report states that a Prospect chapter, called the Barbarians, will ensure control of some areas of crime in South Australia, while providing border contact with most States for other members of the Hells Angels. This report demonstrates that in the past, police intelligence has been able to effectively monitor some of the activities of this group.

The former Government believed that the Police Special Branch had an integral and important role to play in such intelligence activities. As some of the police intelligence has now been published, I ask the Minister whether he can say what evidence the Government has on the involvement of this group in organised crime in South Australia, and whether he can give an assurance that, despite the abolition of Police Special Branch, intelligence will continue to be gathered on groups suspected of involvement in activities such as this.

The **Hon. J.D. WRIGHT**: I have asked the Commissioner for a report on the very matter that the honourable member raises. I have received the report but unfortunately I do not have it with me. In South Australia, there is some concern quite obviously about the gangs to which the honourable member has referred. The Commissioner has made no complaint to me whatsoever that, because of the different arrangements so far as the Special Branch is concerned, there is no way of checking on their activities. The Commissioner points out in the report that there is continuous consultation with Federal bodies in relation to the activities of these gangs throughout Australia. He also points out that the activities can in no way be referred to in South Australia as being as bad as they are in other States. The activities of the gangs in South Australia have not reached the climax that they have in other States. However, I will obtain the report for the honourable member and bring down full details on the matter tomorrow.

ELECTRICITY TARIFFS

Mr **GREGORY**: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy give an indication of the methods under consideration to

minimise the impact of rising electricity tariffs on domestic consumers, especially those consumers in the lower and middle income levels?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Yes, I can. I have been extremely interested in this possibility since becoming aware of work being carried out in Victoria. As early as November last year I first heard of this work, and I wrote to the Chairman of ETSA on 2 November 1983 in the following terms:

Dear Bill,

Following our recent discussions about this year's tariff increase you will be aware that I am concerned about the needs of people on low incomes and the best means by which the Government can attempt to ensure that they have access to electricity and other services at charges which are within their means.

Mr Baker: What about small business?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Just be patient. The letter continues:

The pensioner concession system which has been introduced this year by the Minister of Community Welfare at a cost of about \$8 million per annum is an indication of the priority which the Government gives to this area. However, we are all aware that present financial constraints do not permit an extension of this scheme to other low income groups, some of whom are in a similar financial position to the eligible pensioners. An alternative approach to easing the burdens of these groups may be through the tariff structure.

I understand that the Centre for Urban Research and Action (CURA) carried out a study in 1982 under a grant from the National Energy Research and Demonstration Council (NERDC) which included a survey of energy consumption and social characteristics of 800 homes in four selected areas of Melbourne. The study estimated that the percentage increases in expenditure on gas and electricity varied according to income group, ranging from an increase of 3.5 per cent for expenditure on electricity over a period of a year for the lowest fifth of family incomes to an increase of 12.7 per cent for the highest fifth of family incomes, when an inverted tariff structure was adopted.

I realise that the opportunities for effecting such a redistribution would not be as great in South Australia because we have had an inverted tariff structure for some time. However, there may be some scope for redistributing the charging burden between people on low incomes using electricity only for essential purposes and those with much higher consumptions using electricity, possibly wastefully, but certainly for non-essential purposes, through increases to the tariffs on higher consumption blocks and a lowering of tariffs on low consumption blocks.

If ETSA has done any work similar to the CURA study I would be most interested in looking at it. If ETSA has not done any recent work in this area perhaps we could discuss it the next time we meet.

The letter was signed by me. Since the Chairman of ETSA and I first discussed this matter, members of the ETSA board, ETSA staff, officers of the Department of Mines and Energy, and officers of my personal staff have been considering the various options and their possible effects.

I am able to say that we are very close to a decision on the restructuring of ETSA's domestic tariffs which will have considerable benefit for consumers on middle and low incomes while encouraging conservation. These benefits will be achieved without affecting costs to local industry. That is the answer to the question raised by the member for Mitcham by way of interjection. I expect to make an announcement of the details after further consideration by the ETSA board.

NATIONAL CRIME AUTHORITY

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Premier advise whether the South Australian Government will use its representation on the Inter-Governmental Committee which supervises the National Crime Authority to ensure that any allegations about organised crime in South Australia continue to be fully investigated? The public disclosure of correspondence between the National Crime Authority and Mr Costigan, QC, the Royal Commissioner inquiring into the activities of the Ship Painters and Dockers Union, has

indicated Mr Costigan's view that the transition between his Commission and the Authority will fail and that some investigations he has set in train may not be pursued effectively. Mr Costigan has taken evidence in Adelaide on two occasions. That evidence referred to waterfront lawlessness and blackmail at Port Adelaide, and rackets involving extra payment to unionists at Port Adelaide and Port Stanvac.

Five South Australian members of the Ship Painters and Dockers Union refused to answer questions at the Royal Commission. The allegations made, if not fully investigated, could be damaging to South Australia's efforts to increase shipping through our ports. I therefore seek an assurance from the Premier that the Government will use its representation on the committee which is supervising the National Crimes Authority to ensure that this investigation and any other matter relating to South Australia are pursued to a conclusion.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The brief answer to that is, 'Yes, we would certainly encourage the National Crimes Authority to pursue those matters.' I am sure that in doing so it would reflect the wishes of the South Australian community. However, I would add (and in a sense this is supplementary to remarks by my colleague the Deputy Premier a minute ago) that fortunately South Australia has not been the repository or site for the sort of organised crime and problems that have occurred, particularly in the Eastern States. It is certainly our intention to keep it that way, and every means by which the Government can assist the law enforcement agencies, whether State or national, will be used to ensure that that is the case. It was interesting that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, in referring to that matter, mentioned the effect that that might have in terms of shipping through our port. The fact of life is that one of the biggest strengths that we have in that area in particular is that our industrial relations climate and our general reputation for efficiency and dispatch is second to none in the Commonwealth. It is far superior to that which relates to some of our rival ports. As witness to that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, that is the very point that I was about to make. As witness to that, the fact is that the port of Melbourne has been forced into making special subsidies (and my colleague the Minister of Marine and I are looking very closely at that matter in terms of even their legality) in order to attract cargo and to ensure that cargo goes through that port. We know that we can demonstrate the economic efficiencies. That matter is only ancillary to the point made by the honourable member. As I said at the beginning, the answer is 'Yes, all the functions and all the police support that is necessary will be carried out and provided.'

SCHOOL CANTEENS

Mr MAYES: Mr Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Education.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley is attempting to ask a question.

Mr MAYES: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Will the Minister of Education report to the House on the current policies of the Education Department in regard to food served in school canteens? From time to time, I have received inquiries from concerned parents regarding the Department's policies on food served in school canteens. This is particularly relevant given the current debate which appears to be occurring in the community regarding nutrition. I refer particularly to

an article in the *Advertiser* of 12 September headed 'Fast foods have their place in diet, says South Australian lecturer'. The article refers to a booklet *A Pauper's Guide to Fast Foods* which was issued last week by the Australian Federation of Consumer Organisations and which suggests that fast foods are not only unhealthy but also not good value for money. In particular the debate took a further turn today with a letter to the Editor of the *Advertiser* headed 'Turnout food for thought' which states:

I wish to express my disgust at the apathy shown by South Australians as demonstrated by the poor attendance at a seminar held at the Croydon Park TAFE at Thebarton last week on 'Food for Fussy Eaters—Nutrition for Pre-schoolers'... To parents of young children I ask that you take more seriously your role which surely is to bring up healthy and happy social beings, and to take the opportunities which may better help you attain this goal.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question on this matter. It is an important matter that concerns parents throughout South Australia. I would begin by pointing out that in fact in South Australia school councils have the legal responsibility for the operations of canteens within their schools. So, they make the policy decisions with respect to each individual canteen.

But, the point I make in addition is that neither the Department nor the Government abrogates its responsibility in this regard by trying to say that it is their problem and that they should look after it. Quite the contrary—we recognise that there is a responsibility to see that canteens have a part to play in developing appropriate or good eating habits by students.

As a result of that, in 1983 (last year), I approved the appointment by the Department of a canteen liaison officer to look at questions of nutrition in school canteens and to work with school communities so that those objectives could be achieved. I want to outline some of the work that has been done by that liaison officer: she negotiated with the Department of Technical and Further Education about the introduction of a course which offers a certificate in school canteen management. When that course was offered by TAFE, there were 200 applicants for it. By no manner of means could they all be accommodated, which indicates the concern that exists in the school community. That course endeavours to offer advice at that level for school canteen managers.

Further, there is an arrangement of four canteen workshops in one of the regions of the Education Department, a half-day workshop in another region, as well as compact courses through the Wattle Park Teachers Centre. In addition, seminars have been held in a number of country centres. Those are just some of the activities that have been undertaken by that canteen liaison officer to encourage school councils to improve the nutrition policies that they may follow in their canteens.

But, one of the major hurdles that she has found in trying to convince school councils of the need to change to different food policies is that there is in the minds of many a firm belief that school canteens can make a profit only if they offer a wide range of food, including what we call junk food. She has quite clearly been able to ascertain that that is not correct. A large number of school canteens in South Australia have very firm policies as to the type of food and drink that they supply. They are quite conscious of setting policies on the basis of good nutrition in that regard, yet they make good profits to help schools purchase extra equipment or materials for their communities.

This canteen liaison officer is trying to say, 'It works in those cases: it can work in your case, too.' She is presently, in conjunction with the South Australian Dental Service, organising a survey of all South Australian Government schools and a number of non-government schools to determine how many school canteens are applying such policies.

When that survey material becomes available, she will spread it to other schools in the State to convince them that the mental block that they have is unnecessary and that, in fact, they do not have to give up profits just because they are turning to a policy of good nutrition. I firmly encourage all school canteens to adopt a positive and good nutrition policy with regard to food and drink.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I suggest that that is a very important thing to happen because it assists in the development of good eating habits in students in our schools. But, I return to the point that it is the legal responsibility of school councils, not that of the Minister, regarding what policy they follow.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The drink offered in this place is nutritious, and I commend the Minister of Water Resources accordingly. But, this is an important issue. I hope that parents will pressure their own school councils to consider what positive benefits there will be for their children if they adopt good nutrition policies and that they do not in the process have to forego the profits that they wish to raise for the enhancement of their school facilities.

ELECTRONIC FARE COLLECTION EQUIPMENT

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Will the Minister of Transport explain why the State Transport Authority is negotiating with a French manufacturing company for the purchase of electronic fare collection equipment in preference to an Australian manufacturer which was prepared to guarantee the use of South Australian suppliers as part of the contract? I have been informed that the State Transport Authority has begun negotiations with a French manufacturing company to produce electronic fare collection equipment, despite the fact that a Western Australian based company, Associated Electronic Services, also submitted a bid for the work. In its bid Associated Electronic Services guaranteed almost 50 per cent South Australian content in the contract split between Codan Pty Ltd of Newton and Technical Suppliers Pty Ltd of Hendon.

I understand that, while French equipment proposed for this project has been tested in only five buses up to the beginning of this year, AES equipment (that is the Australian produced equipment with a South Australian component) has been in service in the Metropolitan Passenger Transport Trust in Perth for three years and also with the Urban Transport Authority of New South Wales. This is a high technology industry and the State Transport Authority's decision appears to be inconsistent with the Government's policy of encouraging the development of further high technology industry in South Australia.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I thank the honourable member for his question. When the Government considered this matter, we referred it to my colleague the Minister for Technology, and his advice was that a certain amount of the technology was not available in Australia and that the quantity was not really large enough to be offered to Australian companies in this field.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The STA is currently looking at a new ticketing system involving electronic validating equipment. The system is being explored basically to increase the efficiency of current ticketing procedures and, most importantly, to remove the chances that are currently available for fraud and arguments over the validity of tickets. The STA issued invitations to tender to a number of firms that had expressed interest in the new system. The tenders

received were extensively evaluated. The Government has decided that the STA should enter into negotiations with Crouzet of France to develop a contract for the supply of the necessary equipment.

Crouzet are the world leaders in this high technology area and have won a major acceptance for their system in the United States, where there is obviously a very competitive market for high technology applications, such as ticketing systems. The benefits of the Crouzet system are that it fulfils all of the requirements of the STA for a system that will correct the problems of our current tickets and validating equipment.

It is expected that offsets in this \$5 million plus contract will see approximately 30 per cent of the manufacture and supply of that equipment coming from South Australia. This will involve Crouzet setting up a South Australian base, which will give a large boost in technology transfer to the expanding South Australian electronics industry. We are hopeful that, if this occurs, the South Australian manufacturing base will be used by Crouzet to supply South-East Asian markets that they are currently entering. With their acknowledged world leadership in this field, the benefits to South Australian industry are obvious.

Various other firms tendered a variety of systems for this job, and only two, Camp and Crouzet, tendered a fully readable system. The firm, Australian Electronic Systems, based its tender on equipment that did not fulfil all the requirements of the STA and, in general, were assessed as being less technically competent in this area than the leading contenders. I am surprised that they have reacted in a quite unjustified fashion and made some unsupported claims in their telex that they forwarded to me. It is an unfortunate exercise in sour grapes.

The Government's decision for the STA to commence negotiations with Crouzet was taken on the basis that this was the best equipment for the job, with the best record of technical ability and service reliability, at an acceptable cost. The question of the involvement of South Australian and Australian high technology industries in the supply of this equipment has been fully considered by the STA, the Minister for Technology in this State, as I mentioned, and the Government as a whole. Discussions are being held with the unions and the Fares Task Force Committee on the introduction of this system, which we hope will be operational by the end of 1986. When a suitable contract is drawn up for the supply of new equipment, it will again be presented to Cabinet for its final approval.

TRAFFIC-LIGHT CAMERAS

Mr HAMILTON: Can the Minister of Transport explain the reasons for the trial installation of traffic-light cameras in South Australia? Over the past few months there has been a series of headlines in the *News* condemning these devices and in today's edition of that newspaper there are yet more stories and an editorial comment about it. It is claimed that vast amounts of revenue from new on-the-spot fines is the reason for these devices being installed. They have been called 'Orwellian snoopers' and 'spy cameras'. Tony Baker claims that they are the politician (I suppose he means the Minister) trying to justify an overseas study tour. On page 7 of today's *News* Tony Baker says:

Hordes of damn fool politicians traipse around London, New York and other urban madhouses. On return they feel impelled to justify the cost and their existence by introducing the latest Orwellian device designed to keep pandemonium in those bedlams within bounds and utterly out of place here.

Can the Minister say whether there is any basis for such a concerted and obvious campaign by this newspaper?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I am quite horrified by the coverage given to the proposed introduction of red-light cameras as a road safety measure in this State. The *News* has again excelled itself in a hypocritical exercise in distorting the truth. This grubby little newspaper is conducting yet again another shock horror campaign that has nothing to do with the facts. The use of the words 'spy' and 'snooper' is a calculated attempt to distort the public's perception of the facts. If the police were stationed at intersections to detect offenders, would they be called spies and snoopers? The cameras are simply a device to release valuable police manpower for more productive jobs, while ensuring that dangerous breaches of road rules are detected and, it is hoped, reduced.

What is the freedom that this newspaper claims it is protecting? What is this little freedom it says we have lost from this city by the installation of these lights? Is it the freedom to disobey all traffic laws? Is it the freedom to kill and maim by selfish and criminal driving? What arrogant and irresponsible nonsense the newspaper is talking.

An honourable member: Who wrote this?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I wrote it. In a few brief hours on one day that the Sudholz Road intersection was surveyed, 68 drivers entered that intersection after the red light came on, and 13 drivers risked their own and others' lives by driving their cars across the intersection. Does anyone in this House defend their behaviour?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The way the Opposition is carrying on, it is defending the behaviour of those drivers who travel through red lights. Does anyone seriously object to a device such as the red-light camera saving lives and preventing this disgusting behaviour on the roads? One editorial claims that this is using a sledgehammer to crack a nut. Ask the friends and loved ones of those killed or maimed at intersections because some fool has driven through on a red light whether their problems are simply a nut to be cracked. In 1981 there were 1 120 injuries and seven fatalities at signalised intersections; in 1982 there were 1 179 injuries and eight fatalities; and this year it is expected to be more than 1 000 people injured and a number killed.

Everyone interested in road safety should condemn without question this newspaper's statements and headlines and especially the editorial, which is a blatant attempt to create emotional opposition to a valuable road safety device. I point out that 27 per cent of all injury accidents in the metropolitan area occur at signalised intersections. In Western Australia in monitored trials using cameras over one year, right-angle accidents (the most serious type) were reduced at one intersection by 55 per cent. I am pleased to say that the Royal Automobile Association is also strongly supporting this move. It is a pity that the *News* did not stop its emotional campaign to stir the public but assisted the Government and the community in implementing additional road safety measures.

ELECTRONIC FARE COLLECTION EQUIPMENT

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Will the Minister of Transport table the technology assessment of the electronic fare collection equipment by the Minister for Technology and the full assessment of the French and Australian equipment by the State Transport Authority and, if not, why not?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague the Minister for Technology and bring down a report.

LAND AND PROPERTY TRANSFERS

Mr FERGUSON: Can the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Attorney-General, inform the House whether his colleague's Department has given consideration to the witnessing of long or short forms of proof for land and property transfers? Justices of the peace in my electorate have mentioned to me the difficulties that they sometimes face in witnessing the long or the short form of proof for land and property transfers because of the clause that states that the witness should be well known to the justice of the peace. These documents can also be witnessed by solicitors or bank managers, who often also have the same difficulties.

The problem relates to the fact that the people seeking the signatures are not often well known to the person witnessing their documents. Modern finance systems have also changed since the introduction of this legislation. Quite often these days people utilise building societies or credit unions in preference to using savings banks. It would appear to be sensible that this clause be changed to allow a document to be witnessed by persons who have satisfactorily identified themselves rather than being well known to the witnessing officer. I understand that submissions relating to substantial changes to this section of the Act have been made by the Real Estate Institute.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question, and I will most certainly refer it to the Attorney-General for his consideration. In the early 1970s amendments were made to legislation requiring a great deal of caution to be taken in signing important land transfer documents, in particular, mortgages. This Parliament passed requirements that certain documents needed to be witnessed by solicitors so that these documents could be fully explained to the client seeking the signature.

This is the largest transaction that confronts a great majority of people in our community, and it needs to be handled with every care and caution. I would suggest that the honourable member hasten with caution in this matter so that, whilst it may be simpler on one occasion for a signature to be gained, the consequences may well be significant throughout the life of the person concerned. So, whilst convenience is important and the law should provide for that wherever it is possible, the law also has a responsibility to protect consumers, particularly in very substantial transactions.

POLICE COMMUNICATION TOWER

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Will the Deputy Premier, as Minister of Emergency Services, say what action he is now going to take to ensure that the police communication tower is built on Mount Barker as a matter of urgency? Recently in the House, in reply to a question I asked, the Minister stated:

Certainly, I support the construction of the tower. There is no question about it.

I am now advised, however, that there is a distinct likelihood that the tower will not be built at all, because of union interference following a protest by a small group of people who claim that the summit is an Aboriginal sacred site, a claim which has lacked substantiation. After all, the Minister for Environment and Planning, as the Minister responsible for the protection of the Aboriginal heritage, has indicated that the construction of the tower may proceed.

Investigations to locate the most suitable site for the communication tower commenced in 1972. Nine other sites have been examined, but there is no doubt that the site selected, because of the need to obtain a 360 degree contact, is by far the most effective. I am informed that it is not

just a matter of providing improved communications on the part of police and emergency services on occasions of State emergency: the facility is much needed by the police on a day-to-day basis in the Hills and also to facilitate an improved contact between Adelaide, the South-East and the Murray Mallee regions. Benefit to people in these areas and, in particular, the fire-prone Adelaide Hills would be immense. I have received considerable representation urging the Government to give support to the South Australian Police Force and to intervene so that an installation of such importance will not be impeded by such a few on a flimsy protest when the need of the very large majority is so great.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I reiterate what I said in this House last week (or whenever the honourable member asked me the question previously) and simply say that I support the communication tower being erected.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: What are you going to do about it?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Has the honourable member quite finished?

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: Yes.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I reiterate, for the honourable member's benefit—as he was too busy interjecting to know what I said—that I support the erection of the communication tower. If the honourable member would like to question his mind or ask the Police Commissioner or someone in authority in the Police Force, he would ascertain that I have done probably more in the communications area for the police than has any other Minister in modern times.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: Do you support the tower on Mount Barker?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Only yesterday Cabinet carried a further decision on the communications system of the Police Force in South Australia.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: Do you support the tower on Mount Barker?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: It is reasonable to assume that, as Minister of Emergency Services, I have carried out my duties in an effective and proper manner in ascertaining and determining the best communication system possible for the police in South Australia.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: Do you support the tower on Mount Barker?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The honourable member is, really starting to sound like a parrot.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The honourable member is sounding like a cockatoo. One would think he was perched on a big tower somewhere doing the job that birds do down upon you.

An honourable member: Is that all the importance you place on this matter?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: No, but it is the importance that I place upon the honourable member's rude interjections; that is what I am complaining about. We will look at *Hansard* later and, if *Hansard* has recorded the interjections, we will see how many times the honourable member has interjected since I have been on my feet.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: It is no wonder that I am living in fear of the honourable member when he interjects so rudely and so often when I am on my feet. I am trying to get a sensible answer to the total communications system for the South Australian Police Force. I support the erection of the communication tower. I have always supported the erection of that tower and continue to do so. Discussions taking place at present between the Minister for Environment

and Planning and the Mount Barker council will determine the site of that tower.

NOW PROGRAMMES

Ms LENEHAN: Will the Minister of Education inform the House of the current status of, and future proposals for, the New Opportunities for Women programmes, more commonly known as the NOW programmes? Specifically, can the Minister give an assurance to the residents of the southern area that the NOW programme will be offered to students at the Noarlunga TAFE College in the first term of 1985? The NOW programme was offered at the Noarlunga TAFE College for the first time this year. Because the course had been so successful in meeting the objectives of the NOW programme, I was approached by many constituents requesting that the course should be offered by the College in the third term. However, this was not possible due to financial constraints. I therefore seek an assurance from the Minister that the course will be offered at the Noarlunga TAFE College in 1985.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I wonder whether before answering this very important question the member for Glenelg would assist. The NOW programme is a very important one and has taken place due to an initiative of the present Government, which recognises the very important issues that came out of the national economic summit held last year. One of the points identified by the summit was that mature age women received the least assistance of any group in the community when they wished to return to the workforce. Consequently, the NOW programme (New Opportunities for Women) was developed by the Department of Technical and Further Education in South Australia under the sponsorship and by the initiative of the Equal Opportunities Section of that Department in an attempt to try to pick up the issues that had been identified.

The courses provided are offered to women over 25 years of age, working on the premise that women under 25 years of age are able to obtain course opportunities in other areas within the Department of Technical and Further Education. The initiative, which I launched last year, has resulted in seven programmes taking place so far, six of which were provided in the metropolitan area and one in a country area. Of those seven programmes, two were provided in the 1983-84 financial year, and five have already taken place in the 1984-85 financial year. A total of 93 women have graduated from those courses, and a further 20 are expected to graduate by the end of September.

At this stage it is planned that a further five courses for a further 75 students will be undertaken during the remainder of this financial year. It is proposed that the Noarlunga College will offer one of those courses. Therefore, I can give that undertaking now about the first term of 1985. I have to say, however, that one of our problems is that the demand for these courses has far outstripped our capacity to provide them. I refer to the numbers of persons who have graduated from the courses that were provided, but, indeed, only 17 per cent of those who applied were actually able to obtain a place on a course. That really highlights how much of a need is being met by those courses but, quite frankly, we are not able to fully meet the need at this time.

I shall identify a couple of issues concerning why this is an important area of concern. I mentioned the national economic summit. I also point out that OECD survey data from its member nations shows that we have the highest degree of division between what are seen to be women's jobs and those that are seen to be men's jobs in that group of nations. Also, it is a well recognised point that women form the majority of the discouraged job seekers in the

community. So, there are important issues to be addressed in this regard.

I was very enthusiastic when the NOW programme was launched last year, and I remain just as enthusiastic about it. I hope that we can do more to expand that programme, but clearly that must be dependent on the level of total resources available. The Department of Technical and Further Education shares with me a great commitment to this area, and, as I mentioned, the programme will be maintained in 1985. We hope that it will be able to grow further, because many people wish to take advantage of the NOW courses that are now being offered.

INSTANT CASH TICKETS

Mr BECKER: Will the Premier say whether the Government is conditioning the public of South Australia to accept poker machines, by allowing the format of the current instant cash tickets now being sold by the Lotteries Commission? I have noticed that the current instant cash ticket format is similar to the symbols used on poker machines, namely, cherries, bells, oranges, bars, and the triple 7's. The triple 7 provides a first prize of \$25 000. The Lotteries Commission sales of instant cash tickets in the financial year ended 30 June 1984 totalled \$25.1 million. That is an increase of \$7 million over the previous year—a total of \$18 million.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: My Government's policy is opposed to the introduction of poker machines, and there is no change in that policy. As far as the Lotteries Commission Instant Money Game approach is concerned, there are various changes of format as part of that game. Periodically, the format and game change and there is no significance at all in that change: they are simply a part of the overall production of the cards. That policy is in the hands of the Commission. I think that the Lotteries Commission can claim to have been very successful indeed. One should bear in mind that the revenue raised by it is of direct benefit to the community. But, I assure the honourable member that there is no intention to introduce poker machines in this State.

VEHICLE SERVICING INDUSTRY

Mr MAYES: I ask the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Attorney-General and the Minister of Consumer Affairs in another place, whether he is considering introducing tighter controls over the motor vehicle servicing industry. In the *Advertiser* of 13 September an article headed 'Tighter controls sought on vehicle servicing industry' appeared, part of which reads:

Tighter Government controls over the motor vehicle servicing industry were needed in all States to protect people from an industry which had a 'consistent and blatant disregard for the consumer', it was claimed yesterday.

The public affairs manager with the Australian Consumers Association, Mr A. Asher, said a report on the industry in the latest edition of the ACA's magazine, *Choice*, highlighted a suggestion that the industry was worse than the blackest folklore surrounding it.

The article continues:

For the *Choice* report three late-model, second-hand cars, a Ford Falcon, a Datsun Bluebird and a Mazda 323, each with about 20 000 kilometres on the odometer, were bought, made faulty and then taken to 18 Sydney repairers to see what sort of work was offered. . . . One of the worst cases was a centre that replaced old spark plugs with even older, rusty ones and charged for new plugs. . . . The industry has had 50 years of self-regulation to clean up its act and they have not done it so it is time this Government stepped in and exercised controls for the consumer's sake.

That is according to Mr Asher. The article then refers to comments by Mr Flashman of the Automobile Chamber of Commerce, and also comments made by the Chief Executive Officer of the RAA. An item on *Nationwide* that same night referred to Mr Asher and one of the dealers concerned who made a fairly comprehensive defensive argument in relation to the claims made by the Australian Consumers Association.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I will certainly refer the honourable member's question to my colleague in another place for a report, but I am sure that all honourable members were most alarmed to read of that *Choice* survey and the results that were obtained from it. It has achieved a great deal of publicity since its publication. It is of concern that in the State where those tests were conducted there was such a degree of error in the maintenance of motor vehicles. This most certainly relates to the comments that were made earlier during Question Time by my colleague, the Minister of Transport, about road safety matters.

Maintenance of road vehicles is obviously central to the attempt that is being made by the Government of this State to maintain a lower rate of accidents on our roads. If there is some way in which the Government can assist in the maintenance of high standards in the motor vehicle repair industry, that will assist not only consumers but also the maintenance of safety on our roads. I am sure that the Attorney-General will pursue that course.

RADIO STATION 5AA

Mr ASHENDEN: Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport indicate when he was first advised by the TAB of its interest in taking over radio station 5AA? Did he discuss the matter with any of his Cabinet or Parliamentary colleagues before the first public announcement by the TAB of its bid and, if so, with whom?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I cannot recall immediately the exact details of that matter, but I will get a report for the honourable member and advise him accordingly.

INTERPRETING FACILITIES

Ms LENEHAN: Will the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs in another place, investigate the current situation of providing interpreting facilities for clients using the services of the Residential Tenancies Tribunal with a view to ensuring that accessible and adequate interpreting facilities are available to people of all nationalities? At a recent speak-out on women's housing which was organised by the Women's Housing Action Group on 21 July, concern was expressed to me about the lack of interpreting facilities available for people whose second language is English. It was further suggested that because of this situation such people suffer considerable disadvantage in understanding proceedings and communicating their viewpoint or complaint and therefore feel that they are disadvantaged in achieving a fair hearing.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for her question. Once again, I will ask the Minister of Ethnic Affairs for a report on this matter. I have received many inquiries in my electorate office not only from tenants but also from landlords who are facing language difficulties in presenting their cases to the Residential Tenancies Tribunal. So, I am sure that the services to which the honourable member has referred would be most valuable if they could be provided in those circumstances.

GIFTS TO MINISTERS

Mr LEWIS: Can the Premier say why Cabinet has issued a new set of policy guidelines for the acceptance of gifts by Ministers, officers and their families and, more particularly, whether the Premier's recent visit to Singapore contravened those guidelines? I point out that one of the new guidelines decided by Cabinet, as I understand it, is that Ministers are not to accept gifts in kind by way of free air travel and/or accommodation unless it is in conjunction with official Government business and has been approved by the Premier. I further understand that the Premier visited Singapore for a week's holiday last month and that during his absence his Deputy, as Acting Premier, in a speech to the annual dinner at Adelaide Brighton Cement Company, said that he was in Singapore on a freebie (to use his words—not mine). I ask the Premier whether his trip to Singapore was in contravention of Cabinet's new guidelines.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I confess that I was on a freebie. In fact, I was in Singapore and Penang. The circumstances were completely in conformity with the guidelines. When Singapore Airlines introduced its direct flight to Adelaide International Airport—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Premier does approve such things, but it was in the public interest as well. When Singapore Airlines established its line, it invited me to take a trip on the inaugural flight, as has been done by previous Premiers and others in the past. At that time I was unable to do so and was provided with the opportunity to have a trip in lieu as part of it. In fact, on that trip I also undertook a number of official engagements—a little more than I had anticipated at the time, so it was not quite as much of a holiday as I had thought. I undertook a number of meetings both in Singapore and Penang with Ministers of Government and people with whom we have trading and other commercial relations.

So, the opportunity for a trip at no cost to the taxpayer was a very useful one in terms of our overall State development. However, as to the first part of the honourable member's question, there have been in existence some guidelines in relation to the acceptance of gifts by Ministers. It is a very common practice for visiting deputations, and so on, to make presentations and indeed to have things presented to them in return. I requested some time ago that these guidelines be dusted out, as it were, because they had not been looked at for some considerable time and be updated, and—

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That is right.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Certainly not. We were operating under those that had been introduced under the former Government. They had not been looked at. I asked that they be looked at and they have been updated in some respects. That is a perfectly proper practice, and all Ministers are aware of those guidelines and conform to them.

SUBMARINE CONTRACT

Mr PETERSON: Can the Premier say how much it is expected that the Government will have to spend on the establishment of facilities when we obtain the submarine construction contract? I am sure all members support the project to obtain the submarine contract, and there has been considerable effort put in by the current Government and other bodies in the community to that end. When Eglo was established substantial funds were spent on it, and it could be expected that when we obtain this contract considerable

riverside work will be required to make it a feasible proposition, quite a few new facilities having to be provided. Has any cost for the Government's contribution to this work been estimated?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Before I specifically answer that question, I would add something to the answer I have just given to another question. What was free was the air ticket, and I personally paid for all my accommodation and other expenses. I did not make any claim on the public purse or taxpayer, despite the fact that I had a number of official engagements. I just put that on the record.

As to the question on the submarine contract, I think the honourable member for raising it: it certainly is a key project which we are pursuing vigorously indeed. It will require costs as far as the Government is concerned, mainly relating to the infra-structure. In other words, we would expect, first, that any modifications to the harbor or port facilities required to assist the establishment of the submarine construction complex would be undertaken in the normal way by Government, just as, for instance, preparatory work has been done in past years for particular installations and establishments. That could run into quite a considerable sum, but the return to Government will be infinitely more than we will be required to outlay.

In addition, support will be provided under our normal industry incentive schemes, such as the establishment payments scheme. If in fact there is a major expansion or new industry coming as a result of that, the Government does provide assistance under various well established schemes for which companies involved will apply and can confidently expect to have granted to them. Again, the exact amount of that is unknown. I would make the point that we are pursuing this total project as a combined effort with industry—the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, leading firms and the Government—and we therefore see a co-operative effort involved in terms of the infra-structure expenditure. But we are also pursuing it commercially. In other words, I think it would be bad for Australia in general and bad for the project if in fact some kind of option was indulged in between the States.

For instance, I have noted that the New South Wales Government has announced that it will spend \$3 million on upgrading the Newcastle dockyards as part of the bid for the submarine project. Let me state quite frankly, I think that that is a waste of money, because I do not think that that facility technically will be capable of handling this project. Indeed, it would be a disaster to try to put it into the existing infrastructure, however much money has been spent on upgrading it. I think it would be a pity if the States of Australia got into that kind of option. We believe that we have technical superiority which can be encompassed within all the normal commercial parameters.

There is no case for some extra special grants. There will be one or two facilities that we will certainly support as part of this thrust, and we stand ready to do so, but all the contracting parties involved in discussions with us have emphasised that the way in which we can gain the project is by selling to the Federal Government our technical competence and the costs which we can contain in terms of the project, including Government infrastructure. I think our future at the moment is well positioned. We obviously have a lot more work to do but the reaction of the various interested tenderers has been very positive, and I hope that all members will be involved in whatever is necessary in terms of political support for the project to ensure that it comes to South Australia.

DEBT RECOVERY

Mr BAKER: Can the Premier say whether the timing of the restructuring of the State Government debt through the South Australian Government Financing Authority contributed to the short-fall of \$20 million in debt recoveries in 1983-84 and thus reduced the opportunities to eliminate part of the State's accumulated deficit? The Premier has spent considerable time in this House explaining the difficult financial situation being faced by his Government. Much has been made by the Premier of the deficit which resulted from the disasters of 1983 and poor control on State Government expenditure. The Government received a windfall of nearly \$40 000 000 from State taxation during 1983-84. The 1984-85 Budget papers explain that much of this excess revenue was offset against the revenue short-fall of debt recovery. Had debt recovery operated under the conditions which were in place at the time the Budget was framed there would have been little or no reduction from revenue through debt recovery. In other words, over half the taxation windfall would have been available to offset this State's indebtedness.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not have the precise details in front of me at the moment. The honourable member will certainly be able to pursue this in more specific terms before the Estimates Committees. In general, I would simply make the point that the increase in taxation receipts, which was mainly attributable to the housing boom and the much higher receipts than expected from stamp duty collections, was to an extent—not totally, but to an extent—set off by the fall in expected revenue on that debt collection side, some of which was attributable to the fall in interest rates which had taken place to a greater extent than was expected. For further details I suggest that the honourable member raise that point in the Estimates Committees.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEES

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

That for the remainder of the session in relation to the Appropriation Bill (No. 2)—

Suspension of Standing Orders

(1) Standing Orders be so far suspended as would require the Bill to be considered in a Committee of the whole House.

Consideration in Estimates Committees

(2) On completion of the second reading of the Bill, members may discuss grievances on a motion which shall be moved by a Minister—'That the House note grievances'—on the passing of which, the proposed expenditures for the departments and services contained in the schedules to the Bill shall be referred to an Estimates Committee. Such referral shall be on motion moved by a Minister, of which notice has been given, and which shall include a timetable by which (subject to paragraph (4)) the Committee is to order its business.

(3) There shall be two Estimates Committees to be known as Estimates Committee A and Estimates Committee B which shall not vote on, but shall examine and report upon the proposed expenditures contained in the schedules. A Committee may ask for explanations from a Minister, assisted where necessary by officers in the provision of factual information, relating to the items of proposed expenditure. The report of a Committee may contain a resolution or expression of opinion of the Committee but shall not vary the amount of a proposed expenditure.

(4) The Speaker may, at the request of the Chairman of an Estimates Committee, with one day's notice, reallocate any proposed expenditures from one Committee to the other, or vary the timetable if, in his opinion, such reallocation or variation is necessary to facilitate the examination of the proposed expenditures.

Members

(5) Subject to paragraph (10), each Estimates Committee shall consist of seven members including the Chairman.

(6) The members to serve on each Committee shall be nominated by the mover, but if any one member so demands they shall be elected by ballot.

(7) A member may be discharged from an Estimates Committee at any time, except when a division of the Committee is proceeding, immediately on delivering in writing to the Speaker or Clerk a request to be so discharged; provided that the member may nominate another member in substitution, such member indicating on the same notice his concurrence to serve.

(8) In the event of a vacancy occurring in the membership of an Estimates Committee, the Speaker may nominate a member in substitution but in so doing shall have regard to the composition of the Committee as elected by the House.

(9) An Estimates Committee may proceed to the despatch of business notwithstanding any vacancy in its membership.

Chairmen

(10) The Chairman of—

(a) Estimates Committee A shall be the Chairman of Committees; and

(b) Estimates Committee B shall be nominated in writing by the Premier to the Speaker.

(11) Any member of the Committee shall take the Chair temporarily whenever requested so to do by the Chairman of the Committee during the sitting of that Committee.

Quorum

(12) The quorum of an Estimates Committee shall be four, of whom one shall be the Chairman or Acting Chairman and, if at any time a quorum be not present, the Chairman shall suspend the proceedings of the Committee until a quorum be present, or adjourn the Committee.

Participation by Other Members

(13) Members of the House, not being members of the Committee, may participate, at the discretion of the Chairman, in the proceedings of the Committee, but shall not vote, move any motion or be counted for the purpose of a quorum.

Sitting Times

(14) An Estimates Committee shall only meet in accordance with the timetable adopted by the House, or as varied by the Speaker. If a Committee is sitting on any day—

(a) at 1.00 p.m., unless otherwise ordered, the sitting shall be suspended for one hour;

(b) at 6.00 p.m., unless otherwise ordered, the sitting shall be suspended for one hour and a half; or

(c) at 10.00 p.m., the sitting shall be adjourned.

Proceedings of Estimates Committee

(15) Consideration of proposed expenditures in an Estimates Committee shall follow, as far as possible, the procedures observed in a Committee of the whole House.

Naming of Member

(16) If any member persistently disrupts the business of an Estimates Committee the Chairman shall name such member and—

(a) in the case of the member so named being a member of the Estimates Committee, shall suspend the sittings of the Estimates Committee and report the offence to the House; or

(b) in the case of the member so named not being a member of the Estimates Committee, shall order his withdrawal from the sittings of the Committee, until he has reported the offence to the House

and shall, as soon as practicable, advise the Speaker, who will give notice that the House is to meet at 9.30 a.m. on the next day.

Disagreement with Chairman's Ruling

(17) If any objection is taken to a ruling or decision of the Chairman of an Estimates Committee, such objection must be taken at once; and having been stated in writing, the Chairman shall, as soon as practicable, advise the Speaker, who shall give notice that the House is to meet at 9.30 a.m. on the next day; provided that the Estimates Committee may continue to meet, but shall not further examine the vote then under consideration.

Meeting of House

(18) For the purposes of paragraphs (16) and (17), it shall be sufficient notice of a meeting of the House for the Speaker to cause notices thereof to be placed on the House notice boards before 10.00 p.m.

(19) If the House meets pursuant to paragraphs (16) or (17), it shall, after the Speaker has read prayers, hear the report from the Chairman who requested the meeting and—

(a) where a member has been named, proceed with the matter as if the naming had occurred in a Committee of the whole. For the purposes of any suspension of a member, the sittings of an Estimates Committee shall be considered as a sitting of the House; or

(b) where a Chairman's ruling has been disagreed with, resolve the matter pursuant to Standing Order 164.

(20) Subsequent to any proceedings taken under paragraph (19), a motion may be proposed by a Minister to alter the timetable relating to that Estimates Committee's consideration of the proposed expenditures; such motion to be put forthwith, without debate, but no other business may be entered upon during the sitting.

Hansard Report

(21) A *Hansard* report of Estimates Committee proceedings shall be circulated, in a manner similar to the House *Hansard*, as soon as practicable after completion of the Committee's proceedings.

Report of an Estimates Committee

(22) A report of an Estimates Committee shall be presented by the Chairman of that Committee or a member of the Committee deputed by him and shall contain any resolutions or expressions of opinion of the Committee.

(23) On the reports from the Estimates Committees being presented, they may, subject to paragraph (24), be taken into consideration forthwith or a future day may be appointed for their consideration.

(24) In considering the reports from the Estimates Committees, a Minister shall move 'That the proposed expenditures referred to Estimates Committees A and B be agreed to (and that the resolutions or expressions of opinion agreed to by the Committees in relation thereto be noted)'.

(25) An amendment moved to the question proposed in paragraph (24) shall not require a seconder.

(26) Upon the completion of consideration of reports of Estimates Committees A and B, the question shall be proposed and put forthwith without debate—'That the remainder of the Bill be agreed to'.

(27) When the Bill has been agreed to by the House, the third reading may be taken into consideration forthwith or made an Order of the Day for the next day of sitting.

Time Limits

(28) The following time limits shall apply in relation to the following questions—

'That the House note grievances'.

One Minister and Leader of the Opposition or member deputed by him—30 minutes. Any other member—10 minutes.

'That the proposed expenditures referred to Estimates Committees A and B be agreed to'.

One Minister and Leader of the Opposition or member deputed by him—Unlimited. Any other member—30 minutes.

In moving this motion I would like to draw the attention of all members to a number of changes which have been made in the arrangements for this year. The number of members on each Committee has been reduced from nine to seven, and this should facilitate the operations of the Committees. To ensure that members are thereby not restricted in participating in the work of the Committees, the limitation on interchange of membership of the Committee has been removed so that members might interchange at any time by simply giving notice to the Chairman, naming the member who is replacing him.

The time of adjournment of the Committees has been made more flexible to allow each Committee to determine its own time of adjournment for meal breaks to suit the convenience of the Committee. The Committee will still be required to adjourn at 10 p.m. The time at which the Committee will begin its examination of the Estimates will be fixed by subsequent resolution of this House. It is proposed that the Committees should begin at 11 o'clock each morning. However, on Friday 28 September it is proposed that Committee A should begin at 9.30 a.m. In the event that this House is required to meet that morning, pursuant to the proposed Sessional Orders (16), obviously alternative arrangements will need to be made. There are three amendments to the Standing Orders so far as Estimates Committees

are concerned and to which we have been used in the past. I have nominated those three which I and the Government believe will facilitate the workings of the Committees and I commend them to the House.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition agrees with two of the proposed changes. However, we oppose the third. There seems to be some sense in the proposed arrangements for replacing members of the Estimates Committees, because there has been some difficulty in the time tabling under the current Standing Orders for the operations of a Committee where it is wished to make a change in membership for a variety of reasons which might arise. We have no argument with that.

Concerning the times of adjournment there is no major change, and it adds some flexibility to the arrangements. However, I cannot see that it will lead to any real change in the working of the Committees: it will be a member's right to see that a Committee sits for the whole of the allotted period if he has questions to ask. One value of the changed arrangements over the old method of discussion of the Budget Estimates in Committee, where discussions could go on all day and all night with a degree of filibustering, is that the set time allotted for these Committees seems to work very well. The availability of departmental officers for set periods has added to the opportunity of members to glean information at first hand without the Ministers going away and getting reports, and the like.

So, we have been well pleased with the arrangements which have allowed departmental officers to be available during the questioning of the Estimates. However, no good reason has been advanced for the reduction of the number of members on the Committees from nine to seven. I think another change has been included also in relation to the quorum for the Committees. I do not think the Deputy Premier mentioned it. If he did, I did not hear it.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I did not, but it follows.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: There is a change for the quorum of the Committees from five to four. The Opposition does not believe that this will benefit members who may be seeking to glean information on the Estimates. There should be maximum participation by members (both back-bench and front-bench) of the Opposition and, indeed, I would have thought that Government back-benchers would welcome the opportunity to glean information from Ministers and their officers at first hand.

The Opposition cannot see any advantage in reducing the numbers from nine to seven. It will make the Committees very thin, and it will reduce further the opportunity of members to get first-hand knowledge of these Budget Estimates. For those reasons, without carrying this debate to extreme lengths, the Opposition cannot see any reason for excluding two people from the deliberations of the Committee. I know the arrangement stands that a member can sit at the back of the Committee, but he is restricted to asking his questions until all members of the Committee have finished their line of questioning, and that is a considerable inhibition on other members of Parliament who may wish to seek information.

For that reason I seek to move two amendments to the Sessional Orders, the first at page 1 of the Notice Paper, under the heading *Members* in paragraph (5), by deleting 'seven' and inserting 'nine'; and the second at page 2, under the heading *Quorum* in paragraph (12) by deleting 'four' and inserting 'five'.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: We've never had five before; it's always been four.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I guess that the first will be taken as a test case. This is something that the

Deputy Premier has just found out. My memory is not serving me particularly accurately but my understanding was that it was five.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: It's more appropriate the way it is.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: We believe that a quorum of five out of nine members is not inappropriate. I move accordingly.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Elizabeth): I am amazed at the amendment moved by the Deputy Leader, because my understanding of the proposed change was that this was a mechanism by which ordinary back-benchers, not members of the Committees, would have been able to involve themselves more in the matters of discussion before the Committees than they are able to do at present.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: This can be handled quietly, because I do not think the Deputy Leader has seen the point. Except perhaps for convenience, there is no other reason: it will be easier for non-Committee members or non-participants to involve themselves in the discussions if there is a smaller number on the Committee. It is patently obvious. Before, eight people were asking questions and by the time they had finished, there was not very much time left. If there are only six people asking questions, there is a reasonable chance that more time will be available for non-participating or non-Committee member back-benchers to ask questions. That argument is conclusive and stands as quite reasonable. I am only sorry that in whatever discussions went on earlier the Deputy Leader does not seem to have grasped this point, because if he did understand it he would not have raised this amendment. I see no purpose in the amendment, and I strongly support the proposal moved by the Deputy Premier.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): The sooner the member for Elizabeth goes to Canberra and finds out about the operation of the Estimates Committee system there, the better: I wish him good luck.

The SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member to come to the point.

Mr BECKER: I support the amendment. The establishment of Estimates Committees was one of the best innovations introduced by the Liberal Government. All members could have full and frank discussion with Ministers as to the receipts and expenditure of the State. However, one complaint we received was that members of the Government should not ask questions. On many occasions on the Committees on which I sat we deliberately did not ask questions so that Opposition members would have the opportunity to ask as many questions as they wished. A second complaint was that members of the Opposition (who are now in Government) had great difficulty in understanding the information and in researching it—so much so that the assistance of the staff of the Public Accounts Committee was offered to any member who needed it. Certainly, those who were members of the PAC used my staff, when I was Chairman, to assist them in preparing questions and understanding the documents.

I would think that, if the Government is genuine about accountability and open government, it would ensure that every member has the opportunity to sit on a Committee and be a participant of a Committee. Other members can come in whenever they wish, ask a question and go. I take Government members back to the time when I was acting Chairman of one of the Committees and the then member for Mitcham, Mr Millhouse, wanted to ask a question. So, after he persisted for a while, an arrangement was made that the member for Mitcham ask his questions, and he

asked one or two questions. I assume that he had matters before the court; he shot down on his pushbike, asked his questions and left. The then members of the Opposition got huffy and walked out, so the members of the Government carried on and kept the Committee alive.

Unfortunately, the Estimates Committees have never been used to the full advantage of all members and the taxpayers of South Australia. A lot of work and research is necessary to fully understand the documents now provided to the Parliament. Any reduction in the numbers of official members of the Estimates Committee would be, in my opinion, an attempt to reduce the activities and public scrutiny of the public accounts of this State. On behalf of the taxpayers, I say that that would be an absolute disgrace.

Mr EVANS (Fisher): I am concerned about the area in which we are trying to reduce the numbers on the Committees. Over the years since this system came into operation I have had to worry about the change of personnel and the time the change takes place. I accept the proposal before us to make it easier for the change of personnel during discussion on any subject. The Sessional Orders under which we could change the numbers were saying that we would have the views of only three people who have the questioning from either side at any one time. I would hope that they do not go along a line of questioning that is planned and organised as a political group. On that basis I would hope that the four people have individual questioning of the Government and the officers on any subject. By having four, we have greater opportunity for that.

The member for Elizabeth used the argument that we will give greater opportunity to back-benchers. In practice, that is hogwash because, if members of the Government team want to slow down the process and keep on asking questions, they can do so regardless of how many people are in the team.

Members interjecting:

Mr EVANS: I believe that four people are better than three.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Fisher has the call.

Mr EVANS: Moving to the Sessional Orders that give us the opportunity to question Ministers and departmental heads through the Minister, I am concerned about one other matter. When, as Whip, I was asked by my colleague for the list of Ministers, subjects they were going to handle, and the day on which they were going to handle them, I did not have it. I made inquiries of the appropriate bodies or persons and found that it had not been distributed. That was during the week ended 29 August. With an inquiry to the Minister's office by that person, the list was made available to me but was confidential and subject to change. That was only a little over a fortnight ago, which is not much time for a group or individuals to get organised for the Estimates Committees, because of the other commitments we have within the community as members of Parliament.

I ask the Government to think why it is trying to cut the number to three. It is not for the sake of back-benchers. One of the hassles a Government has is finding enough members who are prepared to commit themselves to the House and the Estimates Committees in lieu of going out campaigning, whether we be coming into a Federal or State election. I oppose the proposition and support the amendment that the Deputy Leader has moved.

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): I will not delay the House for very long, but I wish to underline the point made by the member for Fisher. Quite clearly, this proposal is a ruse put up by the Government to relieve the pressure on its back bench

to enable that back bench to get out into the electorate to campaign. There is no other reason for it. It is a contempt of the Parliamentary process. My own judgment is and always has been that the scrutiny of the vote for each department ought to be conducted by as many, if not all, members of this place, department by department. Too many members take their money, go home and forget about their obligations to the rest of the electorate and South Australia, ignoring entirely the way in which funds are appropriated through the taxation mechanism from the public for the purpose of those departments. The programmes in which the departments are expending those funds are just not known to a large number of members opposite.

I have some other gripes about the Estimates Committees which I will not bring into this debate. Indeed, they relate to the substance of this debate, but I have taken up those matters by correspondence and have had unsatisfactory responses to them. I place on record what I believe to be the reasons why the Government is moving in this direction and I think it is disgusting.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Deputy Premier): The first point that ought to be considered in summing up this debate is the last point made by the member for Mallee, wherein he suggested that the Government is taking this action for some ulterior motive other than to facilitate the workings of the Estimates Committees. He used words like, 'The Government wants to get out and doorknock electorates in an election period.' I remind the House and the honourable member which Party was the instigator of the Estimates Committees. The present Opposition instigated the Estimates Committees and it is responsible for reducing this House as it was, with every member attending the House during the examination of the Budget. I do not see where the member for Mallee has any valid point to make in relation to the reduction of the House itself. He interjected earlier that the whole House should be here. Let the blame stand where it is—clearly on the heads of the Opposition so far as the changing of the system in this House is concerned. Let the Opposition live with that. Having made that change—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I must be upsetting people. Every time I get up I get interjections.

Mr Lewis: Because you don't tell the truth.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I demand that that be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member for Mallee to withdraw the remark.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: It's not unparliamentary.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I know that it is not unparliamentary, but it is quite immoral for the honourable member to make that statement, because I am telling the truth, and well he knows it. If that is the attitude that the member for Mallee wants to adopt in this House, calling me a liar, then so be it, but it rests on the shoulders of the member for Mallee.

Dealing with the proposition before the House, I cannot refute what the member for Fisher has said. I do not know when he got the document, but I am told by my officers that the documents were handed to Mr Jory some six or eight weeks ago. I am not in a position to say whether or not they were passed on, or whether Mr Jory did not pass them on. Let me clear up one matter. There will be no more dealings with the staff of the Leader of the Opposition. All dealings on all matters in relation to the running of this House will be done between the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Premier on a formal basis, so that in future there can be no misunderstanding concerning

who may have been right or who may have been wrong, or where some allegation lies.

Three propositions have been put forward, one with which the Opposition agrees and two with which it does not agree. No ulterior motive whatsoever is involved in the proposal to reduce the number of members serving on a Committee from four per side with one Chairman to three per side and one Chairman. In fact, this will provide to members right across the spectrum the opportunity to participate in the Committees' activities. Members will be able to move from one Committee to another as and when they like.

The sole purpose of the proposal is to provide to honourable members the facility to move around. I have spent a lot of time in this House, particularly when I was Deputy Leader of the Opposition, watching members trying to ensure that the opportunity to move from one Committee to another be available to members who may be interested in the proceedings of more than one Committee. However, previously members have been unable to move out of a Committee. That is where this package comes together. Reducing the number from four members to three will make it possible for interchange to occur at any time. That did not apply previously. The opportunity too will be available for a member to move from one Committee to another. Surely, that will be a better arrangement than that which has existed previously.

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Of course the numbers must be reduced if the opportunity for more people to move from Committee to Committee is to be provided. Whether a member is active on a Committee or sitting on the Committee while waiting to ask a question, the number needs to be reduced. That is the sole purpose of it, and there is no ulterior motive involved whatsoever.

In regard to the point made by the member for Hanson about Government members being able to tie up the entire debate for as long as they might like, let me say that the same thing applies to the Opposition. Everyone has the opportunity of asking three questions, after which the Chairman calls someone else. That situation prevails whether there are one, 11 or 20 members participating. If one wanted to tie up a debate it could be done with only one person serving on a Committee. So, the argument about numbers in that regard is totally immaterial.

The Deputy Leader referred to the quorum. He has moved an amendment that, in my view, is simply preposterous. Previously, when there were nine members on the Committee, four from each side of the House and the Chairman, the quorum was four out of nine members. That was on the volition of the Opposition itself. It was not even a majority, but previously that was an acceptable situation for the members who are now in Government, but who at that time were Opposition members, as it was acceptable to the then Government, now the Opposition. Further, it was an acceptable proposition for the members of the Opposition last year.

In retrospect, I think it was wrong to have a quorum stipulated at four members, which was not even a majority of the nine member Committee. I also make the point (which I think is very valid) that often there was not a quorum present while the Committees were in progress. That is a further argument in favour of reducing the number from nine to seven. Members opposite know that that was the case. I believe that a reduction in the number of members will make the proceedings easier, more viable, and more easily facilitated. Finally, on the matter of a quorum, if it was good enough to have four out of nine members, then surely it is now good enough to have four out of seven members for a quorum. I am surprised that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has moved that amendment when

he stipulated the original proposition when the Estimate Committees Standing Orders were formulated. Whether the Deputy Leader has overlooked that or forgotten that that is the case, I am not sure, but it is a fact that he has moved an amendment to his own proposition. I commend the motion to the House.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Deputy Leader having agreed that his amendments be treated as linked amendments, I put them before the House.

The House divided on the amendments:

Ayes (19)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, Ashenden, Baker, Becker, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy (teller), Ingerson, Lewis, Mathwin, Meier, Olsen, Oswald, Rodda, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (21)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon, M.J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs Mayes, Payne, Plunkett, Slater, and Wright (teller).

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs D.C. Brown and Gunn. Noes—Messrs Whitten and Trainer.

Majority of 2 for the Noes.

Amendments thus negatived; motion carried.

JUSTICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It makes two amendments to the principal Act, the Justices Act, 1921. I seek leave to have the remainder of the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Remainder of Explanation

The first amendment empowers a justice to suspend the operation of a warrant of distress or commitment. Section 83 of the principal Act provides that, when any application is made to issue a warrant of distress or commitment to enforce payment of any fine or sum of money adjudged or ordered to be paid by any conviction or order, the justice may, if he deems it expedient so to do, postpone the issue of a warrant for such time and on such conditions (if any) as he thinks just.

When a fine remains unpaid after the due date has elapsed the usual procedure is for the complainant to apply to the court for the issue of a warrant, which is then referred to the police for execution. No action is taken to check with a defendant why he has not paid the fine or to have any discussions with him as to his ability to pay. The defendant only knows of the existence of a warrant when he is approached by the police, told that a warrant has been issued and that he must pay the overdue fine or serve out the amount of the fine in prison. In practice the police usually allow a defendant some little time to raise the money. He raises it, pays out the warrant and that is the end of the matter. However, there are situations where a defendant just does not have the money to pay the fine—he may be unemployed, sick or have heavy family commitments. In such situations there is no way of dealing with such a situation, for once a warrant has been issued there is no way of suspending the execution of the warrant.

There have been a number of instances in recent years where this situation has posed problems. Defendants unable to pay fines temporarily have found themselves faced with warrants of commitment, have had to either serve out the

amount of the fine, borrow money and put themselves further into financial difficulties, or change their address and try to dodge the police and the warrant. The introduction of provisions giving a justice power to defer the execution of a warrant, so that a defendant can make arrangements to pay the fine, will provide greater flexibility and reduce the need for people to go to prison to serve out a warrant.

The second matter dealt with by the Bill relates to section 106 of the principal Act, which deals with the manner in which depositions of witnesses are to be taken at a preliminary examination for an indictable offence. The section provides (*inter alia*) for the submission of written depositions to the examining justice. The current practice is for the prosecution to hand a copy of the written deposition to the defendant or his counsel at the hearing. He must then read the statement and decide whether he wants the witness to appear to be examined personally on the matters to which the deposition relates. This procedure has some disadvantages. It means that, on occasion, witnesses attend the court only to find that oral evidence is not required of them, and it is sometimes necessary for the defence to seek adjournments in order to make inquiries and take instructions.

The present Bill proposes that where a written deposition is to be tendered at a preliminary examination the informant should supply the defence with a copy of the deposition and a notice explaining the method by which he may secure the attendance of the person who made the deposition, at least 14 days before it is to be tendered in evidence. If the defendant or his counsel wishes to examine the witness he must make a request to that effect of the prosecutor. Where, at least seven days before making the request, the defendant informed the prosecutor in writing of his intention to make the request, the defendant or his counsel may examine the witness. Where a justice is satisfied that there is good reason for excusing the defendant for failure to give the written notice, he may permit the defendant to call the witness for oral examination notwithstanding that failure. This new procedure should mean that both sides are better prepared for the preliminary examination. The question of which witnesses will be required for the purposes of giving oral evidence can be resolved in advance. This should eliminate a good deal of inconvenience and delay.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 provides for the repeal of section 83 of the principal Act and the substitution of new section 83. New section 83 provides in subsection (1) that for the purposes of the new section 'order' means a judgment, conviction or order of a court; and 'pecuniary sum' means a fine, pecuniary forfeiture, compensation costs or any other sum payable under an order. Under subsection (2), a person against whom an order for the payment of a pecuniary sum has been made may apply to a justice, being a Clerk of Court, for relief. Subsection (3) provides that where the justice thinks there is good reason for doing so, he may postpone the issue of a warrant of distress or commitment or suspend its operation (as the case requires). Under subsection (4), such a postponement or suspension shall be subject to such conditions as to payment of the pecuniary sum as the justice may impose and may be revoked by a justice for breach of a condition. Under subsection (5), the conditions may require payment by instalments or require that specified security for payment be given.

Clause 4 provides for the amendment of section 106 of the principal Act. The passage 'and a copy thereof has been received by the defendant or his counsel' is struck out. This is consequential upon the striking out of subsections (5) and (6) and the substitution of new subsections (5) and (6). Under new subsection (5), no statement shall be submitted under subsection (2) and no affidavit submitted under subsection (4) unless not less than 14 days before the submission the informant gives or causes to be given, personally or by

post, to the defendant or his counsel, a copy of the statement or affidavit and a notice drawing his attention to the provisions of this section under which the personal attendance at the preliminary examination of the person by whom the statement or affidavit was made, may be served; or the defendant consents to the submission notwithstanding the failure of the informant to comply with those requirements.

Under new subsection (6), where a written statement has been submitted under subsection (2), or an affidavit submitted under subsection (4), and the defendant before the completion of the prosecution case requests the personal attendance for examination of the person who made the statement or affidavit, and either the defendant, at least seven days previously, gave written notice of his intention to request the personal attendance of the person or the justice is satisfied that there is good reason to excuse the defendant for his failure to give such written notice, then, subject to subsection (6a), the person to whom the request relates shall be called or summoned to appear for oral examination.

The Hon. H. ALLISON secured the adjournment of the debate.

WHEAT MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 12 September. Page 811.)

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I indicate to the Government that the Opposition supports this amendment to the Wheat Marketing Act. The Bill, introduced in another place a week or two ago, seeks to amend the Wheat Board formula used for fixing the human consumption wheat price on the Australian market. As pointed out in the notes attached to the Bill, the current formula was designed many years ago to establish a level of prices for the domestic product at levels no more than 20 per cent above the price derived from the export of that same grade of grain.

That current formula has failed to achieve its original objective, and in recent times the price of domestic wheat has reached levels up to 40 per cent above the simultaneously prevailing export price. Wheatgrowers and flour miller representatives whom I have contacted since the introduction of the Bill indicate that, generally speaking, they acknowledge the sense of the formula that is proposed for future home consumption wheat prices at both milling industry level and from the point of view of representatives of the grain growers.

One interesting aspect of the Minister's second reading explanation caused me to make some further inquiries. He said, among other things, that a compromise had been reached with the respective industry parties in relation to this proposal. I suppose it is a tendency for Oppositions generally but, in this case, in particular I followed up the background which led to that apparent compromise. I found that the Wheatgrowers Federation opposed the Government's move in this direction. Wheatgrowers generally over the years have been concerned about the restrictions, controls and ceiling levels that may apply to the price of their product. I suppose that that is understandable from a primary producer's point of view.

However, having regard for the viewpoint of Australian customers, I accept that the compromise arrangement, in an effort to contain home consumption wheat prices within a 20 per cent ceiling over export prices, is an appropriate step to take. It is my understanding that at the moment the average price paid for our wheat on the export market is about \$152 a tonne and the current home consumption

price \$220 a tonne, in round figures. That gap is far too wide to tolerate, bearing in mind that the real costs associated with the storage, holding and marketing of small lots as and when required by domestic users, plus the levy factor as it is associated with the movement of grain from mainland Australia to Tasmania, does not justify such a wide margin. There must be some legislative control, in our view, to contain that gap figure. So, in short, the Opposition supports the Bill.

However, I was a little alarmed last evening to have delivered to me at Parliament House a schedule of further amendments to the Government's own Bill. About a page and a half of details were provided with some explanation for their reasoning. Today I am advised that for reasons not yet given that schedule of detailed amendments has been withdrawn. Whether it has been withdrawn temporarily or permanently, I hope that the Minister acting for the Minister of Agriculture will explain, because industries like the wheat and milling industries in Australia are entitled, in my view, to know precisely what the Government has in mind and to what level of intervention it proposes on matters of this kind so that they have plenty of time to assess the implications of such moves and to enable them to enjoy participation in the overall consulting process which not only the State Government but also the Federal Government have undertaken to give the industry.

With those few remarks, I await the brief explanation from the acting Minister, if he is able to give it, in relation to that latter subject. The Opposition wishes the Bill a swift passage through the Houses so that federally and within the wheatgrowing States of Australia this measure can be proclaimed, as intended, by 1 October this year.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Education): I thank the honourable member for his comments and indication of support of this measure. Certainly, I hope that we can get the Bill through very quickly. First, on the point that the honourable member raised about the differential between the domestic and overseas prices, I note the points and will have them referred to the Minister in another place. Clearly, another aspect is involved other than the cost of production differential: there is also the question of how one meets varying demand situations, nationally and internationally. I am rather sorry that the member for Mallee is not in the Chamber, because we could have quite an interesting debate on supply and demand economies with particular reference to kink demand curves, marginal cost of production, and issues like that.

If those sort of things are taken into account, I think that they are the historic origin for the differential between national and international situations. However, that is a point that I throw in for what it is worth. I will certainly refer the comments to the Minister in another place. As to the amendments that were circulated last night, I make the point that in a kink demand curve situation one recognises that one does not have the same capacity to obtain quite the same prices in one market as in another and that that is extraneous to the cost of production.

The honourable member raised the point about cost of production and said that there were not many differences. It may have nothing to do with cost of production at all; it may be a case of what the market will bear. That is the real origin of the difference in prices. I raise that as a matter of some possible interest. As to the amendments that were circulated to the honourable member last night—

The Hon. Ted Chapman: That's a curious one.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The honourable member interjects that it is a curious one. It is a curious one. They have been sent to the State Government by the Commonwealth Government and, as the honourable member knows,

we are attempting to introduce complementary legislation. The Commonwealth Government initially sent us the first set of amendments about three weeks ago. We dutifully took the matter to the Parliamentary Counsel. Having gone through the Cabinet process, they were drafted, the introduction was approved, and they were so introduced. We are now advised that certain technicality variations are required in that first set of amendments, hence the second set of amendments that came on Friday last week.

We endeavoured to get a copy of that to the honourable member as soon as possible, which turned out to be last night. The honourable member expressed alarm about that. He asks why they have now been withdrawn. One of the reasons that they have now been withdrawn is to accommodate his concern about the last minute arrival of those amendments.

However, there is another point about which we are concerned: that, if we were now to introduce those amendments, given that they are amendments of original amendments that were submitted to us, there could well end up being some problems by the two being meshed together, and we do not want to see the final Act become inoperative because of that kind of complication. We feel that it is better that we proceed with the amendments that originally went through another place.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Yes. Then, at a later stage we can give more appropriate consideration to this second set of amendments that has come. They can go through a proper stage of consideration by the State Government and the State Opposition, and this House in a few weeks can, if necessary make the appropriate amending legislation at that time. One of the things—

The Hon. Ted Chapman: They are temporary.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: They are temporary, yes. We have an assurance from the Commonwealth Government that the new human consumption price formula will operate using the first set of amendments, and on that basis we have decided to stay with the first set, pending further consideration of the second set of amendments that have come.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: Are you sure they originated in the Commonwealth or in New South Wales?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I am advised that they have come from the Commonwealth. I can give the honourable member no more advice than that because I am merely representing the Minister in another place. These are the reasons why they were not delivered, with the anticipation of bringing them through. First, that it was out of consideration for the honourable member. Secondly, it was because of the belief that we could raise a problem with such a rushed job bringing in a second set of amendments on the first set, and that could make the legislation inoperable. We therefore determined that it was not an appropriate course of action.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I hope that we have the honourable member's concurrence in the strategy that is being proposed by the State Government in this regard. It is essential and complementary legislation with all States, individual interstate Ministers notwithstanding.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I notice the honourable member's conjecture about the flavour of amendments. I think that it is the first time that I have heard of the term 'flavour of amendments'. I did not realise that they were aromatic or that they had certain embellishments to them. Nevertheless, I have noted the comments and I can assure the honourable member that they will be noted by the Minister in another place. I thank the Opposition for its

support and look forward to the early passage of this Bill and appropriate follow-up action that may be needed within a few weeks or a couple of months.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

ABORIGINAL LANDS TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 30 August. Page 687.)

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): The Opposition supports this Bill in principle, and during the second reading debate I will express some reservations that I hope the Minister will see fit to address. There is just a possibility that some slight amendments to the legislation may be introduced should the Minister's explanation not be satisfactory to the Opposition. However, this Bill seeks to enable any Aboriginal community occupying lands owned by the Aboriginal Lands Trust to invoke powers to deal with persons who are intoxicated and under the influence and control of alcohol and also to control the possession and use of alcohol on those lands.

Provision was made in the Pitjantjatjara and Maralinga land rights legislation to enable regulations to be made to control the use of alcohol on those lands, and all other freehold land held for Aborigines is in the control of the Aboriginal Lands Trust. There are no provisions in that Act concerning these issues and, as the Minister has said, this legislation aims to fill that gap. We have noted with great concern the recent publicity (and by 'recent' I suppose that we can go back over the past three or four years) about the social disintegration at Yalata Aboriginal Reserve. The Minister assures us that all parties involved at Yalata appear to be in agreement that, until action is taken to reduce the abuse of alcohol in the community, it will be difficult to establish law and order on the reserve.

I make the personal comment that since the Reverend Barry Lindner ceased to be the Superintendent on that reserve the situation seems to have steadily deteriorated. The Minister believes that to prevent problems of conflict with the Commonwealth Racial Discrimination Act this Bill will invoke provisions of the Public Intoxication Act (a general South Australian Bill which will soon come into operation) and will also apply to Aboriginal Lands Trust freehold lands. The Bill will thus cover intoxicated persons, and further provisions in this legislation will provide for the control of liquor being brought into the lands. The Opposition notes that all these provisions will be applied only at the initiative of the relevant Aboriginal community.

It is a very sensitive area, and I am quite sure that no member would like to believe that we are imposing once again on Aborigines restrictions in the use and consumption of liquor with which they may not concur. So, the initiative will come from the relevant Aboriginal community, and then with the recommendation of the Aboriginal Lands Trust. The Bill also provides for some considerable flexibility in the application of the provisions of the Bill through there being the high level of community control in the enforcement of its provisions and in the nature of recommendations made to the Lands Trust and the Government for subsequent proclamation by His Excellency the Governor in Executive Council.

We note that the Bill may also confer on authorised officers, including members of the Police Force, the rights of search, confiscation and disposal of liquor or drugs, and these powers are to be extended to specified parts of the lands by proclamation. The Bill provides that any proposal

to make a proclamation to extend the powers of the Public Intoxication Act, with or without modification, must be initiated within the Aboriginal communities affected by it, and those communities must also be in general agreement (I am not sure how extensive 'general agreement' will be; whether a vote will be taken or whether it is by some sort of accepted concurrence) that the request for a proclamation is lodged with the Government.

In South Australia the Aboriginal Sobriety Group provides hostel and rehabilitation services in Adelaide and several country areas. That is acknowledged, but there is a crucial problem that still remains: which further difficulties may be created and which cannot be handled adequately outside the reserves if this Bill serves to drive alcoholic Aborigines away from their home communities such as Yalata.

This Bill is not going to solve the problem of Aboriginal alcoholism; in fact it may transfer it into the general community, for example, towns such as Ceduna, which has already experienced considerable difficulties with the civil population and with the police over the whole question of alcoholism. Conditions that are imposed under this legislation are more stringent than those imposed on the general community but these conditions can be put into effect on Aboriginal reserves only at the request and with the agreement of Aboriginal communities.

I would like to know what additional measures, if any, the Minister, the Minister of Health and the Minister of Correctional Services intend to put into effect to counter the possible substantial increase in problems of Aboriginal alcoholism outside the communities once these proclamations have been made because I do not believe that all the Aborigines so affected by such proclamations will necessarily stay within the reserves and subject themselves to rehabilitation programmes. I can see the problem simply being transferred from the reserves out into the general community.

I am not saying that this is not a most acceptable move because, as former Minister of Education, I recall having to authorise the Director-General of Education to withdraw the services of educational staff at Yalata following some severe alcoholic disturbance which resulted in social problems, the breaking of windows and the stoning of Education Department houses, much to the distress of teachers who were occupying those premises, and it did reach the point of very high tension and staff being withdrawn, even if only for a short time. We know that even more recently there has been a succession of problems, generally alcohol-related, and I sincerely hope that the measures contained in this Bill will go at least some way towards relieving the problems on reserves. It does indicate that, the request having emanated from Aboriginal communities, they themselves are only too aware of the acute difficulties which confront their communities and are anxious to obtain some strong legislation to assist them in improving a difficult situation.

We support the legislation, but we are extremely concerned about the power to confer upon Aborigines and/or others an authorisation which means that they will have the right to use force. Just how extensive that force may be is not clearly defined. They will have the right to stop vehicles, right of entry, a right of confiscation and the right of disposal of drugs or alcohol. Questions which I believe the Minister should answer are the extent to which force may be used; how much redress any person would have against an authorised officer if subsequently found to have been wrongly stopped and to have had been subjected to force which has resulted in bodily or property harm; and whether there is any accountability ultimately regarding the confiscation and disposal of those drugs or alcohol which might be found. They need not necessarily be destroyed, because disposal can mean a wide range of options: it could be consumed, or put up for sale, or it could be put down the drain, burnt

or otherwise disposed of. If the Minister can assure the House on this point it might not be necessary for the Opposition, either here or in another place, to introduce amending legislation regarding the question of authorised officers and the possibility of their using undue force and exercising undue control.

Mr BAKER (Mitcham): I think that most members and the public generally would understand, from events that have transpired recently in one of the communities in South Australia (and I understand that the same thing has occurred in other places), why this Bill is necessary. I refer back to the statement I made when we were debating the Maralinga Tjarutja Land Rights Bill. At that time I expressed my dissatisfaction with the Government's providing land rights with no responsibility but, more than that, not doing anything constructive to assist the communities concerned. I dealt briefly with the legislation and the performance of the Government in Canada in this particular area. In Canada a number of reserves are set aside for original inhabitants. The Indians in Canada have a number of requirements, and they have certain powers. They have the right to determine their own future within a certain framework, and they have responsibilities which they must undertake. I mention that because one of the areas I canvassed at that time was the alcohol problem, which was one of the many problems facing Aborigines in Australia.

I think it is long overdue that the Government should place certain powers within the hands of the Aboriginal communities to enable them to assist in their own development. One such power is the ability to try to remove some of the negative influences on those communities, one of which has been identified as being the alcohol problem, but there are other problems facing these people, such as their life expectancy, which is 20 years less than that of the European population. There are a number of mechanisms which we can use within the legislative or regulatory framework to improve the ability of these people to meet some of the challenges facing them.

I am quite disappointed that Governments have been more concerned with giving land rather than looking at the future development of the Aborigines concerned. The challenges are there, and I can imagine that in a few years time we will be starting to look at development plans, not in the way in which we determine whether Adelaide is going to have another building or where we are going to put a road: we will have a framework that allows these people to develop within their own communities without disrupting too much their heritage. Progress will be slow, but it is important that we understand some of the difficulties facing these particular communities.

Unfortunately these difficulties rear their ugly heads particularly in terms of alcoholism but, in addition, many Aborigines finish up in South Australian gaols. They are in gaol for a wide variety of reasons involving anti-social behaviour and the adjustment problems they face. All these matters need to be addressed, and I would hope that the Minister of Community Welfare, by promulgating this Bill, will pay attention to some of the other areas where legislation, regulation or Ministerial direction will assist in the development of these communities which will reduce some of the negative influences on them and actively promote a way of life which is compatible with the communities themselves but which also advances them. Indeed, there is a need for people in these communities to advance whether it be in the field of personal hygiene or being able to develop personnel within their own communities who can actually translate some of the technology and become familiar with some of the practices required, for example, to solve the health problems in those communities.

I support this legislation. I hope that it is the forerunner of a number of measures introduced by the Government at the instigation and with the assistance of the Aboriginal communities concerned to advance them in the direction I have outlined. A great deal of newspaper coverage has been given to the disintegration of Aboriginal communities. The land legislation has not assisted, although it could well assist if used in a proper fashion. The instruments are conceivably there: it is up to Government and everyone concerned to promote those things that will assist Aboriginal people to achieve greater equity in the Australian community.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I support the Bill, and I am aware, as much as anyone else, of the reasons for its introduction. I sincerely hope that it will achieve the objects that the Minister explained when he introduced it. However, the Bill deals with only one part of the problem. Unfortunately, there is an abuse of alcohol by all sections of the community, not just the Aboriginal people. The situation at Yalata is difficult, because the people there have little to occupy their time: it is a depressed area. After this law is passed through both Houses of Parliament, proclaimed and operating, I wonder whether anyone has looked a little further ahead at what will happen once the community has the power to prevent the consumption of alcohol, as well as the power to prevent people coming on to the area who have been affected and the power to have them removed or arrested. Has anyone thought about what will take place? Has anyone thought about where the drinking will be shifted to? In passing legislation of this nature, we run the risk of shifting the problem from Yalata to Nundroo, Penong or Ceduna, or there will be the possibility of people becoming engaged in sly-grogging activities.

People used to cart alcohol to Yalata, and it took a great deal of police time to apprehend them. It was a difficult role for the police, and I hope we do not have a repetition of that and a shift of this problem to the three areas mentioned. I ask the Minister to address those problems in his reply, because anyone who has been to Ceduna recognises that there is a problem in the town with people lying around in the streets near the hotel for many hours of the day. Anyone who thinks that we can prevent people from consuming alcohol by passing laws of this nature is not facing reality. The real problem commenced when then Attorney-General Dunstan opened the gate and allowed people (who previously had not been allowed) to consume alcohol; he made it open slather. We might have been in a better position today if it had been done gradually.

I am concerned about the welfare of the Yalata people. As the member for Mitcham said, we thought we could solve the problem by passing land rights legislation. However, we will not solve the problem in those areas until there is some suitable and capable management which meets the long term needs of the people concerned. It does not matter what laws are passed or how much money is spent: unless those people are given some supervision which can lay a foundation for long-term responsible management, the sort of problems and frustrations which boil over on a regular basis at Yalata will be repeated, because alcohol will be brought in there, and that is the result of frustration.

One problem in addressing a subject such as this is that there are a large number of people between two societies who really have nothing constructive to do. One of my concerns for a long time has been the possibility of what will happen to a large number of young Aborigines who are growing up with no prospects of long-term employment or, in many cases, any employment. What will happen? There has to be trouble in those communities.

When considering legislation of this nature, the Government should allow the councils and the Outback Areas

Community Development Trust the opportunity to pass laws affecting their towns to prevent people consuming alcohol in certain sections or areas under their control. That has been done in Alice Springs and, from what I saw when I was there with the Minister, it has been reasonably successful. It is all very well to say that we have a problem at Yalata. I understand the Yalata community not wanting to be disturbed by people affected by alcohol: no community wants that. I do not want that, nor do other members, but if we are not careful we could shift this problem to Ceduna, and what can that local community do about it? Absolutely nothing!

The police have difficulties, and they will do their best, as will the council, but we have to face reality. I understand the problems that occur at Port Augusta and Coober Pedy. There have been requests from time to time from the Port Augusta council seeking these powers. When considering a matter of this nature, we ought to look closely at the other suggestion I have put forward. People can say that it would be aimed at one particular section of the community: it is not. It would be aimed at any citizen. Take Glenelg, for instance: the people there are concerned about hoodlums who congregate in the area, affected by alcohol. No community should have to put up with large groups of people who are affected by alcohol and make a nuisance of themselves. The local authorities ought to have the power to remove those people.

The local community at Yalata has wanted this legislation for a long time. I am aware of the publicity and indeed, first hand, of the problems there, as the Minister is also. I have seen the problems of petrol sniffing and the general deterioration in the community. I have been concerned ever since I have been a member of Parliament about what will happen to these communities in the long term. Every time I go to the North-West of the State I am concerned about conditions there.

I say to the Minister and to the House that I hope that this matter has been thought through to its logical conclusion, because we can prevent not 100 per cent but the majority of the problems at Yalata. We can pass a law to ban alcohol without any trouble at all, and the police or the local authorities can be called to enforce that law. However, if people are inclined to consume large quantities of alcohol, they will find somewhere else to do it. I hope that the Minister and his officers have thought about this, because it is hardly fair to shift that problem to another community. I understand that the people of Yalata do not want people misbehaving themselves. I have had discussions with people from other areas, and I understand their concerns also. I hope that the Minister in his reply will address himself to this subject and at least give some consideration to my other suggestion. I hope that he does not get up and accuse me of making an attack on the Aborigines, because that is not the purpose of my comments at all.

If the Minister wants to reduce the debate to that level, I could join in and rough it up in the Committee stages. I sincerely hope that the Minister looks at the matter in a positive way because, having lived in those communities all my life, I am concerned about what may take place when this legislation comes into operation. I would hate to think that we are shifting problems to one of the towns that I have mentioned, because considerable concern would be expressed publicly by large numbers of people living in that area.

I support the Bill, although I believe that it contains certain deficiencies. I hope that it will achieve the aims that the Minister has expressed in his second reading explanation. I am concerned about these other communities. In the not too distant future, whether the Minister or the Government is prepared to introduce similar legislation as is in operation

in the Northern Territory, it will come into operation in this State, because the public in those areas will demand it. Therefore, both subjects should have been addressed at the same time. I look forward to the Minister's reply and to the Committee stages of the Bill.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I rise to speak to this Bill to amend the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act, 1966, and note with interest that the Minister, in his second reading explanation, stated:

The purpose of this Bill is to enable any Aboriginal community occupying lands owned by the Aboriginal Lands Trust to invoke powers to deal with persons who are intoxicated persons under the control of alcohol, and to control the possession or use of alcohol on those lands.

That is commendable in the sense that evidence has come forth that there has been massive abuse of alcohol in these areas in the past. Several newspaper articles appeared during the earlier part of this year. One in particular, headed 'South Australia's "Third World" Disaster Zone', which was featured in the *Advertiser*, quoted some relevant comments by Dr Don Urquhart, who has been administering in that area for some time. I quote from that article as follows:

I am appalled at the continuing saga of violence, disease and despair . . . Alcohol abuse among Yalata Aborigines had reached endemic proportions. Nothing is sacred. Tribal elders have been known to be bashed by gangs of drunken, marauding Aboriginal youths looking for thrills. 'The fractured skulls, femurs, ulnas, tibias, pelvises, facial bones and stab wounds, chest injuries, etc., arrive monotonously on our hospital doorstep,' the doctor said.

Alcohol abuse has led to a marked decline in health. Venereal disease, diabetes, tuberculosis, skin disorders, trachoma, infections of all types and kidney and liver malfunctions are rampant. 'The community is physically destroying itself through the constant, unrelenting alcohol abuse,' the doctor said.

A disappointing thing which followed that was that our Minister of Health attacked that very person and asked what right he had to make those sorts of statement. Thankfully, the Government has not followed the Minister of Health's line and chosen to ignore it but has come out with the Bill that we are now debating.

In my opinion, the irony of the matter is that a former Labor Government decided to open the doors to alcohol for the Aborigines in earlier days. It was back in 1967 when the then Attorney-General, Mr Dunstan, pushed hard in seeking so-called 'equal rights'. I hope that we in this State are learning something by considering this amending Bill before us, namely, that to throw around the words 'equal rights' does not necessarily mean that it will be for the betterment of people. We need to keep in mind whether so-called 'equal rights' in this case and in other cases will have serious detrimental effects to the point where we must try to fix it up. I recognise that the local people are being given the opportunity, and I hope that it is not too late.

We have heard other speakers, in particular the member for Eyre, expressing concern that the problem may simply drift over to Ceduna or areas out of Yalata. If that is the case, it will be very disappointing for people living in those surrounding areas. I appreciate that only time will tell and that this is a step in the right direction.

I do not know whether it has been specifically addressed in the clauses of the Bill, but one should appreciate that the Lutheran Church of Australia has been conducting a spiritual ministry at Yalata for many years and is very concerned about the ongoing problems of the people in that area. I hope that the Minister will be able to give me an assurance in the debate that any prohibitions on alcohol use in the area will not extend into the area of communion wine. From earlier conversations with the Minister, I believe that that matter is in hand, although I would be pleased to hear his direct comment on that matter. I am pleased to see the Bill before us and hope that it is a reminder to all members in this State and perhaps throughout the Commonwealth

that, when we bandy around terms such as 'equal rights', we realise in future the consequences of such statements and that the implications are taken into account in the future much more than they have been in the past.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Community Welfare): I thank honourable members for their support of this measure. They have raised a number of fundamental issues with respect to this legislation, and we all agree that it is not possible to pass a law in this Parliament and then hope that a fundamental social issue such as alcohol amongst Aborigines will pass away quickly. I will try to answer some of the questions raised by honourable members and try to seek further information on questions that I cannot answer.

First, I advise honourable members that I have received a similar request from the Pitjantjatjara people for regulations to be brought down under their legislation to prohibit alcohol being brought in and consumed on the Pitjantjatjara lands. I hope that those regulations will be brought down in the House in the very near future. This legislation, whilst written as a result of circumstances at Yalata, is available to all Aboriginal communities residing on Aboriginal Lands Trust lands. Each of those communities must decide whether they want to take advantage of the legislative framework and the protections that follow from this legislation.

Honourable members have also referred to the necessity of local communities to take a decision in the first instance at the community level with respect to a request from the Aboriginal Lands Trust, and hence the Government, to invoke this legislation. That is, in my view, fundamental to the success or failure of this legislation.

The member for Mount Gambier asked whether I would say how this would work. There have been a number of meetings of Yalata people where they have taken this decision after long consultation with the police, who were present over a number of days, and community advisers, and obviously following discussions with doctors, health workers, and the like. Decisions of that nature will, I presume, be taken in the normal manner. That is how they take decisions in those communities on all other important issues.

Decision taking bodies have been established in each of those communities, and they involve general meetings of the community. The honourable member, as well as the member for Eyre raised (albeit in a threatening way) the matter of the problems that may follow the introduction of these measures within Aboriginal communities, particularly at Yalata. The honourable member referred to what he considers to be an undesirable situation at present at Ceduna with respect to the movement of Aborigines in the township of Ceduna and their attendance at local hotels. I do not think that this legislation will remove that problem. It is not designed to meet the situations that exist in townships such as Ceduna.

With respect to there being an expulsion of persons from those communities, I do not consider that that necessarily will be the end result. First, the application of the public intoxication legislation is not intended to treat alcoholics and problems arising out of over-consumption of alcohol in the criminal sphere but to relate more to problems in the health and health related spheres, that is, concerning the taking of those persons into care and of trying to provide some treatment programmes for them. I am told that only some 10 to 20 people in the Yalata community are regarded as being alcoholics and as being persons who cause trouble when they are intoxicated. It is not considered that this legislation will thrust those people into Ceduna.

I must take up the point raised by the member for Mitcham. He suggested that we should not have proceeded with the land rights legislation and that we should have given priority to health and health related proposals. I do not

think that those issues can be separated like that, or that the comments made by the honourable member reflected the real situation that exists. It has been shown by doctors and other workers that the health of people who have gone back to the lands either permanently or for substantial periods of time has improved. Undoubtedly, one of the reasons for that is that they had not been drinking large amounts of alcohol. Generally, there is no alcohol amongst the groups that have moved back on to the Maralinga lands.

It is my view (and I think that it is a view that is widely held) that the granting of land rights to these people is indeed a very stabilising factor in the advancement of that community and that it is the most constructive way in which that community can be assisted. They waited for nearly 30 years, as we all know, to go back to those traditional lands once again to assert their law and re-establish their kinship and some of the traditional way of life that they have left. I think that in that way we can best help those people, and that this will relieve some of the pressures that exist at Yalata. Those people who remain at Yalata (obviously some people will remain in that community) may find that their lives are a little easier.

Thirdly, the Commonwealth Government has indicated that it will provide substantial funding for treatment programmes and for facilities for treatment programmes to be undertaken for the Yalata people. Discussions are taking place between the Commonwealth and State Governments and other appropriate authorities to ascertain how those treatment programmes can be established—whether they take the form of an outstation on the Maralinga lands, on the Aboriginal Lands Trust lands, or nearer to Ceduna, or whether in one of the other towns some treatment centre can be provided, particularly for those persons who are perhaps hospitalised and who need some additional care after hospitalisation as a result of their acute alcoholism. So all those matters are being considered, and I think that that may allay the fears expressed by some honourable members with respect to this small group of people who, it is feared (I think unnecessarily so), may be thrust upon the predominantly European communities that live close to the Yalata community.

The member for Mount Gambier raised the matter of force in the application of this legislation, and that obviously is a matter of concern. In regard to the matter of policing within traditional Aboriginal communities (indeed, the Commissioner of Police is actively giving consideration to the establishment in South Australia of a police Aboriginal aid system similar to that which exists in the Northern Territory and in Western Australia), there are fundamental difficulties for members of an Aboriginal community who are asked to exercise police powers or akin powers amongst such a community, and it is a very difficult task. We must always be very sensitive about not placing members of Aboriginal communities in incredibly difficult situations while carrying out those tasks.

I am very confident that in their training members of the Police Force, the Aboriginal Health Organisation and other authorities will pay particular attention to this matter. I shall point out to honourable members the statutory protections that exist, and that may allay the fears that were raised. First, I refer to section 13 of the Public Intoxication Act, which refers to an immunity for persons acting pursuant to the legislation where those persons act in good faith in the exercise or purported exercise of those powers that are vested in them.

The safeguard there for a person who alleges to have been harmed in some way as a result of the exercise of those duties is that that person must show that those powers were not exercised in good faith. That is a common provision in legislation of this type. In those circumstances, once a person

is taken into care, there is another section in the Public Intoxication Act which creates an offence, and it carries substantial penalties—a penalty of up to \$2 000 or imprisonment for one year; that is, 'a person who has the oversight, care and control of a person attained pursuant to the Public Intoxication Act who ill treats or wilfully neglects that person shall be guilty of that offence'. There are those protections for both parties in the exercise of the powers provided by this legislation.

In regard to the question of accountability for the exercise of this power, I suggest that the community itself obviously will monitor the situation and that there will be considerable discussion within the community with respect to the application of this legislation and how it is operating. But, of course, the police will have the primary responsibility and will undoubtedly watch with considerable interest the application of this legislation. Of course, the many Government officers who are employed in that community and who have responsibilities with respect to it will take considerable interest in the progress of the legislation. It is novel and, of course, we want to see that it works to the best advantage of that community. I say that with respect to the accountability questions for the policing of confiscation and the destruction of alcohol that is brought on to the lands and seized.

Here, I would presume that the Police Department would bring down regulations or police orders that would deal with how this would occur, and of course that would be discussed in conjunction with the community. But, obviously I do not envisage liquor being seized and then stored somewhere. I think that would be most inappropriate in a remote community of that type.

Obviously, the liquor would be poured out on to the ground or taken off those lands, but probably and more appropriately it would be destroyed. Also, this legislation places a moral obligation on the licensees of licensed premises surrounding the Yalata community. I have spoken to the wife of one of the licensees and I am confident that they will accept the purport of this legislation and do what is within their powers not to supply liquor to persons who they know will take it on to Aboriginal lands. One can only hope that that will be the case and that a sense of moral obligation will be exercised by those licensees.

Mr Gunn: That doesn't prevent sly grog, of course.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: This is a remote community, and there are not a great many people who buy huge amounts of liquor, so it is obvious that one would have some idea of who was buying regular amounts of liquor. In that way I think that tabs can be kept on persons who may be transgressing this law: they will have to be dealt with in due course if that is the case. I understand that a number of licensed premises already restrict the sale of certain types of liquor. That is most appropriate. Obviously, the Licensing Court will take into account some of the recommendations that have been put before the Government in the Licensing Act review which commented on Aboriginal communities and liquor problems associated with them. In conjunction with the AHA and other groups we can develop a sense of responsibility in the provision of liquor to the community and indeed to Aborigines who want to purchase liquor from licensed premises off declared lands.

The member for Mitcham referred to a speech that he made some time ago in the House with respect to the position of American Indian communities (I think Inuit communities) in North America. I recently visited some of those communities, where I must say to the House that alcoholism and solvent abuse is also rife.

Mr Evans: And the Eskimos.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Yes, the Inuit communities in Canada as well. There has been some 450 years of

European civilisation in those countries, yet it has not been possible to remove the great social tragedy of alcohol and other personal abuses that bedevil Aboriginal communities throughout the world. So, I do not want to raise the hopes of this House that this legislation will bring about dramatic results, but I believe it is a responsible first step. I take that view because, first, it is requested by the communities themselves. I have confidence that they want to come to grips with this problem in their own way. Secondly, it provides a mechanism which is compatible, I believe, with what that community wants to do to overcome this problem. So, in those circumstances, I appreciate honourable members' support. Obviously this is a matter that will be kept under close review by the Government.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Application of the Public Intoxication Act, 1984, to the lands.'

Mr GUNN: I think that the Minister was a bit harsh in his comments in reply to the second reading debate. I was not in the Chamber, but I heard him on the speaker while I was collecting my papers for the next debate. He said that I had made certain comments in a threatening manner. I did not make any such comments whatsoever. I did what I believe was my obligation and responsibility—to clearly point out to the House what I perceived to be problems which could arise.

The Minister should know me well enough to realise that if I was going to threaten him I would do it clearly and precisely. I have tried to address this matter in a reasonable and responsible fashion because it is a problem as you would know, Mr Chairman, that we cannot run away from. We should look at it responsibly and with our heads clear. I and some of my colleagues could get up here and make the most hair raising accusations and tell stories which would attract great attention from the media if we wanted to, but that would not do any good whatsoever. It would not solve the problem. I was born in this area and spent most of my life with those people. I know the problems; I have an office in Ceduna. I have worked with those people, so I really do have some knowledge of the matter. I think that the Minister was being a bit rugged, because the point I made in relation to further legislation that may be necessary to give local communities an opportunity to control problems in some of the communities which may arise as a result of this legislation is, in my judgment, a quite proper course of action for a member representing an area to take in the Parliament.

I tell the Minister that in the past I have had legislation drawn up: it is all ready to bring in. I have refrained from doing so hoping that the problem would go away. If I wanted to I could bring it in and cause a stir. The politics of the situation are these: I would not lose a vote out of it; I would gain some votes. I could really stir the possum in this Chamber and in the public arena over these issues if I wanted to. I hope that on reflection the Minister realises he treated me a little harshly. Normally in these matters I have tried to be most reasonable. I would like the Minister to reflect on what he had to say about that matter.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The Minister gave reassurances about the means by which the authorised officer would exercise some discretion, but I would like to know from him whether this means that all action taken by authorised officers will now lie within the ambit of western legislation rather than under Aboriginal law. I remind the Minister that on at least one occasion there have been examples of ritual spearings of Aborigines who have flagrantly breached the requirements of Aboriginal reserves in taking alcohol on to those reserves. I assume, therefore, that this could

mean an end to the imposition of Aboriginal law in such cases.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTY: I thank the honourable member for his question. First, to allay the fears of the member for Eyre, I certainly do not mean to be rugged. Perhaps I am one of the least rugged members of this House, as the honourable member might know. What he said was that if I did not answer his question he would give me a rough time in the Committee stage. I presume that when he said he would give me a rough time he meant it. I took that as a mild threat, to say the least. I hope that I have answered the honourable member's questions with as much detail and information as I possibly could to allay his fears and those of his constituents. The member for Mount Gambier asked whether the passage of this legislation may destroy the Aboriginality or those traditional methods of dealing with discipline and the application of Aboriginal law in those communities.

I sincerely hope that a compromise can be reached in these circumstances. The Bill provides that there may be within the proclamation some consideration given to the imposition of limitations in the exercise of powers. I am not quite sure whether in the first instance this can be provided, but I hope (and there is power to vary it from time to time) that we can develop a code in the community of how to deal with these problems that are particularly relevant to that community. I do not think that that is an easy exercise, but I certainly hope that that could be evolved over a period. Whilst the traditional methods of law and order in Aboriginal communities may be unpalatable to us, obviously there is some value to that community in giving support to the traditional methods of maintaining peace and order and the application of that traditional way of life. We need to try to understand that, and we certainly do not want to destroy the option of that occurring by the passage of this legislation.

Mr MEIER: I directed this question to the Minister during the second reading debate, but I know that there were many other points he wished to answer in his response. As I said then, I think that this comes under clause 3. Since the Lutheran Church of Australia conducts a spiritual ministry at Yalata, I would like the Minister's assurance that communion wine would not be affected by any ban that the people there may institute in a prohibition on alcohol.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTY: I thank the honourable member. I am sorry that I overlooked that point. The honourable member raised that with me some time ago, and I specifically took up this matter with Parliamentary Counsel. I am advised that it is not intended that altar wine and the use of wine in church services be prohibited, although I understand that non-alcoholic wine is used in some church services (I think by the Uniting Church). I know that it certainly does not apply in the Catholic Church. I think that the wine supplied by the Jesuits at Seven Hills is particularly potent. However, there is provision here—

Mr Gunn: Are you a connoisseur?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTY: I have my sip from time to time, yes. It would be most inappropriate to stop that occurring, so provision is made for that to be exempted.

Mr GUNN: I am pleased with the Minister's earlier comments, because I think that he knows me well enough to know that I am a very reasonable fellow and would not like to delay proceedings or in any way rough him up. He is one of the more gentlemanly members and is perhaps a little more sophisticated than some of his colleagues in handing out other than bouquets. However, clause 3 (1) (b) refers to 'an authorised officer'.

I take it that an authorised officer other than a police officer could be a member of the Yalata council, because I would think that if this Bill is to be successful it would be

necessary to have some local members of the community appointed. Some people are, shall we say, quite imaginative in the methods they adopt to get around provisions to legally bring alcohol into areas. We could all tell many stories about our experiences of seeing people getting around various facets of the law. There is a lot of scrub there and I think that police officers would have some difficulty apprehending some of these people unless they had the co-operation of local residents. Therefore, I hope that the Minister will look at that suggestion. Obviously, the people concerned would need some training before they could be authorised, so I hope that the Minister's reply is favourable.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTY: Obviously, police officers will be authorised persons under the Act, and I understand that the community has already had some discussions about suitable persons from the elected body of the community exercising these powers as well. It may be that some other persons in the community may also be authorised persons, and that will obviously need to be taken in conjunction with the community itself at duly organised meetings. However, the Commissioner of Police has a task force that is reporting to him on Aboriginal and police relationships, and I believe that he is developing a very innovative and responsible plan of action with respect to the policing of remote communities in this State. That programme will certainly involve special training for Aborigines who accept additional responsibilities in communities, so I am very hopeful that that action can be seen in the very near future and that special assistance in training can be given in the development of those Aboriginal persons who accept special responsibilities pursuant to this legislation.

Mr GUNN: I am pleased with the comments that the Minister has made and I do not want to keep the House unduly in relation to this matter. The clause is quite wide, and it refers obviously to areas other than Yalata. My understanding is that it refers to all land under the control of the Aboriginal Lands Trust. I pose this question to the Minister: has he any other areas of the State in mind when he envisages a proclamation being made under this Bill? Obviously, the first area to be addressed is Yalata. I do not know whether consideration has been given to the land at Coober Pedy or other parts of the State under the control of the Aboriginal Lands Trust. I would be pleased to have that information.

I am pleased that the Commissioner of Police is looking at the problems of relations between the Police Force and indigenous Aboriginal communities; it has always appeared to me that it is often a waste of time arresting Aboriginal people and putting them in gaol, because in many cases there is no social stigma attached to that. I hope that the problems that exist can be solved in a satisfactory way. Finally, I am interested to know whether the Minister has any other parts of the State in mind in relation to proclaiming this Bill.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTY: No other community that lives on Aboriginal Lands Trust land has approached me to have this legislation applied to it, although I understand that a number of communities have shown particular interest in the legislation. Most certainly the people at Yalata have over a period—

Mr Gunn: It's already operating at Maralinga.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTY: I think that the honourable member was absent from the House when I said that the people will be bringing down regulations under the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Act with respect to alcohol on those lands, and following the proclamation of the Maralinga legislation obviously similar regulations will be brought down with respect to the Maralinga lands. However, I welcome any other Aboriginal community living on Aboriginal Lands Trust land, which believes that this legislation would help

it, to discuss further with the Government the application of its lands to this legislation.

Clause passed; title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SOIL CONSERVATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 13 September. Page 864.)

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I address myself first to a number of problems confronting the poorer people in South Australia, those for whom the Department for Community Welfare should be exercising great concern. As an introduction, I must confess that this morning I heard with some considerable surprise that the Minister of Community Welfare, who is in the House, was delivering an attack on the press and the media generally, especially on the television media, for contributing, as he said considerably, to family problems as they exist today. I could not help thinking that this was rather an unfair attack and that the Minister was making the media a scapegoat in an attempt to get both the Federal and State Governments off the hook. I say that because he was referring to the impact which television and other programmes have upon families in helping to destroy the family image that both children and parents have of themselves, and I cannot help thinking that this problem must have existed for several decades.

I recall long before television was available in Australia hearing such radio soft soapiers as the *Blue Hills* saga, which went on for more than 6 000 episodes, *Dr Paul*, *When a Girl Marries*, and subsequently we have had a range of radio serials which are heard daily, as well as television serials, which I would think are much more popular since the lady of the house can watch television while she is ironing or performing sundry chores. I have been able to watch one or two of those programmes and I cannot help thinking how mild and innocuous they are. They are nothing more than a form of escapism which did not do much to affect my mental or moral standard just through viewing them. They are everyday soapiers and I do not think there is very much harm in them. It is essentially escapism which is very much needed in contemporary life. I cannot help thinking that the Minister is attaching a great deal of importance to a relatively insignificant issue, when we look back two or three years ago, when those terrible children's books such as *Biggles* and Enid Blyton's *Noddy* books were banned from school and State children's libraries. What next!

I wonder whether the Minister will join with his Cabinet colleagues in attacking a much more important issue when the Bill which concerns the terrible impact of video pornography, X-rated movies, snuff films and others involving sexual and other brutalities comes before the House. Will he bear in mind the fear which he holds about the ordinary television programme and attack those much worse programmes, which have quite a serious impact on our lives, with considerably more vigour than he is currently attacking the normal everyday programmes on television? If he is going to be a man of his word and be consistent then I suggest we are in for some strong support on this side of the House from the Minister when that legislation comes before us. Meanwhile, the Minister seems to be defending the position of the Federal and State Governments.

I refer to a publication which the Minister released (I think with some reluctance, because it was supposed to have been handed out with the State Budget but I managed to obtain two copies very belatedly on the day of the Budget), which is entitled 'The Review of State Government Concessions'. Recommendation R1(a) states that a principal reason for concessions (State) is the inadequacy in the levels of pensions and benefits and as a result there is a need to ensure that the Commonwealth Government establish and maintain adequate levels of income support.

If that, from a member of the Minister's own Concession Review Committee, is not an absolute indictment of Federal Government policies and their failure to accommodate adequately the needs of our impoverished people in the community, I do not know what is. I believe that represents another attempt to pass the buck. It is almost part of a pattern procedure that is emanating from this State Government wherein the Federal Government is being blamed for ills affecting people in the community, and this morning, I believe the Minister has slapped the media in the face. We have also had attacks on education, which also comes in for its share of criticism when things are going badly and unemployment is running rife.

The real ills in our community which have not really been addressed by either the State or Federal Budgets this year are the problems affecting the beneficiaries of social security payments: age pensioners, widowed pensioners, invalid pensioners, the increasing number of unemployed in South Australia (we are now running at 9.8 per cent, which is .5 per cent above the figures of only three or four months ago), supporting parents who are in receipt of pensions, and so on. These are the people who are going backwards financially and in their living standards. They are not alone; they are joined by ordinary pensioners whose pensions are fixed. They are not receiving any annual increments, as many of our Public Service pensioners are.

Those on fixed pensions are particularly in dire straits, as are those people on the basic wage and a little above that, because they receive none of the benefits which accrue to those who are in receipt of a Commonwealth health card, they have to pay out for the Medicare payments, and they do not receive any of the additional benefits. That group of people in our society is in extremely impoverished circumstances. These are the people whom the State Government Concession Report ostensibly is aiming to help, and yet we find in one of the concluding sections of that report that, instead of helping the impoverished, the Government is looking at saving \$4.7 million from within the 19 recommendations—an increased cost of \$3.4 million with a net saving of \$1.3 million. That means that by reviewing pensioner and other concessions the Government is looking to save an additional \$1.3 million. It is not really aiming immediately to help any of those people to whom I have just referred to as being in desperate need.

One of the groups particularly in need of assistance is the single unemployed adult male, who rarely qualifies for any of the concessions that apply to most other people in those beneficiary groups. What is recommended is that, if and when those savings accrue to Government, the people whom I have named as already being in dire need of help and who have been in need of help for several years, not just this year, will then receive additional Government subsidies. In releasing this report, the Government said that it has taken a year to compile and publish and it is now going out for further public comment, in other words, the politics of delay.

In addition to that, a couple of the recommendations, one of which was going to save about \$2 million, will not be implemented in any case. So, the chances of any saving emerging from this lengthy and fairly expensive report are,

I would say, absolutely nil. In other words, it is a sheer waste of time, a sop to the public and one which will achieve very little unless some firm and positive steps are taken by the Government.

There is another proviso contained within this report and that is that \$100 million might possibly accrue to the Government, provided that two approaches to the Federal Government are not only made but are successful. The first approach is to the Federal Government for a massive subsidy for the existing State subsidies to Housing Trust rental beneficiaries, where about 60-odd per cent of Housing Trust occupants currently receive some form of rental subsidy. The State Government says in this report that it could save \$77.6 million, provided the Federal Government came to the party and paid the South Australian Housing Trust that money each year.

The report states that another \$25 million could be saved by way of recommendation 17, with a submission to the Commonwealth on Housing Trust rent rebates. So, if we have the income support of \$77.6 million and the Housing Trust income support of \$25 million, things in the garden would be extremely rosy. Well, of course, they would, but is that not rather wishful thinking on the part of this Government Concession Review Committee? Do members of the House really believe that the Federal Government will put South Australia's way another \$100 million odd, in addition to the other budgetary assistances which are being paid as a matter of normal course?

That is one more case of pipe dreaming. What this report really means is that we have spent a year compiling it and we will spend some considerable months ahead in putting it once again to the public to see what it thinks and then, after these delay tactics, very little will have been done to help the people in the community who desperately need assistance. In the report, the initial recommendation R1(a), combined with the Minister's and the Government's attempt to pass the blame for being unable to look after our poor and needy, are firm positive indictments of State and Federal Government failure to look after the impoverished in our community.

I refer to one initiative which has been taken by the Federal Government and that is the Community Employment Programme. Tens of millions of dollars have been put out to help people who are unemployed. I did hear that the Minister responsible for unemployment in South Australia (Hon. J.D. Wright) had been overheard to say that the South Australian Government was in trouble to expend all of the money it was being allocated on CEP programmes. By 'expend money', I mean on the target group in South Australia; the very large proportion of our unemployed who are desperately in need of retraining and education before they can even begin to compete for anything other than unskilled, manual jobs which were already disappearing from the scene as long ago as 1974-75 when automation began to take firm sway and employers realised that it was cheaper to employ machinery than to keep on employing people with the associated costs, the on costs of workmer's compensation, long service leave, sickness leave and all of the other overheads which very often amount to 50 per cent and over of a normal wage.

So, for seven or eight years we have had the problem of this chronically unemployed group being in desperate need of retraining. Under the former Liberal Government in South Australia, programmes such as those being currently tackled by the Community Employment Programme were reduced considerably in favour of retraining programmes and money was diverted to work skill programmes, job training programmes, and school to work transition programmes which were designed to equip young and older

unskilled, undereducated people to get the work that was available.

Of course we trained some several hundred young and older people in welding techniques, so that they could take advantage of the work that was available on the petrochemical liquids transportation programme, the gas transportation programme, from the gas fields in the North of the State down to Stony Point: a successful programme which is even now beginning to repay the State by way of royalties. That is a way of training people, employing them and using the money towards the State's future productivity—the well-being of South Australia. That is the sort of positive programme that I would like to see in hand.

I find that young people and others in my electorate are approaching me in concern because we have an aquatic centre, currently scheduled for commencement, which will cost \$2.5 million to \$3 million on completion, almost \$2 million of which is available from Community Employment Programme funds and which was ostensibly to utilise the services of unemployed people in our local community. What do I find? We were shopping around at local level for skilled tradesmen, most of whose efforts are already taken up by building programmes in the South-East. We were also looking to Western Victoria and the Western Victorian trade unions likewise were seeking immediate employment on that project several months ago because of the situation which existed at the Portland Comalco construction programme. Work had been stopped there and they were desperate to get union employees into South Australia.

That programme in Western Victoria has been revitalised, and we now find there is an absolute dearth of skilled tradesmen around for the Mount Gambier Aquatic Centre to commence. Yet, in Mount Gambier last night, Monday night, a meeting in East Gambier was held by the unemployed young people, desperate for programmes to get them off the streets, to get them active, interested and earning, when this \$2 million or \$3 million is waiting not for the chronically unemployed to get work but for skilled tradesmen.

If that is what Community Employment Programmes really mean, I am surprised that the Commonwealth Government appears to have completely missed, once again, the true target area: the really grossly underprivileged and neglected young people in our community who are simply desperate to get some work of any kind. The real problems in our community are not from the ladies and the young people who sit and watch television programmes or listen to the radio—that is an utter nonsense from the Minister of Community Welfare. He knows full well, as we all do, that the issues besetting South Australia, worse than any other mainland State, are those of the chronically unemployed and the very high proportion of social security welfare beneficiaries who live in South Australia—a greater proportion than in any other mainland State. It is this group that we have to worry about, and not the people who are producing television programmes. These poor unfortunates are unemployed, unskilled, undereducated and a major part of our unemployment group.

For the rest of the people living at or below the poverty level there is an acute loss of self-esteem. They are under intense pressure from their peers and from their families. They very often isolate themselves from the general community because they do not have the money to join in ordinary recreational activities: a glass of beer, a game of bowls, or whatever. They are unable to cope and, as a result, their idle hours are filled with depression.

If members think that that is an exaggeration, I remind them that week in and week out in my electorate office over the past eight to 10 months or so we have had an

increasing number of people of all types in the underprivileged group who come in looking for counselling, advice, reassurance and help. I am sure that other members must be similarly faced with requests for assistance and for a friendly sympathetic ear which often they have been unable to get from the beleaguered people working on the front benches of Social Security and Department of Community Welfare offices. They are under great pressure, as I well know from personal day to day experience.

A great deal of my time is taken up not in Parliamentary activities of legislation (for which ostensibly we are here) but by way of being the local counsellor, local ombudsman and a person who is trying to restore some sense of well-being and esteem to the unfortunates in the community. That is increasingly what members of Parliament in socio-economically underprivileged areas are being asked to do. I do not object to doing it, as it is part and parcel of being a responsible human being. It does concern me, however, that the people who should be addressing these problems—those in the Cabinets of Governments—are not hitting the target areas. It makes one weep inside to realise that so many people are suffering in what is surely one of the most affluent countries to be found anywhere in the world. It is one of the most marvellous countries that one could hope to find anywhere. If we have problems like that in our wonderful land of Australia, what sort of problems are people experiencing in the Third World and very underprivileged countries?

I wonder also whether the Federal Government is helping South Australia in tackling this overall problem which confronts the Minister of Community Welfare on a day to day basis when it initiates the means test programme. We have our own review of State Government concessions, which is looking to means test the pensioners who are in receipt of really meagre concessions compared to what the Federal Government pays out. At the same time the Federal Government is initiating a means test on full pension recipients, which must surely be frightening. I wonder whether the Federal Government is really sincere when I realise that it is hoping to recoup some \$45 million from pensioners across Australia in the first year of operation of the means test, when it will cost, on the admission of the Federal Minister for Social Security, some \$30 million to implement. In other words, we are looking at scaring the life out of all Australian pensioners to save a paltry \$15 million in the first year.

The Minister himself, in a *Sixty Minutes* programme recently, was given direct evidence of fraud within his Department of Social Security—fraud which was costing that Department some \$310 million a year. Whilst the Minister is pushing to establish the means test on all Australian pensioners he has at the same time refrained from initiating any action to recoup the \$310 million a year which the *Sixty Minutes* people pointed out to him that it was costing the Government and which could easily be tackled with much more profitable results than threatening our elderly and aged people.

Those people have been working all their lives and contributing through income tax payments and their daily work, as well as through a whole range of direct and indirect taxes, to the Federal and State coffers, only to find that when they reach retirement age they are knocked over the head with this threat—a threat which the much maligned former Prime Minister, Mr Fraser, firmly refused to impose on our aged. For that alone, Mr Fraser should be well and truly respected. He did not want to attack the aged and infirm in our community with any threat at a time when they should be looking forward to a quiet and peaceful retirement.

I mention the young people who are striving to find something to do. About 28 per cent of all unemployed in

South Australia are under 25 years of age—a massive proportion of young people looking for assistance. However, a crisis is also facing middle aged unemployed Australians. These people have special problems. Many of them in my electorate have found themselves out of work, many voluntarily retiring early on the Government encouraged early retirement programme only to find that, while the State is encouraging them to retire, the Federal Government still has not a 55 years retirement pension but a 65 years retirement pension for adult males and a 60 years retirement pension for females.

So, these people who voluntarily retire and receive a nominal financial handshake from the Government then find that they have to front up on a week by week basis to register for unemployment and to look for work which they and everyone else well know is not available for the elderly adult male or female. So, by co-operating with the Government, these people place themselves in the invidious and humiliating situation of having to front up on a week by week basis for work which they know is not there at a time when they think that they help the Government by retiring early and voluntarily.

I have had to intercede on a number of occasions to save these people the embarrassment of weekly confrontations with members of the Commonwealth Employment Service to get them some sort of concessions such as having to front up only every two or three months. Even that was against the basic principles underlying the Federal legislation, which provides that everyone has to present regularly and show that they have been looking for work. What a ridiculous situation when we know that we have almost 10 per cent unemployed and that these people still have to front up when there is no work for hundreds of thousands of South Australians. It is a nonsensical situation which needs some redress.

I wonder whether the State Government, the Premier and the Minister have made strong representations to the Federal Government to allay that situation. I know that when I was Minister of Education, confronted with a similar problem in the school to work transition programme, we did manage to get Federal Government payments for unemployment benefits to young people who went back into special retraining programmes, whereas previously the Federal Government had said that we either paid for the education or paid the unemployment benefits, but not both. We refused to accept these Commonwealth benefits until there had been a compromise and those young people were literally bribed off the streets back into an education programme by giving them some income reassurance. I do not think that that situation still pertains because the Federal Government has gone off on another completely different tangent, which I would say was working with only a very limited degree of success.

So, here we have middle aged unemployed Australians facing special problems. They are out of work and still have to face responsibilities which include the raising of children, educating them and paying into mortgages that they had entered into years before. We have had crisis situations in the mortgage belt around the periphery of Adelaide where young, and not even middle aged, people were paying off mortgages and were thrown off onto the unemployment scrapheap. These problems still exist, and I find it very strange that we are receiving constant reassurances from the Federal and State Governments that we have never had it so good and that the economy is picking up yet we have this increasing pool of people in Australia who are part of an absolutely unnecessarily and certainly undesirably divided community. Australia is no longer the united force that it used to be. The accord applies only to those people in employment, and I assure the Government that there is

acute discord which will approach almost riot proportions in the community amongst these people who are unemployed—chronically unemployed—and who are looking to the State and Federal Governments desperately for some assurance that work or other assistance will soon be around the corner.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I want to speak tonight on a subject that I believe to be of public importance. In fact, I think it is of such public importance that it should be dealt with by way of an urgency motion. I refer to a time bomb that is slowly ticking away in the South Australian Health Commission in regard to the costs of running our public hospitals, the drastic cut-backs in the provision of health care, the dollar cuts in real terms in individual public hospitals (examples of both of which I will give later), and the use of phoney figures by the Government to justify those cuts. The bottom line with the alarming cuts is the provision of health care in our public hospitals under the Labor Government. In an issue of the *News* in June this year, the Minister of Health went on the defensive, saying that there was no sign of any crisis. The article stated:

South Australian hospitals were not facing impending crisis or doom the Health Minister, Dr Cornwall, said today. 'People on hospital waiting lists were not dying.'

Of course they are not dying, but they have to wait and wait, and the lists are getting longer and longer. The article further quoted Dr Cornwall as saying:

Since I became Health Minister, we have provided an extra \$8 million for Royal Adelaide, Flinders, Queen Elizabeth, Adelaide Children's and Queen Victoria Hospitals.

I shall refer again to that point later. I particularly want honourable members to note the comments made by the Minister of Health about providing extra money to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I intend to deny the validity of that statement. The time has come for members opposite to look behind these defensive and intimidating outbursts and posturing of the Minister of Health and to analyse exactly what is going on in the South Australian Health Commission. Naturally, the Minister and the Premier want us to believe that everything in the garden is rosy. The reality is that there is a crisis on our hands, and honourable members in this place should address themselves to that and not rely on figures given to us by the Minister.

Mr Groom: Tell us what Fraser did to public subsidy of the Health Commission.

Mr OSWALD: The honourable member should listen to these facts and figures, because they have not been exposed to this Assembly before. I believe that honourable members should pay close attention to them, because there is a lesson to be learnt. We will have to take action in this Chamber to change the direction of the State Government. An article headed 'Two-year wait for surgery at hospitals' in the *News* of 20 June states:

Non-urgent surgery is being delayed for up to two years at Adelaide's major public hospitals. The delays are worrying the State Branch of the Australian Medical Association.

Hospitals affected are Queen Elizabeth, Royal Adelaide and Flinders Medical. QEH has the worst waiting periods, with delays of up to two years for cosmetic surgery. The waiting time for non-urgent plastic and orthopaedic surgery at Flinders and the RAH is about six months.

Delays for plastic surgery at QEH are up to 12 months and for orthopaedic surgery up to six months. Spokesmen at all three hospitals blamed increasing demands for services and limited resources. The RAH Medical Staff Society blames Medicare for diverting people, previously private patients, into public hospitals. But a hospital spokesman said there was no evidence to support the claim.

Therein lies the flaw and the deception, if one likes, of the Government's argument, namely, the use of phoney figures to which I intend to refer at great length. The article continues as follows:

Efforts were being made to reschedule operating times so plastic and orthopaedic surgeons could clear their backlog. Flinders administrator said the centre's bed shortage was chronic. 'We haven't got enough beds to cope with the demand; it's as simple as that,' he said. 'We just can't get electives (elective surgery) in any more—we haven't for the past couple of years. Our elective just keeps on dropping because of the emergency load.'

Queen Elizabeth Hospital medical superintendent, Dr H. Kneebone, said there had always been a significant delay for plastic surgery. But three months was not unreasonable for orthopaedic surgery.

AMA State president, Dr R. Southwood, described the lengthy waiting times as 'a bit poor'. 'The only way they can be overcome is for the Government to provide more facilities and more staff,' he said.

At Modbury, the acting administrator said there were delays of only two weeks for normal surgical procedures, but sometimes delays of up to three months for complex surgery. Queen Victoria Hospital's administrator said the hospital had no waiting lists 'to speak of'.

Of course, one would not expect there to be a waiting list in relation to a maternity hospital. Members can appreciate that the position in other hospitals is reaching crisis point. At the moment a big shift from private treatment to public hospital treatment is occurring, and this has been encouraged by the Federal Government's introduction of the Medicare scheme some seven months ago. Some figures were quoted in an article published in the *Advertiser* of 13 August, and I think this is quite interesting. The article states:

There is no clear picture yet, but South Australia's private hospitals admit they are functioning in 'a state of uncertainty' with fluctuating patient numbers, occupancy rates and income.

South Australian figures compiled by the Australian Hospitals' Association show the number of patients seeking public treatment in public hospitals has increased by about 15 per cent at the expense of private treatment.

The shift has been accompanied by a decline of about 12 per cent in membership of South Australia's biggest private hospital fund, Mutual Health-NHSA.

The Minister and the Premier are always quick to cast doubt on the figure of 15 per cent, and even attempt to deny it by saying that the current services are handling the workload and that a 15 per cent shift to private hospitals due to Medicare has not occurred. My retort to that is to ask members of the House to look at the ever increasing waiting lists that are now starting to appear in our public hospitals. They can then decide for themselves whether they think that the Minister is bending the truth with phoney figures. Honourable members will find that waiting lists are expanding all the time. I put it to the House that the Minister is using phoney figures to attempt to establish that surgical clinics and consultants in our public hospitals are under-utilised and that they should stop their complaints and get on with their work.

To prove my point, I refer to some specific details in the Budget. As my earlier reference to press releases related to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, I shall continue to cite the Queen Elizabeth Hospital in my examples of what has occurred. This is important to the state of crisis that is prevalent in the Health Commission at the moment. The Queen Elizabeth Hospital has had its 1984-85 budget cut by 5 per cent in dollar real terms. There is a 4 per cent increase in its 1984-85 budget compared with 1984 dollars, but, when viewed in the light of inflation, which at the moment is running at about 6 per cent or 7 per cent, in real terms there has been a net cut in the hospital's budget this year of some 2.5 per cent. In real dollar terms this year the Queen Elizabeth Hospital will receive 2.5 per cent less than it received in its budget last year.

However, the real cut is in fact more than that. One must add to that 2.5 per cent two other factors: first (and one must have some local knowledge of the hospital in this regard), one must add on the increases in nursing costs which occurred part way through the year and which are being carried forward into the following year; secondly (and

I would think this would be of interest to honourable members, particularly those representing the western suburbs), the hospital was fined \$620 000 by the South Australian Health Commission because it had an overrun in the 1983-84 budget of \$1.562 million.

Can honourable members imagine a hospital being fined \$600 000 by the Health Commission because it had an overrun in its budget? It will make it extraordinarily difficult, and that is why the crisis exists. When one adds the two factors together, from the initial 2½ per cent reduction in real dollar terms in the budget for the 1984-85 financial year, adding to that the adjustment for staff plus the \$620 000 that the hospital has been fined for the over-run in its budget, one suddenly finds that the Queen Elizabeth Hospital this year is experiencing a reduction, a real term dollar loss in its budget, of 5 per cent. The hospital should not have to contend with that: it is close to breaking point. Patient care is now beginning to suffer. This is a fact of life, whether honourable members want to chat on or listen to me.

The matter is serious and cannot be covered up any longer by the Health Minister, either here or in the other place. The Minister says that there is no problem and to avoid embarrassment to himself he maintains this line. He has a state of crisis on his hands: he is sitting on a time bomb with a slow burning fuse. If the Minister or any members of this House want to doubt my word, I suggest they talk to the medical staff at all levels of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. It is the staff who admit to the crisis and to the dangerous medical situations to which patients are being exposed: it is the staff who admit that patient care is beginning to suffer.

They are not my words; they are the words of hospital staff calling out for help at a time of a 5 per cent decrease in their budget in real terms and at a time when there is a 5 per cent increase in workload from the 15 per cent of potential patients that have left the private health funds and moved into the public sector. This 15 per cent, which represents, as I said, the swing from the private sector across into the public health funds, is an interesting figure, representing those former private patients who have now become public patients seeking public cover under Medicare.

Despite the expectations of the 15 per cent of patients who live in the catchment area of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, the doors of that hospital, or of any hospital such as the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, are not open to them. They say the doors are open to them; the Government says they are open; Dr Blewett says they are open. But I put to this House that those doors are not open to them. These people have no option but to join the ever expanding waiting lists, because, as in regard to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, the Health Commission has put a freeze on staff levels and has imposed a 5 per cent cut in its budget over the past year.

These figures can be verified. Clearly, in the light of Medicare the Health Commission should be expanding the Queen Elizabeth Hospital to meet the demands guaranteed to the public by Dr Blewett at the Federal level. If the Government or the Health Commission are not going to do this, they should turn around and stop encouraging private patients to drop their private cover and enter the Medicare fund. If there is any doubt in members' minds about the Minister's intentions regarding the freezing of staff levels in public hospitals—and at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital in particular—when there is an anticipated 15 per cent increase in the number of patients hoping to use the public hospital system, let me draw the attention of the House to a directive by the Health Commission to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. This directive, from the Health Commission to the administration of the hospital, reads:

It is therefore necessary to advise that you are required to implement the following policies which have been determined by the South Australian Health Commission:

It lists six directives, one of which is quite topical:

That a study be undertaken to determine the appropriate levels and qualification mix of nursing staff at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and, pending that study, that there be no increase in the total number of nursing staff currently employed for the present range of services. Further, the current mix of qualified to unqualified nursing staff must not be varied to incur additional expenditure.

That is the directive from the Commission to the hospital—a freeze on staff and services at a time when the hospital is standing by (or should be) to gear up for a 15 per cent movement of patients from the private health funds to the public sector.

The Federal Government, as I said, is telling the public in the catchment area of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital that they should join Medicare, there is no need for private health insurance and that they are better off using the public sector. After all, they all pay their 1 per cent from their salaries; why not try to reap the benefit of this privilege? But, let us look at what the Government has done to the hospital. First, in response to this cost cutting exercise, the Government has cut last year's budget by 5 per cent in real 1984 dollar terms; secondly, it has imposed a freeze on staff increases; and, thirdly, at a time when there is a potential for 15 per cent more patients to knock at the door expecting admission, the Government is considering a bed cutting exercise.

I would like to enlighten honourable members about this bed cutting exercise upon which the Queen Elizabeth Hospital is engaged. Let me explain. The Queen Elizabeth Hospital has 652 beds. It is normal for hospitals to attempt to keep 15 per cent of beds vacant—they call it the safe limit to cover emergency admissions. It is a normal practice, not worth debating. It means that 571 beds are occupied. The Health Commission wants to reduce the number of beds in the Queen Elizabeth Hospital to 500. Taking out the 15 per cent safe limit for emergency services, this leaves some 425 beds to be occupied, effectively reducing the capacity of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital by 146 beds. Honourable members can check my mathematics. So the hospital is planning for 146 patients to be put onto the street or, alternatively—

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: I take the explanation from the honourable member opposite. Alternatively, if those people are not to be put out onto the street, let us analyse where they are to be put. I suggest that the only place for them to go is to other public hospitals which will be in the same plight as the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Those people will go on the waiting list.

Mr Hamilton: Piffle!

Mr OSWALD: It is not piffle. If the honourable member analyses the figures, he will find that it is not piffle. It is the reason why the waiting lists are getting longer and longer. If the honourable member does not believe me, I suggest that he talk to the administration and medical staff 30 the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, with which he would be most familiar.

Mr Groom: Tell us about the Fraser cuts.

Mr OSWALD: The important point is that one cannot assume that those 146 patients will go to a private hospital. In regard to the interjection, I think that should sink home. Most of these people will end up on the waiting lists, and that is where the Government is hiding its problems. This is the tragedy behind the whole of Labor's Medicare socialisation programme for the hospitals. Honourable members may be interested to know what is happening over the border.

The waiting time for a hip replacement in Victoria has stretched from two to four years, because waiting lists in public hospitals are getting longer and longer. I submit that, if one was waiting for a hip replacement, one would consider that to be urgent surgery. That is an unacceptable wait under the standards to which we have become accustomed in South Australia.

I now return to the question of the Minister's being fed phony figures to give a false picture of the under utilisation of hospital clinics and wards. First, there is the question of the operating theatre utilisation rates at the Royal Adelaide Hospital which I think is worth mentioning. These figures seem to justify a slight reduction in surgical services, whereas the truth is that there is under utilisation caused by a reluctance on the part of the hospital to, first, pay nursing staff overtime—that is, they cannot exceed the curfew hours which apply to daily operations. Hours between which operations will take place have been set. Outside curfew hours, operations other than normal routine surgery are not scheduled.

Secondly, there is a practice whereby operations are not commenced if they cannot be completed by the end of the curfew hour and, thirdly, there is a lack of efficiency in the process of the administration of the hospital in calling patients on the waiting list to fill up the gaps towards the end of the curfew hours. The net result is a reduction in the numbers of services performed, a fall off in the excellence of patient care and the creation of apparent under-utilisation of the theatres to the extent that the Minister's argument is supported. There is also a fudging of the use of figures showing the initial admissions at the acute stages of life-threatening illnesses and injuries.

The misleading figures syndrome comes in because only those patients discharged from that service or clinic are recorded. Let me explain. A patient is admitted, in the majority of cases, into acute care. After admission he will become stabilised and will be moved into another ward or clinic. The original acute specialty records show only those who have been discharged, and hence the service appears on paper to have had only a small work load. Let me reduce this to figures to make it easier to understand. A clinic might admit 4 000 patients in a year, some 3 000 are initially treated, stabilised and moved to another clinic and only 1 000 are left and subsequently discharged; the figures would show only 1 000 for that clinic. As a result of these figures, the Premier, the Minister and the Health Commission claim that the hospitals have sufficient staff to cover the operations performed, and herein lies the falsehood to the claim.

I put it to honourable members (and this is probably the first time that it has been put to honourable members in this Chamber) that by the use of phony figures the Government has been able to say to the medical staff, 'You have got the staff and resources to cope with the work load. Get on with doing the job for which you are being paid'; in other words, 'Stop complaining. You have nothing to complain about.' Surely honourable members can now see that the Health Commission is suppressing the amount of work done by using figures that on the surface make it seem as though the hospitals are not working at their full capacity, when in actual fact that is not really the case.

The truth is that the hospitals are working at full capacity, but the figures used play down the individual work loads and provide justification for freezing staff levels and services. I quoted earlier the directive to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital from the Health Commission. As a further illustration, half the emergency work is being done by consultants and salaried medical staff. It is not charged for and does not show up in hospital figures. Hospital administrators know that this work goes on but they have no idea of the figures. They know that a substantial amount of unpaid work is being

undertaken by visiting specialists, but they do not have the records to show the actual numbers. I pose a question to honourable members: what would happen if the visiting specialists decided to stop visiting? I can assure the House that medical staff are sick and tired of being told by the Premier, the Minister and the Health Commission that figures indicate that they are being under-utilised. The figures are phony and give a misleading picture.

Let me return to my opening remarks. First, real cuts in dollar terms are being made in hospital budgets, particularly in the budget for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital in 1984-85. The figures I quoted earlier prove this point. Secondly, the Government is using figures supplied by the Health Commission to attempt to prove the point that hospital staff and services are being under-utilised. The figures are phony and the growing waiting lists only prove my point beyond doubt. One could argue until the cows come home, but the waiting lists prove my point beyond doubt.

Since Medicare was introduced, at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital the waiting time for prostate operations has increased from three months to nine months, and that is a fact of life: the waiting lists are getting longer. Patients who are in their 50s and who are waiting for a prostate operation know that it is an urgent operation and one which should not be put off for three months or nine months—within a year the wait may be 18 months. I could go through examples galore of how the waiting lists will expand because of the attitude of the Government now that Medicare is in operation.

There is only one respiratory physician at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. If this consultant goes on leave or is sick, there is no-one to replace him. There is an 18-month wait for a cataract operation, which one might say is not a vital operation. However, if one is elderly and has lost 90 per cent vision, one will not be impressed to be told that in a few months the wait will increase to perhaps two years because of the impact of Medicare. I think that there are still only two ophthalmologists at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, which is a total disaster. Let me remind the House that, first, there is an estimated 15 per cent increase in the number of public patients who have now come across into the public sector. Secondly, the public hospitals cannot take those people without an increase in staff and facilities, and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital is the example which I think can prove this point.

Thirdly, there is a 5 per cent real growth in the number of patients entering the Queen Elizabeth Hospital at a time when there is a 5 per cent real cut in dollars awarded to that hospital. The hospital is receiving less money this year to handle an anticipated greater number of patients walking through the door. Already 5 per cent more patients are walking through the door, and the difference between the 5 per cent and the 15 per cent is reflected in the increased waiting lists, to which this Government and the Health Commission are turning a blind eye, saying that there is no problem. They continue to ignore the waiting lists.

Those who cannot get into the hospitals are destined to join these waiting lists. I can only repeat (and I will continue to repeat) until there is a change in Government that, until we come to grips with this problem and until there is a change of attitude on the part of the Government, these waiting lists will continue to grow, because of directives, dated this month, to freeze hospital staff numbers. Yet the hospitals and surgeons are told to keep taking in people. Fourthly, the Government is using these phony figures to try to convince staff that they are under-utilised. That is an appalling indictment, when these people are working totally flat to the boards. In the *Advertiser* of 22 October 1982, when the present Government was in Opposition, the then Opposition spokesman on health said that he would restore

the excellence of patient care. I do not have time to refer to that article in detail, but unwittingly or otherwise, in his desire to socialise medicine, which is the ultimate aim, the Minister lit the long fuse of a time bomb. That is exactly what exists in the Health Commission—there is a time bomb that threatens to blow apart once and for all the excellence of patient care about which the Minister talks.

I am disturbed that members opposite think it is a joke. The member for Hartley thinks it is a joke and other members have been laughing at these inferences. These are not my accusations: they are facts put to me by medical staff at the hospital. I am not making up anything for political gain: I am stating to the House what is happening at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital at the moment, so that honourable members can make their own judgments and members of the Government can go to the Minister in Caucus, put these problems to the Minister and say to him, 'We have a problem. We will have to do something about it.' If they do not do something about it, the disaster will explode.

As Medicare is expanded and as people go from the private funds into the public sector, thinking that they will receive the same sort of care with which they have been familiar, they will get a rude shock because, unless we expand the facilities so that cases are accepted into the public hospitals and so that this drift is picked up, we will not be able to offer any sort of excellence in patient care. We need some new ideas, new policies, new initiatives or a new Minister.

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

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I am pleased to have this opportunity to take part in the annual Budget debate. Unlike back-bench members of the Government, members on this side have participated because they have a number of matters to bring to the attention of the House. It is unfortunate that Government members are unable to contribute to this debate. I sympathise with their difficulty because it would be hard for them to justify support for the Budget in view of the number of charges and fees increased by the Government in the past 12 months.

Mr Becker: How many?

Mr GUNN: Well in excess of 130.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: It's 138.

Mr GUNN: Yes, 138. Each week I sit on the Subordinate Legislation Committee and I am amazed to see the amount of work put before that Committee and the charges which are increased weekly—not by a few dollars but by a considerable amount. I read through the Premier's Financial Statement and the accompanying reports with some interest in an attempt to see what initiatives had been put forward to assist people in isolated communities. I was most disappointed to see that there were relatively few. There is no money to increase water schemes, no reduction in electricity charges in isolated communities, and we have yet to see what will happen in relation to funding for rural arterial roads. Those issues are of great importance to people living in isolated communities. Unfortunately, it appears that little or no money was available for these people.

The only contribution from the Government back bench came from the member for Peake, who ranted and raved for 30 minutes. He did not really make a contribution or put forward any constructive ideas as to why the Government was attempting to plunder the pockets of taxpayers, much of it on a weekly basis. I was disappointed to read through the Budget document. I also read the report we received last week dealing with State Government concessions. At page 7 the Premier refers to reducing the blood alcohol content for probationary drivers to 0.5 per cent, and to the

decision to reduce the speed limit on the open road from 110 to 100 km/h. That is not only a retrograde step which will not have a great effect on road safety, but it will also cause a great deal of annoyance to people living in isolated communities.

No evidence has been put forward to justify this decision in relation to road safety. Fortunately, the road toll is down this year. I wonder how members of the Government would like it if they had to drive from somewhere like Ceduna or Penong at 100 km/h. The Government should face reality in relation to this matter and realise that drivers will not do that. All that will happen is that many more people will receive these damn silly on-the-spot fines, which are far too costly. The amount that people are being slugged is excessive.

I recall the Minister of Local Government when in Opposition taking up a great deal of the time of the House complaining most bitterly about on-the-spot fines. However, when he came to office he had the gall to put before the Government a proposal to double on-the-spot fines. If the proposal to decrease the speed limit ever comes to fruition, it will result in hundreds more people receiving on-the-spot fines. It is all very well for members who do not represent country districts where people have to drive long distances. I wonder how many people have driven their motor cars from Adelaide to Mount Gambier or from Adelaide to Port Augusta and have religiously sat on 110 km/h—very few I would say.

The roads and motor cars are better, but we have been asked to go more slowly. It is absolute nonsense; it is a clear example of politicians who have not enough to think about or any new ideas trying to justify their continued existence by dreaming up schemes in the name of road safety because they think that the public will support them. It is clearly an emotive argument that cannot be justified. Not only am I most annoyed but also I have had a lot of complaints from my constituents. It is blatant discrimination. I sincerely hope that my colleagues in another place take appropriate action with this foolish proposal.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: Did you hear what happened in the trucking inquiry?

Mr GUNN: No.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: They have recommended lifting the truck speeds to 100 km/h.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to direct his comments to the Chair.

Mr GUNN: I am very pleased to direct my comments to you, Sir, and I thank my colleague for bringing that to my attention. Unlike most members in this House, I have had some experience of driving trucks. On a regular basis, as I am driving backwards and forwards to Eyre Peninsula, I see these modern trucks, and they are capable of doing very high speeds. For people in these isolated communities to have to sit all day on 100 km/h is absolute nonsense. I sincerely hope that the Government will have a second look at this proposal.

The one good thing if this proposal comes in is that the Labor Party will lose a lot of votes; the people are very annoyed about it because they cannot understand why any group of people can be so foolish or shortsighted when there is no evidence and no demand. It will be interesting to see what the police say about it because I do not believe that they will want it, either. It will merely mean that they will have to issue a lot more tickets when they have amphotometers or radar traps in the country.

Having dealt with that matter, I was perturbed to read in this report that we received late last week, dealing with State Government concessions, a recommendation dealing with motor vehicle concessions. The first reads:

There be legislative change so that the primary producer concessional rebate is granted only where primary production is the

principal occupation of the vehicle owner, estimated saving being \$200 000 per annum.

That is obviously aimed at hobby farmers; so that will be the end of them. The second recommendation, on page 76, is:

Primary producer concessions on utilities and other light commercial vehicles of less than 2 tonne unladen mass be disallowed, saving approximate \$1 million per annum.

If I understand it correctly, that means that all 4 x 4s, Suzukis, Toyotas, Datsuns, Mazdas and all those other commercial vehicles that people use on their properties will not qualify for a primary producer concession. In essence, it will mean that a lot of people will say, unfortunately, 'I will take a chance because I go across the road only on an very infrequent basis and I will not bother to register the vehicle.' That would be a very bad result. I really cannot understand it because most of those vehicles spend 50 per cent to 60 per cent of their time not on the roads but driving around their properties. It is unfortunate, and I hope that the Government does not proceed with that proposal. The third recommendation is:

Only one vehicle per proprietorship be able to obtain primary producer concession, with resultant saving of an estimated \$500 000 per annum.

I do not know what they mean in relation to that clause, but I take it that if a person has two trucks he can get it only on one, even though those vehicles may remain in the shed for most of the year and may do only 5 000 or 6 000 km a year. I know of many people whose trucks would do less than 10 000 km a year. I therefore would be disappointed if the Government proceeded with that item. I sincerely hope that those concessions that apply to my constituents in the opal fields and other isolated parts of the State will not also be attacked.

It would appear that this committee was most diligent in its investigation and is looking to collect a bonanza for the State Government. It reminds me of a document produced for the Whitlam Government some years ago, by the Coombs Task Force Committee, that proved to be disastrous to the people of this State. The only good thing was that it led to the demise of that Government.

Looking again through this document, a considerable amount of money is to be provided for water filtration and other areas in relation to the operation of the Engineering and Water Supply Department. However, I have yet to find any money being provided for some of the 32 uneconomic schemes currently listed on the Engineering and Water Supply Department books.

I am disappointed that those people will not be given some hope for the future. I know that the members for Peake and Hartley are not interested in people in isolated communities, but it is disgraceful that people living in towns adjacent to Ceduna (such as Denial Bay and Penong, west of Ceduna) at this stage are given no hope of having water supplied. It is disgraceful. They are entitled to it and the time is long overdue. A start should be made on some of these projects, including that one, immediately.

Water mains in areas such as Smoky Bay are in a very poor condition, and the Engineering and Water Supply Department does not have the funds at its disposal to renew them. They have been there for many years and renewal is long overdue. It appals me, when I look at a Budget that will appropriate more than \$3 000 million of taxpayers' money, that there is no money made available for projects such as those I have mentioned. My constituents are entitled to a fair go. It is all very well for the Government to subsidise the Festival Theatre for people who want to sit in seats, and to subsidise the Jam Factory and various other things, but my constituents get little or no benefit, or very rarely, from those projects. If people want to go to those

places, they ought to pay their way. It is grossly unfair, and it discriminates against people in isolated communities when they cannot have what most people regard as a basic necessity of life; that is, water connected to their properties at a reasonable cost. They are entitled to reasonable forms of transport, and they are entitled to have electricity at a reasonable rate.

According to this document, \$24.6 million this year will be collected by way of statutory corporations' contribution to the Treasury. Yet, when I took a deputation to meet the Minister of Mines and Energy to complain most bitterly about the discrimination that applies to certain parts of Upper Eyre Peninsula and a few other parts of the State where people have to pay more than the Adelaide rate plus 10 per cent for electricity which is generated in Port Augusta, goes to Whyalla and Port Lincoln and passes through some of those areas. The people at Port Lincoln do not have to pay for it: they pay the Adelaide rate. However, those people who live along the way are forced to pay extra. There is no justification for it. Since the Government can collect \$24 million from the Electricity Trust, it can remit a fraction of that money and lift that impost. What should be taken into consideration, for those people to have power connected, is that they have made a considerable capital contribution and they pay a standing charge, many up to some thousands of dollars each year.

I am disappointed that the Government has not given any indication of what it will do. The Minister today made some comments in the House and gave some indication that the Government will bring in a new system of charging for electricity. I sincerely hope that in doing that he will rectify this anomaly that is affecting my constituents and some people living in the electorate of Flinders. I could go on at length to talk about undertakings at Marla Bore and other places. Those operators are being slugged for the cost of electricity, which is grossly unfair and, if we want to encourage tourism in this State (and Marla Bore is a fine example of people showing initiative in developing an excellent facility), people ought to be encouraged and should not be taxed to high heaven.

I suppose the Government will accuse me of having a continual whinge, but I was elected to represent people in isolated communities. Last weekend I had the pleasure of being in the Flinders Ranges and I received many complaints about the management of national parks, in particular the failure of the National Parks and Wildlife Service to do anything successfully about the control of rabbits in the national park. Anyone who knows anything about the protection of the environment knows that if we want to protect native vegetation we must get rid of rabbits—

The Hon. D.C. Brown: Starve them to death, the Minister of Agriculture said.

Mr GUNN: That might be all right for someone who does not know anything about the problem or has read too many books. I have had experience with rabbits; the only way to get rid of them is to have an effective programme of ripping the burrows, bringing in myxomatosis, and using the poison 1080.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: Don't they use dynamite any more?

Mr GUNN: I think strychnine was most effective. I have received a number of complaints from adjoining landholders that the national park is a breeding ground for rabbits. I appeal to the Minister for Environment and Planning, because the time has come when he has to put some practical people in charge of the parks. I understand that people are allowed to trap rabbits in the national park in the Flinders Ranges, but are not allowed to drive from burrow to burrow. How anyone is meant to carry their traps under those conditions, I do not know. Out of Cook currently 12 000

rabbits a week are shot and shipped to Melbourne. I do not say that there are that many rabbits in the Flinders Ranges, but surely people ought to be encouraged to get rid of them. Landholders will have to purchase equipment and set about ripping the burrows to get rid of them and the National Parks and Wildlife Service should do likewise.

The report which the Public Accounts Committee released a week or so ago in relation to the Country Fire Services has provoked a great deal of discussion. In his speech the Premier referred to the amount of money made available, and we are all pleased that there has been an increase, but for some time a number of us have been concerned about the manner in which it has been spent and the problems of people in the Country Fire Services in country areas. I refer again to the National Parks and Wildlife Service. It is absolutely ridiculous that volunteers are asked to contain fires, as they were in the Mount Remarkable area last year, and the local people in charge of those operations do not have authority to make decisions in national parks. I put it to the House and the Minister that, if he expects volunteers to go into those parks and fight fires, they will have to be armed with the authority to make the decisions to extinguish those fires immediately. People will not stand around for three days while National Parks and Wildlife Service people act like overgrown boy scouts and are unable to make up their minds.

Anyone who has any experience in these matters knows that one has to bring bulldozers in to do the work. I sincerely hope that the Minister will amend the Act to take away from the administration of the National Parks and Wildlife Service the right to prevent local Country Fire Services officers bulldozing firebreaks and taking other action that they deem necessary because they have authority to do that in the rest of South Australia. The Woods and Forests Department has been responsible for this. There has been no trouble as far as it is concerned. However, the National Parks and Wildlife Service appears not to understand the feelings and concerns that have been expressed. A number of people have expressed concern to me about that operation. The concern was expressed that, if there was another fire, these people would be hesitant about helping. There are some other matters about which I want speak.

Mr Plunkett: You've got plenty of time. You've got three minutes yet.

Mr GUNN: It is all right for the member for Peake to interject and make rude remarks, but we had to listen the other evening to a diatribe of nonsense from him during which he bellowed out and jumped up and down in a quite irrational fashion. He made no constructive comments at all. All he did was tell us how much he dislikes anyone who has been successful. He has a dislike for the rural community. I do not know why this is, because they are the people who have allowed him to make a reasonable living for most of his life. It therefore ill behoves him to come into this Chamber and make such remarks. I am glad that he is here tonight because I want to bring to the attention of the House—

Mr Plunkett interjecting:

Mr GUNN: The honourable member is being rude and interjecting. I come now to the contribution made by primary industry and agriculture to the South Australian economy. I think that all members are concerned about the rate of unemployment and want decisions taken that will assist those unfortunate people in the community who do not have jobs. We have to create conditions to ensure that we have a growing economy. I am most concerned about the over regulation, red tape and various other impediments that are placed in the way of people who want to employ others.

As someone involved in the area of employing people, I find that every disincentive is put in the way of an employer by over zealous inspectors, unco-operative Government departments and the charges that are levied on people. People will do anything but employ others because of this and, when they are forced to employ, they will put the employees on casual rates on a short term basis wherever possible. The time has come when people should be encouraged to employ and the Government should immediately set about deregulating where possible.

In the figures provided on page 21 of the document headed *The South Australian Economy* which was tabled by the Premier, it is interesting to note that it is estimated in relation to grain production that this financial year barley will provide the economy of South Australia with \$291 million; oats, \$28 million; wheat, \$437 million; livestock production, \$112 million; sheep, \$83 million; and wool, \$289 million. The total agricultural contribution to the economy of South Australia this year will be \$1 796 million. That is, I understand, in excess of 60 per cent of South Australia's income.

I am concerned that we have a Government that does not appreciate that fact, or the fact that the rural industry is continually faced with people such as environmentalists and other departmental people making decisions when they do not understand the effects of those decisions and the difficulties that they create for people in primary industry. I just mention those figures because I think that they are significant and that people should be aware of them. I could say a lot more about the lack of funds that are available for road construction in this State, about which I will say something on a future occasion.

I want now to mention one or two other brief matters concerning my district. I have been approached by the Chairman of the Le Hunte council, who expressed concern that the Police Department might close the Minnipa police station. He cannot understand how the Government can spend in excess of \$1 million to send a large contingent of police to Roxby Downs to protect the assets and jobs of the people who are lawfully engaged in mining activity against a group of drop-outs and people of other dubious backgrounds who are demonstrating at Roxby Downs when the whole thing is futile.

Everyone in this Chamber knows, and the overwhelming majority of people in South Australia know, that those people will have absolutely no influence on the future operations of that mine. It will go ahead if it proves to be financially viable. The sort of nonsense that has gone on there is an absolute disgrace, especially when considering that the taxpayers of this State have been called upon to pay up to \$1.6 million to prevent these people from wilfully damaging the property of the mining company. I think that that is a disgrace.

I point out that my constituents have been informed that a police station at the small town of Minnipa will be closed down because the Police Department does not have enough money to renew the police house. That is quite disgraceful, because the community involved has had a policeman there for generations. They are entitled to have a policeman in their community, but they have been told that there is a likelihood that the police station will be closed because the Government does not have sufficient money to maintain it. Yet the Government can find \$1.6 million to look after this group of drop-outs and dubious characters up there at Roxby Downs, many of whom look as though they have not had a wash for a long time.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GUNN: I understand that they are now dispersing back to the beaches where many of them spend a considerable amount of time. I do not object to their right to demonstrate

but I do object to their interfering with other people's livelihoods and to their costing the taxpayers of this State a large amount of money.

An honourable member: Ceduna Bay.

Mr GUNN: That is where a lot of them are. I guarantee that many of them will be back at Cactus Beach and other places. I understand that the police are up there looking for some of them right now. I am reliably informed that that is where some of these characters have retreated to, although that is not far enough away as far as I am concerned.

Mr Plunkett: While the bottom of the harbour people are still counting their money.

Mr GUNN: The honourable member obviously supports those people. He does not want those people at Roxby Downs who belong to his union, the AWU, to have a job; he thinks that those people can go and smash the place up and close it down, so that those people who belong to the AWU will lose their jobs. I suggest that he should go up there and tell those people that. The Deputy Leader and I were present when the Hons Dr Hopgood and Mr Payne were up there, and they did not get a very good reception. They were pleased to get out of the canteen. If the honourable member went up there and talked the sort of nonsense that he talks in this place he would be frog marched out fairly quickly, too. It would do him the world of good rather than his guffing on in the way that he does here, talking a lot of nonsense and wasting the time of the House with the twaddle that he speaks from time to time.

I am pleased to participate in this debate. I look forward to the Committee deliberations, as I have a number of matters which I want to bring to the Minister's attention. I intend to pursue with the Minister for Environment and Planning the matter of the Calca waterhole conservation. Some time ago he indicated to me that the problems would be resolved in regard to that matter, and that the local community would get its tennis courts and oval. However, I understand that to this time nothing has happened, although it is nearly three years since an undertaking was given by the previous Minister that the problems would be overcome.

I also hope that the Minister of Health is in a position to do something in relation to the problems that some of the homes in country areas are having in looking after and providing living accommodation for elderly citizens. They are most concerned about the effect that the cost of installing fire prevention equipment and other facilities will have on their operations. They are just some of the matters to which I want to draw the attention of Ministers during the Estimates Committee debates. The Committee deliberations of the Budget are important. It is a time when members can get valuable information on behalf of their constituents. I support the second reading, and look forward to the grievance debate when I can raise a number of other matters that are causing me concern. I support the Bill.

Mr GROOM (Hartley): I congratulate the Premier and the Cabinet on the fine way in which they have managed the economy of this State. In November 1982, when this Government came to office, it was confronted with a very serious economic crisis as a consequence of the policies of the previous Liberal Government and the manner in which it had mismanaged the economy during its three years in office. In 1979 the incoming Liberal Government inherited a genuinely balanced Budget from the previous Labor Administration, not one propped up with capital works money.

In 1981-82, the Liberal Government transferred some \$44.7 million of capital works money to balance the recurrent deficit. Again, in 1982-83 it repeated the exercise and transferred some \$42 million of capital works money to balance its recurrent deficit. What the Liberal Government effectively

did was run down some very considerable cash surpluses built into the system by previous Labor Administrations. It used capital works money to fund its taxation promises. As a consequence, it was caught up with massive increases in relation to petrol, motor registration, drivers licences, stamp duties, transport—to name only a few.

In addition to running down the State's cash reserves by using capital works money to fund its taxation promises, it failed to control overspending in Government departments. The figures I am about to quote come from a well researched article which appeared in the *Advertiser* of 8 September 1984 written by its political reporter, Matt Abraham. During 1981-82 the Liberal Government overspent by some 8.9 per cent in 24 Government departments. This is compared to 1983-84 when the incoming Labor Administration overspent by about 6 per cent in some 27 Government departments.

In relation to overspending in Government departments the record of the Labor Administration is pretty good when compared with the first full year of Liberal Party control of the economy. In addition, in relation to public sector employment, I note from information presented by the Premier that the statistical table under 'Employment aspects of the 1984-85 Budget' shows that public sector employees, as a percentage of persons employed in South Australia, were about 17.8 per cent in June 1980. In fairness, in the first full year of the Liberal Party Government, the June 1981 figure was 17.4 per cent. If one compares that to the June 1984 figure of 17.7 per cent, it is only a slight rise. Again, the Labor Administration's record is very good in relation to public sector employment and overspending in Government departments.

The net result of poor economic mismanagement on the part of the previous Liberal administration was a massive deficit of some \$63 million, plus a huge run down in the cash reserves that had been carefully built up in this State by previous Labor Administrations. The situation that the State Labor Government inherited in November 1982 is in marked contrast to the Budget surplus left by the outgoing Corcoran Government in 1979 with its comfortable cash reserves. Indeed, in the 1979-80 State Budget, a transfer of a surplus of \$15.5 million was provided from recurrent expenditure to capital works. This was the complete opposite of the policies which the succeeding Liberal Administration embarked on and which the Premier and his Cabinet are now in the course of correcting—the use of capital works money in this way, reducing the allocation from the immediately preceding financial year.

This was the situation that faced the incoming Labor Government in November 1982—a record deficit of some \$63 million, over-spending in Government departments, and a run down of the cash reserves where massive amounts of capital works moneys had been used to fund taxation promises. The Liberal Party got caught up in the way in which it was managing the economy and during the 1979-82 period it raised a whole host of consumer items such as petrol, motor registration fees, drivers licence fees, and so on. Combined with its Federal counterpart, it became a Government of very high unemployment, high inflation and record deficits.

Mr Oswald: It had nothing to do with the world economy, did it?

Mr GROOM: If the honourable member wants to use that excuse he can, but the fact is that the Liberal Party deliberately allowed the State's economic position to run down in the latter part of 1982 simply because it was facing an election at the end of that year or, at the earliest, in March 1983. It was not prepared to make the hard decisions that were necessary simply for reasons of political expediency. It did not take measures to correct the run-down of the State's economic base during that period and, make no

mistake about it, had it been elected in November 1982 it would have massively increased State taxation.

I have not heard one member get up and deny that during the period I have been here—since November 1982—because that is exactly what it would have done; it would have increased taxation to correct the very situation that it produced. That was its plan. It was prepared to bring this State to the point of economic bankruptcy simply for reasons of political expediency. That was the massive legacy that the State Labor Government inherited. But, it got on with the job. The State Labor Government has had to make the hard decisions necessary to restore and guide the State back to economic growth and prosperity. These were the hard decisions that the Liberal Party avoided, purely for political reasons, because it had an election coming on. But, even despite the legacy that the State Government inherited, it is very easy to forget the way in which the Liberal Party itself massively increased taxes between 1979 and 1982.

Mr Oswald interjecting:

Mr GROOM: I draw the honourable member's attention to an article in the *News* of 14 August 1984, which states that figures released by the Premier showed that during the last year taxation in this State rose by something like 12 per cent, yet in the 1981-82 year—really the first full year of the Liberal Party Government—taxation rose by 13.1 per cent. So, even despite the enormity of the deficit that the State Labor Government inherited and despite the massive run down in cash reserves, the State Labor Government's record is extremely good. In relation to the increase in State taxation it can be shown by reference to that article and those figures released by the Premier that the record of the State Labor Government on taxation compares very favourably with that of the Liberal Government during those years. This is despite the fact that that Liberal Administration inherited a genuinely balanced budget with plenty of cash reserves.

I want to turn to some of the achievements of the State Labor Government since coming to office. I do not mean to suggest that this list is exhaustive by any means: it is simply by way of illustration. The threshold for pay-roll tax was increased to \$140 000, then \$160 000, and, finally, \$200 000 and it is predicted that this threshold—

Mr Oswald: How many employers will that take in?

Mr GROOM: The honourable member asks, 'How many employees will that take in?'

Mr Oswald: I said 'employers'.

Mr GROOM: It does not matter whether it is employers or employees. Compare what we have done with the record of the Tasmanian Liberal Government, which has actually increased pay-roll tax. At least in South Australia we have recognised that pay-roll tax acts as a disincentive to the employment of people and this Administration has taken measures to reduce the severity and incidence of pay-roll tax on businesses.

Look at what a Liberal Administration has done in Tasmania. I suppose the member for Morphett would suggest by way of analogy that his Liberal Administration—if it was in office—would have followed its Tasmanian counterpart and likewise have increased pay-roll tax. Is that the sort of policy that the member for Morphett wants to inflict on South Australia? Is that his attitude, if indeed the Tasmanian Liberal Government's attitude is his attitude? I might have misunderstood his interjection, but I thought he was agreeing with that type of policy direction. This Government has taken significant steps to reduce the incidence of pay-roll tax on employers. I refer to the establishment of the Small Business Corporation—

The Hon. D.C. Brown: All you did was pick up the policy of the former Government.

Mr GROOM: The honourable member is not in Government now. We do not know what the Liberal Party would have done in Government. One can only draw from the analogy of the Tasmanian Liberal Government and look at what it has done, and with some degree of accuracy one can speculate what the honourable member's Government would have done. Another major achievement is the Small Business Corporation, which will be a big boost to small businesses in this State. Further, we have had a merger of the State Bank and the Savings Bank; that merger has brought together about 200 branches with \$3 000 million in assets. One significant benefit arising from that merger has been the announcement of interest being paid on business cheque accounts.

In regard to employment in South Australia since the Labor Government came into office, there have been some 20 000 new jobs created in 1983-84, and from mid-1983 to mid-1984 the unemployment rate in South Australia fell from 11 per cent to 9.2 per cent—that is not a bad record. I refer to the record expenditure on housing which, as the housing industry predicted last year, would create some 4 000 jobs with a massive spin-off effect. The massive injection of funds into the industry has no doubt contributed to the upturn in the State's economy. In regard to other capital works projects in South Australia one can refer to the Adelaide Railway Station development involving about \$160 million.

Mr Mathwin: You're not going to take credit for that!

Mr GROOM: The member for Glenelg—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GROOM: All I have heard from Opposition members since November 1982 has been their carping criticism in respect of this project and their trying to torpedo it simply through sour grapes. It is this Administration that has brought this project together—make no mistake about that. All we have heard about the railway station project from members opposite is not words of praise but simply warping criticism of the sour grapes variety. The fact is that the Premier and his Cabinet—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There must not be barracking one way or the other. I would like the House to come to order.

Mr GROOM: It is the Premier and his Cabinet who have brought this project to fruition in South Australia. The House should look at the Myer-Jennings Industries upgrading of the Elizabeth Centre of \$29 million, the Telecom headquarters building of \$26.5 million to be expended in South Australia, the Citicom office development in Hindmarsh Square at a cost of \$15 million, the \$14 million Woodside Army Camp redevelopment, the Pirie Plaza office building of \$15 million, the Westfield upgrading of Tea Tree Plaza shopping centre of \$22 million, the redevelopment—

Mr Oswald: Private money!

Mr GROOM: Of course, because this Government is a partnership between Government enterprise and private enterprise. That is the fact of the matter. I am glad that the honourable member pointed that out, because it shows how this Administration works with the business community in South Australia, the way that it has the support of the business community to bring these joint enterprise projects to fruition.

I refer to the redevelopment of the Grenfell Street Mail Exchange, amounting to \$14 million; Porter Bay development in Port Lincoln, Stage I, amounting to \$27 million; the Palace Court offices in Pirie Street, a \$12.5 million development; the Tricon Corporation office block in Flinders Street, amounting to \$17.5 million; the Commonwealth Government offices in Currie Street, amounting to \$38 million, and so on.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The members for Davenport, Glenelg and Morphett are all to come to order.

Mr GROOM: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I know that this list is very painful to members opposite. It is painful because it is this Administration which has brought these projects together and which has ensured that these projects commence in South Australia. This Administration has ensured that a very significant amount of capital works moneys will be spent in South Australia and has actively encouraged the investments involved. This list is a matter of a few examples but it shows the confidence that the business community has in this Administration and in the future of this State. What did Labor Governments in this country and this State inherit in terms of inflation?

Ms Lenehan interjecting:

Mr GROOM: I am pleased with that comment from the member for Mawson, who shows perception on this issue. The fact of the matter is that the Fraser Government left a legacy of inflation running at something like 11 per cent, which was the same as when it came into office in 1975.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Mawson to come to order as well, and I do not need any assistance from the honourable member for Glenelg.

Mr GROOM: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The fact of the matter is that the inflation rate was running at between 11 and 12 per cent when the Fraser Liberal Government came to office in 1975, and here we are some eight years later under the Liberals with the inflation rate at the same level. The Fraser Liberal Government did nothing in that period to bring down the inflation rate. What has the Hawke Administration done in a very brief period (something like 12 to 15 months)? It has brought the inflation rate down to something like 5 per cent as a consequence of the policies it has embarked upon with the assistance of the State Labor Administration, because in terms of inflation in this State we are faring better than the national average. In the June quarter the inflation rate was running at 3.6 per cent here, and the national average was 3.9 per cent.

The national account figures show that the Australian economy grew by something like 10.1 per cent on a June quarter to June quarter basis from 1983 to 1984, compared with a growth of 2.9 per cent on a June quarter to June quarter basis in 1982-83 under a Liberal Government. One can see the remarkable economic transformation that has taken place in Australia, and particularly in South Australia, under Labor Administrations despite the economic mess left by Liberal Administrations. In the past 12 months 230 000 Australians have found jobs, compared with 240 000 people who lost jobs under a Liberal Administration the year before. It has been a very difficult task for Labor Governments in this country to clean up the economic mess and get the country on the road to prosperity. However, Labor Administrations have tackled the job and have made the hard decisions that Liberal Administrations did not make for reasons of political expediency. This is a responsible Budget designed to get on with the job and it will set the scene for economic recovery in South Australia.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): The Budget document before us has brought much comment from many members in this Chamber, but there are a few points I would like to make about it. Before doing so I must refer to the comments that the member for Peake made last Thursday, I think. I was quite interested in the member for Peake's comments, particularly some of the references he made. I will not take up those points except to say that he reflected on or generalised about the work force and members of Parliament on this side of the House, who he inferred had not worked in a

physical sense. I believe that it was wrong to generalise in such a way because, if we were to take such generalisations through to their ultimate conclusion and say that only those who worked physically with their hands were the ones who worked, whilst they are doing a good job for themselves, their families and doing their own little bit for the State economy, those persons were not providing a number of other jobs available to other persons.

Every member of this Chamber has worked—and has worked hard. There is no question about that. Perhaps not all have worked hard physically, but there is no doubt they have all worked. If we were to fall into the trap of generalising, we would probably find that members on this side of the House through their efforts have provided more job opportunities per capita than members of the Government through their individual efforts. Again, that is the trap that could easily befall those who generalise. I think it is fair to say that the whole of the South Australian economy is a cosmopolitan arrangement where people who work physically with their hands are just as important as those who work mentally or in any other way. If those people through their efforts are creating jobs for South Australians, they are contributing to the South Australian economy.

That important aspect should be remembered by anyone who stands up and tries to draw a parallel between those who work physically with their hands and those who work behind a desk or in any other way. We should not draw the same comparison as that drawn by the member for Peake. I know that he did not mean to go that far, but he virtually said that we as members of Parliament do not work. I do not think that the member for Peake intended to draw that analogy, and that needs to be clarified.

I have always been concerned, as I have said previously, about governments using deficit budgeting and, more particularly, using Loan funds to prop up day to day expenditure. I will not elaborate on that point again, except to state that it is dangerous. Federal and State Governments throughout the nation have been doing it. I think we are rapidly reaching an intolerable situation. I understand that in general terms the national deficit is such now that the gross national product of Australia would be totally absorbed in one year if the deficit was to be overcome immediately. That is frightening because I understand that the national deficit amounts to roughly \$20 000 per taxpayer. That is a very frightening concern.

Mr Becker: Per family.

Mr BLACKER: I said 'taxpayer', but that is not correct; it amounts to \$20 000 per family. That is still of immense proportions and it is of great concern to me. I am sure it is of very great concern to all members of Parliament when they realise that that money has to be paid back somewhere along the line. It has to be made up, and we cannot continue in that fashion. Everyone must tighten their belts. To that end we must realise that, if Governments are to spend and continue to provide concessions in one way or another, that money must be made up in other areas. I am saying that the Government needs to tighten its belt as much as anyone else and demonstrate that it is intent on trying to balance the Budget and alleviate the massive debts that have built up in this State over a period of time through a number of Governments.

I refer to page 20 of *The South Australian Economy* where the Premier mentions rural industries. While it may be expected that the member for Peake and some of his colleagues may refer to industries of special interest to them, I guess, equally, it can be expected that I will refer to issues of interest to me. When referring to rural industries the Premier states:

Rural industries in South Australia experienced a good season in 1983-84 following severe drought conditions in the previous

two seasons. Good rains in the latter part of July 1983 and follow up rains were responsible for the improved agricultural production.

Expectations for the 1984-85 season are good following widespread rains across most of the State's cereal belt in early July. In South Australia the areas of wheat and barley sown were about 18 per cent and 7 per cent respectively less in 1983-84 compared to 1982-83. Sheep and beef cattle numbers have shown some increase from 1983 to 1984, with sheep numbers increasing by 0.7 million head to 16.1 million head at 31 March 1984 and beef cattle showing a marginal rise to 0.7 million head in 1984.

I could go on and further refer to the Premier's comments, but the important point that needs to be made is that, whilst the Premier referred to the rural industry in clause 11 of his document, it is nevertheless the backbone of South Australia's economy, for without the rural economy South Australia would hardly exist. It is of the utmost importance that this matter be strengthened, because the job opportunities that are created as a direct result of our rural industry are almost immeasurable. Certainly, without that industry this State would totally deflate.

I really emphasise the point that I made in my first few words: we cannot generalise. South Australia is a cosmopolitan State in which each industry depends to a degree on the other and in which the overall economy depends on each industry. The rural industries would have the ability to absorb much of the work force if our system was to allow it.

That brings us back to the overall difficulties being experienced by many primary producers. The same can be said for small business people or for any employer concerning the cost of taking on employees. I know that many job opportunities are available in country areas, but I also know that many of those primary producers would like to be able to take on employees but cannot stand the hassles that are involved in taking on additional employees and in being saddled with a whole heap of regulations. They believe that, if they have to go through all those hassles, why bother about employing?

While employers have the attitude that it is undesirable or unpalatable for them to extend themselves to take on additional employees, they will not make the effort. If the Government can come back the other way with an incentive to make it worth while to take on employees, that will absorb many job opportunities. I know that I am talking about something which is highly improbable and which might not occur, but, if we could revert to the employment position on Eyre Peninsula 25 years ago, the total number of unemployed in that area at present would be absorbed. So the present amount of unemployment is almost directly relative to the reduced number of job opportunities in the rural industry on Eyre Peninsula. We could probably draw that same comparison in many other areas of the State.

The rural industries by their very nature are unpredictable. One does not know exactly what will happen, but the rural industry itself put another \$500 million into the economy as a direct result of an above average year. That is far beyond the ability of anyone to control, we know, but it stresses the value and importance of the industry because, if a Government was able to initiate something that could put \$1 million back into the economy and float it around, it would make headline news. When the rural economy can put \$500 million back into the economy just because it has an above average year, it shows the massive influence that that industry has on this State.

This present season—and the Premier referred to this—is one of mixed fortunes: some people look like facing an above average year; some have been virtually drowned out through excess water; some have been unfortunate and have missed out on the rain. In my own electorate it is very patchy. If one were to generalise, one could say that it is reasonable to expect an average return over the whole elec-

torate. However, there are cases where some people are facing well below average returns. In that sense, I am referring to the areas on Southern Eyre Peninsula, and I believe that other areas in the State could be similarly cited.

However, on Lower Eyre Peninsula, rain has been so excessive over the past three months that the crops, where they were existing, are rapidly deteriorating. I know of one case on Eyre Peninsula where at least 30 per cent of the paddock is almost certain to be wiped off or be declared a nil return. One can only hope that there will be a certain amount of dry weather in the near future if we do not want to see further down-grading in the estimates of the returns in the more southern areas of Eyre Peninsula.

In the northern areas, the drier parts, there are prospects of an extremely good season. However, one must add a word of warning and point out that the season, whilst it might look good now, is six weeks to two months late and that therefore the likelihood of good finishing rains occurring so late in the season is not good. Whilst the opportunities and prospects may be there, the prospects of a good finish are diminishing, because the whole season is running nearly two months late. Although we would like to be optimistic, we must add that word of caution—that a good year need not necessarily be just around the corner.

Referring to good years in primary production, today I led a deputation to the Minister of Water Resources and to the officers of the Department of Agriculture on behalf of some farmers in the Mangalo area. People who know that area, as would those who have been in any Government Administration, would know that those farmers have been endeavouring to get a water supply to their area for about 40 years without success. Because of their relatively large holdings and the relatively long distance from the main source of supply, the Engineering and Water Supply Department has not been able to justify the extension of mains into those areas.

The Mangalo community has endeavoured to establish a self-help scheme. They realise and have, after continual knock back, come to accept that the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the Government of the day (irrespective of which Government) will not supply a water system to their area. As a result, 17 farmers put their heads together and endeavoured to devise a scheme to supply and lay 43 km of pipe and to provide the distribution points to the front gate of the 17 farms involved. They have sought from the Government some concession, some reduction in the overall cost in order to help them in this regard. I do not believe that their approach to the Government has been unrealistic, because they are endeavouring, first of all to help themselves. Secondly, it is not unrealistic, with a self-help scheme where people are able to provide 43 km of pipeline and 17 service outlets at no cost to the Government, for the people concerned to come to the Government and say, 'Is it possible to get a concessional rate of water or some other allowance?' After several deputations, so far such a proposal has fallen on deaf ears.

Mr Mathwin: They haven't had any luck at all.

Mr BLACKER: They have not had any luck at all, and I do not believe that that is an unrealistic request to be made by farmers who are prepared to meet the cost. We are talking about a project costing \$90 000 for the pipes alone and probably that much again for laying, and that only gets it to their front gate. There are also all the on-farm costs, such as storage tanks and reticulation lines, and pipe fittings and troughs are additional to that.

So, to each of those farmers we are talking of a capital investment cost of between \$15 000 and \$18 000. I fully support the farmers in their approach to the Government. It was not unrealistic that they should go to the Government and ask to have water at 2c a kilolitre less than average so

that the Mangalo water scheme would still charge its recipients the standard price for water, but the 2c could be used in administration and in the cost of servicing and maintaining the line, which they themselves would be prepared to supply and lay. That was only one part of the story.

When that failed, although the E&WS Department was prepared to provide technical expertise to have the project checked out, the Department and the Minister were not prepared to contribute either to a reduction of the cost of water or in any other way financially. The Mangalo water scheme then made an approach to the Department of Agriculture to see whether low interest money similar to that provided on drought relief funding, farm build-up schemes or issues of that kind could be made available. Again they ran into a stumbling block, for it would appear that, under the rural industries assistance scheme such finance can be made available to individual farmers only.

Therefore, it meant that the group of 17 had to find out which farmers were eligible for low interest money, and that can only be done on a means test basis. It could therefore mean that some farmers could get low interest money which would advantage them, to the disadvantage of others. To provide an equitable scheme suitable to all farmers does not seem possible under the existing programmes that are available. So, the deputation that saw the Minister of Water Resources, his staff members and the staff members of the Minister of Agriculture went home this evening rather disappointed. They have gone back and intend approaching the council to see whether a scheme can be arranged whereby the council can raise the money by way of a guarantee and therefore put out, on a standing charge basis, the capital cost of this pipeline to the farmers.

The scheme being envisaged is along the lines of that applied by ETSA when it provided the SWER line system throughout country areas of the State. Some members present may be conversant with that, but in those undertakings when SWER lines were first being distributed throughout South Australian country areas recipients of that power undertook to enter into an agreement whereby they would pay a standing charge annually for 10 years. It may well have been that some farmers had to pay \$800 or \$1 000 per year for 10 years on top of their normal consumer price for electricity. That was the only way in which those farmers were going to get it, so they had to finance the capital construction of the line.

That approach is presently being undertaken by the Mangalo water scheme people, and they hope that somewhere along the line they will get some assistance, so that an equality between each of the 17 farmers can be maintained. They are bitterly disappointed, and I share that disappointment, that the Government of the day cannot see its way clear to assist in some small way these farmers who are prepared to help themselves and who have indicated that they are prepared to meet what would amount to 95 per cent of the cost, anyway. Yet this Government cannot even come some small way towards meeting the cost. The Government must take a serious look at its position in such an instance, because it has continued a policy that has been built up over a number of years where the E&WS Department expects a return from rate revenue that is equal to the interest rate on the capital cost of construction.

That, of course, means that any line that is installed must return by way of rates between 12 per cent and 15 per cent of the capital construction cost. That is impossible under any country water extension scheme. I do not believe that there is a scheme in South Australia that can meet that criterion, so by adopting the criterion that has applied for many years gone by the Government has effectively said that there will be no more country water supply extensions. How long can this, or any future Government, maintain

that stand and say that it will not install any further country water supply extensions?

It is my firm belief that the Government must reconsider its policies in this matter. I suggest to the Government that, if it was seen to be promoting a self help scheme among landholders, whether residential or rural landholders, it could get some considerable kudos out of that. However, at present the Government is saying that there will be no more water supply extensions. How long can that policy be maintained by this or any future Government? I only hope that the Government will reconsider its position and at least add support to the efforts of the people involved in the Mangalo water scheme. No doubt there are many such schemes throughout the State that could be assisted. If the Government can be seen to be assisting it may be that that its reputation in rural areas, which is not of the highest standing at present, will improve to an end.

I would like now to make reference to a point I was prompted about by the member for Hartley, who was singing the praises of the Government and the massive amount of development going on in this State at the moment.

Mr Mathwin: He was off key.

Mr BLACKER: I would like to think he is accurate, because he promoted a \$27 million marina project for Port Lincoln. I note in the Premier's Budget papers an allocation of \$3 million for that project, so what is the Government's commitment to the remaining \$27 million I do not know. I am pleased that the Government has allocated this \$3 million because it is the starting point and the focal point about which this marina project will revolve. A marina cannot work unless there is a basin around which all the other projects can revolve. Immediately work starts on construction of the basin the project will get under way. It will have a tremendous impact and I hope provide the job opportunities so desperately necessary on Lower Eyre Peninsula.

This project has the ability to attract national and international tourists, particularly those involved with yachting. It will certainly provide a home for the majority of boats in the fishing fleet. The Government, because of its involvement in part of the capital construction costs of the marina basin, will be assisting in the provision of berthing facilities. Although that might not sound much, it is interesting to note that this will be one of the few berthing facilities from which the Government will recoup the cost of construction. Although the Government's involvement is to be applauded no end, it does stand to get the majority of its money back. If it put the same amount of money into a breakwater it would not get a cent back. This project is a combined financing arrangement between private enterprise, local government, State Government and to some degree the Federal Government.

I think the concept of that is to be applauded. I think that many people have watched what has been happening to see whether the people involved have made this model the success it is intended to be. I can only say to those people who have been involved so far that it is very important that it be carried out to the ultimate end. In the meantime, many job opportunities will be provided.

One of the key factors of this has already begun, and I refer to the construction of the leisure centre, which, I believe, could probably equally appropriately be referred to as an aquatic centre. It is an indoor heated swimming pool which is covered by a synthetic roof. From a distance it looks like a large tent. It will be a very effective leisure centre which will be able to provide most adequately for the aquatic needs of those living in Port Lincoln and on much of Lower Eyre Peninsula. It is planned that that in itself will be one of the focal points of the marina project. The project is to be officially opened by the Premier on 9

November, at which time we hope that he will be able to make further announcements about the ongoing construction of the marina project.

The employment situation on Lower Eyre Peninsula (and I refer to the marina project for this very reason) is quite desperate. The State Government announced the closure of the Samcor works, and on 30 June 112 jobs simply disappeared. There have been rumours about fertiliser companies scaling down their works. At present there is an air of despondency in the area because of the lack of employment opportunities for workers. This, of course, has its social consequences. It has placed additional pressures on the families of those who have lost their jobs, and certainly the despondency that is prevalent is of great concern to me and to all citizens of the area. If a number of jobs are generated by the marina project, maybe the despondency can be alleviated.

In the last couple of moments that are available to me I want to refer briefly to a recent visit to the area made by a quadriplegic, Mr Richard Llewellyn, the Disability Adviser to the Premier. To me it was an inspiration that he should come to the Eyre Peninsula, accompanied by his driver, his wife and his family, and meet with many of those in the local community who are directly involved in providing assistance to handicapped people. He visited the Matthew Flinders Nursing Home. We then had a public meeting at the LEPSH (Lower Eyre Peninsula Society for the Handicapped) Centre. I believe that his visit was appreciated by all of those who had the opportunity to meet and discuss the overall problems involved with him. I do not think that any of us can stand back and be too complacent about the needs of the handicapped. I guess that I for one should be in a position to know more than most—

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

Mr MATHWIN (Glenelg): In speaking in this Budget debate I must say that as far as I am concerned the present Government is the greediest Government I have seen since I have been a member of this House. A former Premier, Don Dunstan, was a great extractor, as we all know, but the Bannon Administration has taken the cake. I believe that it can claim a record for the number of tax increases that have occurred during its short term of office. Indeed, some 139 increases in taxes and charges have occurred since it has taken office.

Mr Becker: They weren't going to increase—

Mr MATHWIN: Of course we all know that; we all read the papers in those days, although it seems so far away to us now. The present Government has been in office for 18 months, and everyone is fed up with it. Indeed, its promises went to the wall. The oratory from the member for Hartley concerning the great job that this Government has done and the problems that it had will never scrub out the fact that it was dishonest in its election campaign. The Labor Party was dishonest when it brought in all these 139 extra increases in charges and taxation. Of course, we know that is the basis of socialism—high taxation. The Labor Government believes that it can spend your dollar better than you can spend it.

Mr Becker interjecting:

Mr MATHWIN: Indeed, it just rips it off you, no matter what happens. The Labor Administration has taken the State public debt from \$2 898 million in 1982-83 to \$3 489 million in 1983-84—a massive \$591 million increase in one year.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

Mr MATHWIN: The member for Albert Park, if he was allowed to speak (and he will not be allowed to), would

have to agree with me and say that he is ashamed of this Government. It is a greedy Government.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Albert Park is out of order and the member for Glenelg should not bait him.

Mr MATHWIN: I thank you for your protection, Mr Deputy Speaker. I was tempted by the member for Albert Park. The interest on this debt will cost every man, woman and child \$3.20 per week. It will cost an average family of four \$12.80 per week. Of course, the Labor Government is a high tax Government. It is mortgaging our children's future. No-one can argue with those figures, and I would like the member for Ascot Park, in his spare time (if he has any) to reassess his situation and see it as it really is. The Labor Government is a high tax Government. That is what it is all about.

Let us look at some of the taxes that were put on this August. A licence fee on tobacco products from 1 October 1984 based on the volume of sales, was increased from 12.5 per cent to 25 per cent. This was expected to generate some \$30 million during 1983-84. Concerning petroleum products, a licence fee on the value of motor spirits increased from 4.5 per cent to 7.5 per cent. This was expected to generate an additional \$11 million during the 1983-84 year and was expected to add 1c a litre to the price of petrol and diesel fuels. Liquor licence fees increased from 9 per cent to 12 per cent, and were expected to generate another \$2 million into the greedy pockets of the Government.

Mr Meier: So much for saying that he doesn't like the wine tax.

Mr MATHWIN: That is a fiasco if ever there was one. They said, 'We are going to try to help the people of the Riverland!' Stamp duty on general insurance increased from 6 per cent to 8 per cent, which was expected to return an additional \$6 million in 1983-84. The FID tax was the first new tax introduced in this State since 1974. That was to return \$8 million in 1983-84 and \$16 million in a full year. That is a fair amount of extra money from a new tax imposed by a Premier who said that he would not increase taxes (never mind about bringing in new ones) in the lead up to the last election.

The general franchise fee on gas will generate a further \$1.6 million during 1983-84. Motor vehicle registration fees, of course, have increased by 10 per cent, which will generate quite a large increase also. Drivers licence fees will go up by 25 per cent: the cost of a three-year licence has increased from \$24 to \$30 under this Government. These increases in registration and licence fees are expected to generate \$6.1 million additional revenue in 1984-85. No wonder that the Premier can smile when he rubs his little fingers together knowing full well that the bag will be full!

Of course, knowing the record of Labor Governments (socialist Governments), I realise that they know how to spend it; they are big spenders. Registration and administrative fees under the Boating Act rose by between 42 and 200 per cent. Two additional fees have been gazetted. The registration fee for a motor boat has been increased to \$17 from \$12 and the cost of a licence to operate a motor boat has been increased to \$12 from \$5. Obviously, if one has a motor boat one has to have a licence to drive it and it must be registered, so that is a double taxation. The cost of a change of registration number has been increased to \$5 and a copy of an accident report will now cost \$15, which is another big increase in taxation. Twenty-four fees have been increased within the range of 21 per cent to 120 per cent to the E&WS Department. Where one applies to connect a new service or to increase the amount of water coming to one's property, one incurs such a fee. The cost of sewer connection has increased from between 11 and 29 per cent.

Under the Clean Air Act, new fees will apply under regulations that have replaced Health Act regulations, which have been revoked. That fee structure will generate millions of dollars to the State coffers. The increase in bus fares will affect everyone in the community that uses public transport. We are asked to encourage people to use public transport, yet bus fares have increased by between 7.7 per cent and 16.7 per cent. For the benefit of the member for Ascot Park, who has probably never been on a bus in his life, although I know he has been on a train—

Mr Hamilton: Albert Park.

Mr MATHWIN: Albert Park, I am sorry. I know that the honourable member has been on a train, but I do not suppose that he has been on a bus. If he ever does go on a bus, he will see that a 40c fare has been increased to 70c; a 70c fare to \$1—a 42.9 per cent increase; and a 90c fare to \$1.40—a 55.6 per cent increase. That is pretty heavy going, as far as I am concerned. So, the charges go on and will go on while this Government is in power and occupies the Treasury benches. The most recent increase, announced on 6 September, concerned the Business Names Act. Registration fees have been increased in the range of 25 per cent to 60 per cent, which of course is a large increase for any business.

I now want to deal with some other points in relation to the documents. First, as would be expected by some people in this place, I will talk about the Community Welfare Department and the correctional services area. At page 143, under the heading 'Centralised facilities and services' we see the South Australian Youth Training Centre, which was once known as McNally Training Centre, for which \$2 914 800 was voted for 1983-84.

Actual payments were \$3 650 058, and of that wages cost \$2 793 000. This year the Budget allocation is \$3 134 100, with contingencies of \$341 100. That is a fair amount of money. When one looks at the other main South Australian juvenile centre, the South Australian Remand and Assessment Centre, one finds that there has been a rapid increase in the cost of the operation of that institution. To dig deeper and get further detail on this matter I now refer to the Auditor-General's Report at page 54, where the Auditor-General states:

The Department provides secure residential care for young offenders who have been sentenced or remanded in custody for assessment by the Children's Court.

The report goes on to refer to the South Australian Youth Training Centre with a 1982 net cost of \$3 036 000, a capacity of 80, and on average occupancy of 63. The average net cost per offender was \$48 000. In 1984, the net cost is \$3 525 000, an average occupancy of 48 and an average annual net cost per offender of \$73 000.

Mr Becker: How much is that a week?

Mr MATHWIN: It is \$1 403 a week per inmate.

Mr Meier: It's more expensive than a hotel.

Mr MATHWIN: Indeed it is more expensive than a hotel. We could house inmates in a first-rate hotel for less than that. Those are the figures of the South Australian Youth Training Centre, formally known as McNally. The South Australian Youth Remand and Assessment Centre has a capacity of 51. The 1984 average occupancy was 18, and the average annual net cost per offender was \$104 000, which works out at over \$2 000 a week for each offender. That is what it costs to house an offender at the South Australian Youth Remand and Assessment Centre.

Mr Becker: That's almost \$300 a day.

Mr MATHWIN: As my friend, neighbour and colleague, the member for Hanson, says, it is almost \$300 a day, which is a fair amount of money in anyone's language. This situation is disgraceful and shows lack of organisation. Indeed, all members who have studied juvenile delinquency

and adult crime would know that it is far cheaper to keep an adult out of prison or a juvenile out of 'Borstal' and to put them under community service orders. I wonder how far that scheme has gone because we have not had much news about what is happening with that scheme. It did not progress far under my Government, but I would have expected it to accelerate over the past 12 months because of the colossal cost involved in putting offenders into institutions.

The cost of keeping a person in the South Australian Youth Remand and Assessment Centre is \$2 000 a week, \$300 a day or \$12.50 an hour. In some cases (but not all) the answer is to use these young people under the community service order scheme. Let them do some work about the place. Let them perhaps get some satisfaction and avoid being institutionalised, as this would be better for them and for the community. I hope that when we get to the relevant lines in the Estimates Committee sittings we will be enlightened by the Minister in regard to the colossal cost of keeping these young people in training and assessment centres. Call them what one will: the fact is that they are borstals, prisons for people who have done wrong. I believe that the high cost of keeping offenders in those centres should encourage the Government to keep them out of the institutions. I wonder what the ratio is of staff to inmates. For the cost of \$2 000 a week per inmate, I imagine that the ratio must be one to one. I hope that, when the opportunity arises to ask questions on the lines, we will get some good answers from the Department and the Minister of Community Welfare in regard to the massive cost of keeping these people.

The cost has increased over the years. The net cost per offender at the South Australian Youth Training Centre in 1982 was \$48 000. It increased to \$57 000 in 1983 and \$73 000 in 1984. As I have said, it has also increased in regard to the South Australian Youth and Remand Assessment Centre from \$57 000 in 1982 to \$73 000 in 1983 and \$104 000 in 1984. That is disgraceful; it is worrying to me, and must be surely worrying to the Government. That being the case, I hope that the Government will spend some thousands of dollars to get those young offenders into the community on community work orders. I know that there are problems in regard to the type of work they can do, but there is plenty of work for them to do and there is work farther out than the metropolitan area. There is no reason why they could not be put farther out into the country areas, and it would do some of them good to have that type of life and to do some work in the outback. There is plenty of work and cleaning up to be done in those areas, and I think that the Government should take that opportunity.

I now refer to the Department of Correctional Services. The Auditor-General's Report states that the average annual net cost per prisoner increased by \$8 900 (that is 36 per cent) to \$34 000. That is rather startling and it worries me. I wonder what is the situation in regard to the problems in the various prisons of this State, particularly Yatala and the Women's Rehabilitation Centre at the Northfield Prison complex. According to the Auditor-General's Report the net cost for the women's prison complex at Northfield in 1981-82 amounted to \$691 000, and the cost per prisoner was \$43 000. The cost per prisoner in 1982-83 was \$38 000. I note that in 1983-84 the cost of keeping a woman in the Northfield prison complex has risen to \$48 000 per year. Therefore, we are back to square one. We have more problems again. The high cost must be as worrying to the Government as it is to me. I refer to a special heading in the Auditor-General's Report in relation to the cost of call-backs and overtime, particularly at Yatala, where the cost increased by \$400 000 to \$2 million, which represents 11.4 per cent of the total cost of salaries and wages.

I wonder how many extra staff could be employed at our penal institutions for \$2 million. I wonder how many shifts are worked at Yatala at the present time. We all know of the arguments in relation to Yatala and we are aware of the conditions for prisoners at Yatala. I compliment the Government on what it is trying to do to upgrade facilities at Yatala. I wonder whether the Government has come to grips with the problem there with prison officers, whether they still refuse to work the extra shift and are only working two shifts. If they are still only working two shifts, that presents a colossal problem for inmates who are locked in their cells for so many hours without being allowed out. As far as I am concerned, that is morally wrong. The cost of overtime of \$2 million would bring in about 70 extra staff according to the community service orders costing.

I think that 70 extra staff members at Yatala, at a cost of \$2 million, would be far better than paying extra overtime. It would certainly be far better for the prisoners, because they would not be locked in their cells for 12 hours. Anyone who has visited Yatala at any time would know what that really means. In relation to the adult correctional services area, the complex at Yatala is not quite finished, but it is not being fully utilised. The Auditor-General states:

Expenditure to 30 June 1984 on the Yatala Prison Industries Complex was \$5.5 million. These facilities are ready for use and were ready for use in April 1982, but remain only partially utilised.

That is another great problem—to have this great complex which was built under the previous two Governments and which is only partly utilised. The Auditor-General's Report also states:

It is anticipated that the complex will be fully commissioned in early 1985.

That may be so, but it is no use its being fully commissioned if it is not going to be used. I imagine that it would have been of some benefit to the inmates at Yatala if they had been occupied in this industries complex.

It is up to the Government to see that it is occupied and used. As I said earlier—and I say again in relation to the adult area of correctional services—it is far better in some cases (not all, obviously) that the people are kept out of the institutions if possible for certain things. The community service orders should be used to the fullest extent. If there is not enough work or if there are objections by certain unions to allowing certain work to be done by prisoners—and in some cases that is understandable—these people should be taken to some of the country areas and to the outback and given some work to do there. There is plenty to do: there is plenty of rubbish about and plenty of old cars to be removed. There are plenty of things to do in the outback with which they could be well occupied and which would keep them from being institutionalised in Yatala Prison or in some of the other prisons. I hope that community service orders will be extended; that would be an advantage to everybody concerned.

The State Transport Authority loss in 1983-84 of \$75.85 million, or \$92 million including loan remissions and fare concessions, is a loss of \$250 054 per day, or \$14 003 per hour in an 18 hour day (the length of the day that the State Transport Authority works), or \$233.38 per minute, or \$3.89 per second. As my colleague the member for Todd says, it is disgraceful; I agree with him. It takes one's breath away to see such a terrible loss in relation to this area. I wonder what the Government will do about this. I wonder what the Minister of Transport will do; it is a pity that he is not here, but no doubt he is listening on the intercom and he would be only too happy to make a statement on what he will do about this colossal loss of \$14 003 per hour by the State Transport Authority. As my colleague the member for Todd says, it is disgraceful. Not only is it disgraceful, but it is very worrying indeed for us on this side of the House

to see that the Government is doing very little about this problem.

The Government appears to be taking no notice of it at all. It appears to have no plan at all to ease the situation of this colossal loss and drain of the taxpayers' money. Earlier, I outlined the massive increases made in State taxation by this Government, and I believe that that is one way—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. If the Premier speaks he closes the debate.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I certainly intend not only to close the debate but to speak at some length about some of the points that have been raised in the course of this debate. Admittedly, much of it has been extremely tedious repetition. As is very often the case with contributions of members opposite these days (faced with the improvement in our economic conditions, the signs of a developing economy, the fact that since the change of Government the path downwards to recession has been arrested and that we are now beginning to move upwards again), they have very little to do except complain about levels of taxes and charges, and about various other matters which seem to be a recurring theme but which are very dishonestly presented, indeed.

In fact, the contribution of the Leader of the Opposition to this debate—what I would have thought was meant to be a leading financial statement, some sort of blueprint suggesting that the Opposition had ideas for economic management in this State—turned into simply a dreary repetitious and, I suggest in many respects, dishonest diatribe on the State finances. That is simply not good enough. I believe that the people of South Australia have woken up to the fact that, apart from the negative harping exemplified in the Leader's speech, there is really nothing of substance that the Opposition can offer. There is certainly no question of its being an alternative Government. If indeed that was their position one would expect to hear what members opposite in government would propose to do.

One would expect the Budget that I have presented—the outlines and the estimates of expenditure—would be subjected to some kind of critical appraisal, with positive alternatives proposed in those areas with which they disagreed. That has not happened. With very few exceptions, members opposite have simply taken the negative approach: they have followed the lead, of course, from the Leader of the Opposition and his Deputy. Members opposite have taken the totally negative and unconstructive approach that has marked their tenure of Opposition and, at the rate they are going, it will be a long tenure indeed—and that is as well for the State of South Australia.

I recognise that some of the points made by the Leader of the Opposition have to be dealt with in detail. I draw particular attention to the oft repeated statement of the Leader of the Opposition (a statement that has been made in a number of debates over the past 18 months or so) that the Liberal Government, prior to the election, was presented with a document by the Treasury which indicated that that Government was facing a deficit in that financial year—that disastrous financial year, 1982-83—of only \$13 million.

The Leader of the Opposition first raised the question of this document on 16 December 1982 during the debate on the Budget review which I tabled. He has said consistently ever since, having first tried to explain what that document suggested—and this prospect of a deficit of just over \$13 million is the key point he draws out of it—that I have never challenged the figures that were given. That has been repeated every time this so-called document is trotted out.

Well, there have been some constraints in my approach to that document. For a start—and I know it is something

that the Leader of the Opposition would find a little hard to understand but it is a fact—considerable care must be taken in the use to which one puts documents that were made available to the previous Government. While the Leader of the Opposition said on the first occasion—

Mr Olsen: You had no trouble pulling out Premiers Conference papers when it suited you. What absolute poppycock you're talking!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Premiers Conference papers that the Leader of the Opposition said I drew out were in fact published in the *National Times* newspaper for all to read. So that is quite an extraordinary allegation.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader will come to order.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is interesting that the Leader is interjecting his usual high tenor and tone of debate, the tone that introduced Fine Cotton hoaxes and dupes, and things like that; the same loose language is being used. The Peacock approach to politics, which has been so enthusiastically embraced by the Opposition in this State, will gather the same respect and the same electoral support it is getting at the Federal level.

Let us ignore the language and get back to the document. I repeat that considerable care must be taken by a Government in the way in which it uses documents which have been supplied to previous Governments. Whatever the Leader of the Opposition says, it is something about which both I personally and my Government are conscious.

There are occasions on which it becomes relevant or indeed necessary for such advice to be produced, but that must be thought about carefully. In relation to this area—the delicate area of financial advice provided by Treasury to the Government of the day—I do not believe that it should be brandished around lightly. There are certain aspects of that advice to which a Government can gain access and which was tendered to its predecessor, but the advice must be used with care because there are constitutional customs—not laws, but customs and traditions—which ought to be observed.

The Leader of the Opposition sneers about that because it is something that he does not understand. His ethical standard does not comprehend that kind of approach. I am not claiming perfection or being holier than thou, but merely suggesting that it is something to which I and my Government give consideration. That has been one of the restraints in directing specific attention to this document to which the Leader of the Opposition continues to refer. I confess that on this occasion and by now, the matter having been brought up again and again and I being constantly challenged to deal with this document, I certainly intend to do so. I have now obtained a copy of that document which I have refrained from doing previously.

Mr Olsen: I have already tabled it—you do not have to get a copy.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Leader of the Opposition said that he tabled it. If I recall—

Mr Olsen: In December 1982.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Leader claims that he tabled that document. How is it that *Hansard* records, on 16 December 1982, the Leader of the Opposition making the point, 'Whilst I am not permitted to table that document, I make it available'? A minute ago the Leader of the Opposition was telling us, 'I tabled that document.' I suggest that he did not table it. He said 'I will make it available.' He did not make it available to me and I have not been able to obtain a copy from any of the sources to which he said he made it available. On this occasion, the matter having been brought up yet again, I have requested a copy of the document supplied to the previous Government. I have

made an analysis of it and will be dealing with it in some detail.

After the House has heard what that document says, it will see that it is totally consistent with the advice given to my Government some mere two months later about the financial position of this State. Certainly, at the date of the document—12 October—which was exactly one month before the election and two months before I tabled the financial statement that the Treasury supplied to us on our coming to office, there were a number of imponderables which had hardened up in the intervening two months. However, there is no question that most of the elements of financial disaster facing the State through the 1982-83 financial year were spelt out clearly enough, if only the previous Government had chosen to read the document. I am sure it did. Members opposite knew what was happening, and that is why they called on the election when they did. That is why the Deputy Leader hastily cobbled together the disastrous gas price agreement with which we are saddled to this very day and right into 1985, his dead hand still on that.

That is all in the context of hiding the true financial position of this State. I will deal with that document in detail, but I will not do that tonight. I will simply content myself tonight with making a reference to the contribution of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition—again, an appallingly negative statement, indicating tired ideas, rehashed views and the same sort of abuse to which most of us had to sit here and listen for some considerable time. It is entertaining occasionally; it was certainly more entertaining when I heard it the first five or six times than it has been the last dozen or so times.

One aspect I raise that I thought was particularly negative and unproductive relates to the Deputy Leader's reference to the Cooper Basin project, particularly the liquids project. That project was opened and the first loading of a vessel with LPG took place, in fact, a week or so ago. Both the previous Premier, the Hon. David Tonkin, and the Deputy Leader were present on that occasion. I attended that function in my official capacity as Premier of the State of South Australia (Premier through a very large part of the time during which that project was undertaken). Indeed, we had hoped that the Prime Minister would be available to officiate, such was the significance of the occasion and the project, but unfortunately he was unavailable, so I was requested to officiate, and quite properly did so on behalf of the people of South Australia.

Fully conscious of the importance of that occasion, and of the presence of the former Premier and the former Minister of Mines and Energy, in my speech I made specific reference to their roles in establishing the indenture and piloting it through the House, which set that particular aspect of the Cooper Basin project going. That, I believe, was very proper. I am not asking for any particular credit for doing that, although a number of people kindly commented later that it is all too rare that a new Government pays proper compliments to its predecessors for something they have done. When that is warranted I believe that that should be done, and I have made it a habit to do so. I made it a habit to do that following an experience I had as Leader of the Opposition, particularly during the first few months following the change of Government in 1979, when I attended function after function in that capacity to find that absolutely no reference was made to the previous Government.

Indeed, on some occasions previous Ministers who had been involved through the whole of the stages of a project were not invited to attend its opening. It was appallingly churlish behaviour. I then made a mental note that if ever I was in that position I would not lapse into the same bad

habit because, quite frankly, apart from what is right to do in such cases, I believe that not doing that rebounds on one, because people are not idiots. For instance, they knew very well that former Premier Tonkin had not devised and built in three months the Colonnades Shopping Centre, which he claimed three weeks after his election was proof that the new Government's policies were working.

He was not the person responsible for the Art Gallery rebuilding, which took place over three years. I attended that opening as Leader of the Opposition. In fact, I had been the Minister in charge of that project. However, no acknowledgements were made. The new STA depot at Regency Park opened within days of the election, yet the former Minister of Transport, Geoffrey Virgo, was not invited to that opening; he was not paid the courtesy of being asked to attend. Perhaps it is just as well that he did not attend, because it would have made it more pointed that there was no reference whatever to the part he had played in that project. And so the list goes on.

I made a mental note that I would try to avoid doing that. It was with that in mind, and because that project was many many months down the track before our Government came to office, that I paid specific tribute before the whole gathering to those two members of the former Government who were present and who had been directly involved in the project. I believe that Mr Goldsworthy, the Deputy Leader, was quite pleased about that. He certainly seemed to be enjoying himself at the function and was obviously pleased that his role in relation to the project had been recognised. When one looks at the deal done in the Cooper Basin gas negotiations, one can see why the producers were happy to greet them in a friendly manner.

Having come back from what was a bipartisan occasion, which was acknowledged, where proper credit was given where credit was due, there was this extraordinary attack in the Deputy Leader's speech in this House on the Budget in which he denounced the bipartisan approach taken and took time off to attack the Government and its role in this matter. I regard that passage of his speech and the things that he said as absolutely churlish. It is certainly a lesson in fair play that we will all bear in mind in future. I do not intend to deal in any more detail with the Deputy Leader's somewhat pitiful contribution to this debate, most of which was things we had heard about many times before over the years. However, I thought that when he referred to the Stony Point project he could have made some quite constructive points, could have paid tribute to its success and could have taken some credit for it—I would not have begrudged him that.

Instead he chose it as an occasion to yet again attack my Government over a project and to denounce the concept of bipartisanship in relation to it. The Leader spelt out very clearly where he stands on that matter, and I will remember that very clearly in the future. When the debate is resumed tomorrow I will certainly deal with the matter of the Leader of the Opposition's total lack of understanding of the State Government's financial position and with the way that the previous Government hid the advice that was given to it in order to try to skate through the election. Heaven help the people of South Australia had it been re-elected. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Coles): Tonight I want to commend the work of Amnesty International, an organisation that works for prisoners of conscience. I want not only to commend Amnesty but also to condemn those who are working either directly or indirectly for causes that are in conflict with Amnesty's aims. Members would recall that we were all invited to join this organisation in recent weeks. I was invited to join Amnesty shortly after my election to Parliament in 1977, and I did so. I gave my financial support, but in those years I was not actively involved in supporting prisoners of conscience through correspondence. However, in recent times I have undertaken correspondence on behalf of prisoners of conscience and I am working especially for the release of a Lithuanian Christian woman who is a prisoner of conscience under the regime of Soviet Russia as a result of her efforts to work for world peace.

Members can probably imagine my feelings when, on opening last week's issue of the Adelaide University student newspaper *On Dit*, I read an article which made it clear that a member of this Chamber is involved with an organisation which gives support and succour to the regime which is the captor of the prisoner of conscience for whose release I am working—and I refer to the member for Elizabeth. An article in last week's issue of *On Dit* entitled 'The Kremlin and Peace' states:

Mr Duncan, a leading figure in the A.L.P.'s left-wing, is deeply involved with Soviet peace organisations.

He is a leading member of the Kremlin controlled 'front' organisation, the World Peace Council, which was set up by Joseph Stalin in 1949 and whose affiliates were roundly condemned by the Australian Labor Party of that era as 'instruments of Soviet imperialism . . . which exploit the desire for peace in the interests of Russian plans . . .'

Since its inception, the World Peace Council has supported the Soviet invasion of Hungary (1956), the Soviet-led invasion of Czechoslovakia (1968), and the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan (1979).

In a letter to the London *Times* last year a former British Labour Minister for Disarmament, Lord Chalfont, exposed the pedigree of the World—

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, this is a matter which is the subject of proceedings in the courts and, therefore, I would have thought it was *sub judice*.

The SPEAKER: I do not follow the honourable member's point on the *sub judice* issue that he is raising. What part is before the court?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The article to which the honourable member referred is the subject of libel proceedings which I am taking, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Order! On the assurance of the honourable member for Elizabeth that the document is before the courts, I rule that it not be further referred to.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: A point of order, Sir. As a point of clarification, is it the situation that the member for Elizabeth has threatened to take legal action, has sent a letter, or is the matter before the court? If it is not before the court, then I understand that it is not *sub judice*.

The SPEAKER: Order! I understand that. I said in my ruling that I was ruling that way only on the basis of the assurance by the honourable member for Elizabeth that the document that the honourable member for Coles was reading from was before the courts. The honourable member for Coles.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: In order to seek further clarification, I ask which court the matter is before. I have an assurance that, whilst the member for Elizabeth has threatened to sue the author of the article, no writ has been issued and the matter is not before any court. Therefore, I ask you, Mr Speaker, to seek the advice of the member

for Elizabeth as to whether my assertion that the matter is not before the court is, in fact, wrong.

The SPEAKER: Order! In that case I come back to the member for Elizabeth and ask him whether or not the document under discussion is before the courts.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: It is not correct that I have threatened action. In fact, I have indicated that I am taking action. Some time last week I instructed my solicitors to issue a writ in this matter. I am not able to give you my assurance that a writ has been issued, because I have not seen it. All I can say is that I have issued instructions to demand an apology and to issue a writ not only against the authors of the article but against the editors of *On Dit* and the Student Union.

The SPEAKER: Order! I will hear the honourable member for Coles.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I have an assurance that no writ has been issued, and that, whatever the instructions of the member for Elizabeth may be, the matter is not before any court. Therefore, it is the liberty of any member to discuss the content of the article in *On Dit*.

The SPEAKER: Order! Under those circumstances, the matter obviously calls for a discretionary ruling. I rule in favour of the member for Elizabeth on the basis of the information that he has given us that he gave instructions for the writ to be issued a week ago. One would anticipate that a writ would be issued in that time. It is a catch 22 situation in that there is no adequate forum where each side can produce the evidence.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Disregarding entirely the article in *On Dit*, I refer to a letter on the letterhead of the Australian Peace Committee signed by E.H. Craill.

The Hon. R.G. Payne: Ted lives in my electorate. I know him well.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: That may be. Mr Craill signed the letter on behalf of the Convening Committee. He invited friends to attend a meeting at 2.30 p.m. on 6 July 1980. It was to be an inaugural meeting to establish a branch of the Australian Peace Committee, and was to be held in the AMW & SU meeting room at 234 Sturt Street, Adelaide. The letter states:

Through affiliation with the World Peace Council, the Australian Peace Committee unites with organisations in 130 countries around the world in the struggle against war and for disarmament.

At the bottom of the letter are the names of the Convening Committee. It states:

Peter Duncan: Member, House of Assembly, Vice-President, Australian Peace Committee.

The letter makes clear that the Australian Peace Committee is affiliated with the World Peace Council. The World Peace Council is well known as an instrument of Soviet foreign policy and it is that policy which is imprisoning the prisoners of conscience for whom we on this side of the House are working. Whatever the honourable member may wish to do by way of litigation, whatever he may threaten to do to those who write for *On Dit*, he cannot deny his name on a letterhead of the Australian Peace Committee, nor his involvement, as recorded in *Quadrant* in September 1982, with the World Peace Council.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I hear a little interjection—a reference to muck raking. If we are going to talk about muck, let us talk about the muck the prisoners of conscience in the USSR are wallowing in because their captors keep them in that situation. If we are going to talk about muck, let us listen and look at those people who are, through no fault of their own, simply because of their Christian beliefs and their wish for peace, imprisoned in horrible conditions too awful for us to contemplate while people such as the member for Elizabeth work for fronts

which are friends of the captors of those prisoners of conscience. I refer particularly to the member for Elizabeth's well publicised visit to the World Peace Council which was held in Helsinki in 1982.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable lady's time is expired.

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): In the time allowed me this evening I wish to raise a matter that has been mentioned to me with some feeling by many people from all walks of life—that is the conduct of the Parliaments in this country and Parliamentarians who sit in them. Many of us (myself included) are becoming increasingly concerned at the way in which the Parliaments in this country are being viewed by the electorate—with steadily declining regard.

Only last week in Canberra we had the incredible situation, I suppose one could say, where one allegation after another was hurled across the floor of the House of Representatives. It was not just a matter of Opposition and Government: it was a real set-to with no real purpose. As a matter of fact, I think that the Federal Treasurer was quoted. This is the man charged with the responsibility for managing this country, telling his predecessor that he was going to squash him like a rat if he carried on the way he was doing. The other incredible thing in Parliament last week was the Peacock affair, as I suppose one could call it, where an allegation was made about the Prime Minister of this country and where Mr Peacock called Mr Hawke a little crook—an allegation, I might say, to this day unsubstantiated. I notice in the *Advertiser* report of the incident there were comments such as:

In the Parliament on Thursday when he called the Prime Minister a little crook, a perverter of the law and one who is associated with criminals and takes his orders from those who direct these criminals...

It is a ridiculous situation and hardly the sort of thing the people of this nation expect from their elected members. I am concerned that all politicians and Parliamentarians are now being tarred with the same brush. Recently, in our own Parliament, we had a situation of an argument over whether or not a member could wear a hat, a matter that got pretty poor publicity, I thought. The upshot of that remark—and one that I assume was meant to be witty—was a comment about another honourable member's hairdo.

I do not think it is relevant whether a politician wears a hat, has false teeth, padded bras or whatever—it has nothing to do with our function in this Parliament. We are here not because of what we look like but because we are supposed to represent our constituents in the districts of the State. I am in a fairly difficult position because I do not have a Party, committee or forum where I can voice my point of view on these things. Obviously, nobody here tonight would care, anyhow. Of course, there is no secret where my philosophies would best fit.

Members interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: It is true. I suppose I could say with honesty that I am a little reluctant to discuss it here tonight. But, I believe that the people of the State and this nation—because we have a Federal situation—deserve much more than they are getting. Recently, even the Government Whip attacked the Address in Reply debate and said that, in essence, most of it was a waste of time. That also received publicity. The member for Hanson attacked the Government for failing to provide a quorum in the House at all times.

Mr Becker: It's true.

Mr PETERSON: Yes, and there are times when one could fire a cannon through this House and not hit anyone. The people of South Australia deserve much more than they get at times from this Parliament and their politicians. The House must remember that it is not an old boys or old

girls club. Members are not meant to sit here and read the newspaper before going for a port and cigar (although I enjoy both in their place). I refer to allegations made in another place on about 8 May or 9 May regarding a Minister's actions and further allegations in that Chamber that a member of this House could not be found sober after 6 o'clock. Those things are not necessary.

The Hon. R.G. Payne: They are disgraceful.

Mr PETERSON: I think that they are disgraceful and certainly are not required. I take my job here as a member seriously and always try to do my best to keep high in people's minds the image of politicians and the Parliament, but this situation continues all the time. Members of all Parliaments prefer to spend their time denigrating the other side. Surely more common sense is required in Parliament.

Another point made by many people concerns the pure conflict between Government and Opposition. The point has been made that we cannot all be wrong all the time and that there must be ideas on both sides that can work. Certainly, there is need for much more consensus in Parliament. I refer to just some of the projects in this State which have proceeded and in relation to which there has been consensus. I refer to the Adelaide Railway Station development, which is a matter of consensus. Not all members will agree as to the dots on the i's and the crossing of the t's, but it is a consensus project. Everyone wants Roxby Downs. What about the Moomba project? Everyone wants it.

Members interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: Members opposite should look at the report of the debate. It is a fact that those projects are a matter of consensus. Why cannot many more matters be the subject of consensus? Why must we go through all the argument? We spend many years arguing points and trying to beat and put each other down. Yet that time could be spent in constructive debate and achieving much more consensus. We need consensus. It is all right for members opposite to have a shot at me; that is their right. However, I believe that consensus is needed, and the electorate, too, believes that it is needed. That is what constituents want from this place.

I often wonder what visitors to this House think. Obviously, for some of them it is an impressive place, and a House where the State's destiny is decided. On the other hand, I am sure that others see a bit of a circus with an overpaid staff and, at times, unfunny entertainers. But, this House is important. It is the House of the State, it is the House where decisions are made. Indeed, I often feel for the schoolchildren whom we bring to visit this House. All honourable members bring children to this House to see it work, and many children must go away wondering what it is all about. They sit up there and wonder what is happening.

People who have spoken to me have expressed disgust on the goings on in Canberra and the reports emanating from our two State Houses. They have expressed their concern about the need for much more consensus. There are projects where consensus has been achieved. I refer, for example, to the submarine construction contract. No member from either side opposes that project—there is not a word of opposition. All honourable members want that. So, why cannot consensus apply in respect of other projects? Repeatedly accusations are made concerning the change of Government and the lack of money left in Treasury. Perhaps, as one constituent indicated, we need at election time a clear statement of the money left in Treasury and how it will be spent by the incoming Government. Certainly, that would stop the argument about what is left and what should be done with the remaining moneys. Perhaps that is another argument to be looked at.

To clarify the attitude of people out there, the other night I had to use a taxi. I did not mention to the taxi driver what I did, but he broached what was obviously his favourite subject, which was politicians and Parliaments. He spent half an hour telling me what he thought about them, and as I got out of the cab, I said, 'What do you really think of politicians?' The term he used was, 'I think they are a mob of orang-outans.' I think that he reflects the attitude of many people. They do not believe that we are doing a worthwhile job and, unless we work to improve our credibility and standing in the community, no-one else will do it: we are the only ones who can do it.

I intend to stay in this House and in politics for a long time. I will do what I can to make our standing better. All I ask is that members of this House, the Upper House and all Parliaments work to that aim. I do not have a halo—not at all. However, I believe that we must have good standing in the community because, once we lose our credibility, we are worth nothing: we are just pawns of political Parties or pressure groups in the community. We must have good standing and credibility, and we are the only people who can do it. If we are not prepared to do that, the will of the people will take over. They all have a vote: we all know that. One fights for votes every time there is an election and, unless one gives them something to vote for, they will change their vote. People have told me now on the Federal scene—

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

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I appreciate the point that the member for Coles made earlier tonight in relation to the World Peace Council. It is interesting to note that Lord Chalfont wrote to the *London Times* and that his letter appeared at page 13 of the 26 April 1983 issue.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

Mr BECKER: No, he was a Minister of the socialist Government. In part, he stated the following in regard to the World Peace Council (and we acknowledge that the member for Elizabeth is a member of the Australian Peace Council, which is affiliated with the World Peace Council):

It is the most important of the Soviet Union's front organisations. It is controlled by the International Department of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which also supervises the activities of the KGB. It was founded after World War II with the principal functions of promoting Soviet foreign policy aims by infiltration and control of activist organisations in Western countries. It has been expelled from France and Austria for subversive activities but now has its headquarters in Helsinki and operates in the United Kingdom through the British Peace Assembly.

It aims to attract non-communists to its meetings, so that they may be associated with resolutions laying the blame for the arms race entirely on the United States and the West.

Therefore, I can understand the concern of the member for Coles, as a member of Amnesty International—

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

Mr BECKER: The member for Elizabeth belongs to it, too, as the honourable member says. The letter by Lord Chalfont of the House of Lords, who was a Minister of the socialist Government, was dated 22 April and printed in the *London Times* on 26 April 1983.

The other point about which I am most concerned is the emergence of the continuing tax slug in South Australia and the impact of the high taxes that have been introduced by the State Labor Government. The current Government is caught up in a terrible situation, which has been partly its own doing, of creating and seeing the establishment of a mini boom in housing and residential allotments—a boom on which this Government will capitalise. Unfortunately, the boom cannot survive. I would like to see it survive, but it cannot survive, particularly in the building industry. The building industry has been flat out trying to catch up the

run-down in the housing sector over the past five years, and within about six to nine months there will be a levelling out for a short period. There will then be a lull, and hopefully it will climb steadily. We want to see in this country steady development and progress so that we do not have sharp upturns and downturns.

That pattern is causing the problem, and it caused many of the headaches in relation to employment over the past decade. The peaks and troughs are too high and too low. Thank God we got rid of Stone in the Federal Treasury. I was never a lover of Mr Stone. I think he was responsible for some terribly conservative policies at times, with switches from one extreme to the other. That turn-on turn-off situation caused the awful peaks and troughs. We should be going along on a far more level plane. We need a damn strong Treasurer who will follow the policy of the Government of the day irrespective of the Party in power.

I refer to an article in the *Advertiser* of 17 September, relating to a possible 10 per cent rise in property values, as follows:

A new method of reporting the value of house sales by the Valuer-General is expected to show rises of up to 10 per cent in metropolitan Adelaide values in the quarter from March to June alone. The first report using the new system will be issued by mid-October and every three months thereafter.

It will contain much greater detail than in the past. Instead of relying on average prices, it will gradually swing over to the use of median values to reflect market conditions more realistically. In the previous system, the Valuer-General reported average prices for local government areas and suburbs. This 'average' value was calculated by adding up total sales revenue and dividing by the number of transactions.

Under the new system, the 'median' or middle price—where half the sales are for lower values and the other half for higher—will be used.

[For instance, if seven houses sold for \$39 000, \$44 000, \$46 000, \$52 000, \$63 000, \$81 000 and \$97 000 the median price is \$52 000, whereas the average price is a fraction over \$60 285].

A preliminary look at the figures now being compiled for the first report shows many properties gained a massive 20 to 30 per cent in value so far this year as the real estate boom gathered momentum.

The Valuer-General is now confirming what I have been saying in relation to the impact of the real property boom in South Australia. The article continues:

Big rises appear to have occurred in the inner local government areas and especially in suburbs like Woodville close to the city. But there has also been a dramatic rise in values in the Glenelg area and in some Adelaide Hills centres. At Stirling, for example, there has also been a significant catch-up following five years of sluggish appreciation with prices moving up by around 10 per cent in the period from March to June.

Figures are not yet available for the June to September period, but when these are taken into account in the new median values,

it is expected they will confirm dramatic gains for most metropolitan areas. In the past, the Valuer-General has only been able to provide sketchy details of property values in South Australia but now, by using a more complex computer programme, his department has been able to extend the range of information available.

The next report will analyse separately sales of houses, maisonettes, home units, flats, hotels/motels, commercial/industrial properties, vacant lots, rural living, non-viable primary production, primary production and other categories. For those working in real estate as agents or valuers, the new statistical information will be made available by the Valuer-General on microfiche at a fee of \$25 a quarter in January, April, July and October.

We are still stuck with this terrible situation of the Valuer-General sending out his field staff, looking at a property, assessing the sales in an area, and then placing a value on a property. For years I have said that this method is an educated guess. I still maintain that to place a valuation on any one given property is nothing more than an educated guess. I refer to the situation of a constituent at Henley Beach South who has seen the property value on his house rise from \$30 000 to \$80 000. Last year the Valuer-General revalued the Henley and Grange council area, so that the impact of property valuations is now being felt in the council rates and the water and sewerage rates. This constituent has seen his water rates increase by 200 per cent. His council rates have gone from \$196 to \$372. His property valuation went up by 166 2/3rds per cent; yet his water and sewerage rates went up by 200 per cent.

My constituent is complaining that in 1979, when the last property valuations were done in the Henley and Grange Council area, it took two weeks of his pension to pay his water and sewerage rates and his council rates. Now, it takes just over five weeks of his pension to pay the current water and sewerage rates and his council rates after the deduction of the concessions that are offered. The concession for his council rates is \$150; so his council rates have gone from \$372 down to \$222. His water rates have gone from \$20.98 a quarter to \$65.30. This situation makes it extremely difficult for the aged, for pensioners and for the unemployed in that community. How can they maintain a roof over their heads? How can they maintain their standard of living when in just under five years my constituent—a pensioner—has lost 3½ weeks of his income just to meet two basic commodities: water and sewerage rates and council rates?

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

Motion carried.

At 10.7 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 19 September at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 18 September 1984

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

20. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism representing the Minister of Health: What are the estimated cost savings to the Government if the recommendation of the Sax Committee to close 200 beds at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital is implemented?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Theoretically, the closure of 200 beds at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital could result in gross cost savings of the order of \$7.1 million in a full year. However, revenue forgone could be of the order of \$4.4 million in a full year, resulting in a net saving of \$2.7 million in a full year. The extent of new savings would depend on a number of variables, including the type and location of the beds to be closed, the timing of the bed closures and the relevant labour cost structure and nature of associated staff redeployments.

The report of the Committee of Inquiry into Hospital Services in South Australia (Sax Report) did not specifically recommend the closure of 200 beds at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. It supported the proposals recommended in the Metropolitan Hospitals Planning Framework (1983) that inpatient accommodation at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital be reduced from 702 to 500 beds. Currently, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital has 652 commissioned beds. The Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the South Australian Health Commission are presently conjointly working towards the production of a role and function statement to define the hospital's future activities, with special reference to the balance of this decade. It is in this context that bed closures and the associated cost savings at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital will be addressed.

SCHOOL COMPUTERS

23. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What is the stock of computers in each Education Department school, how many in each school have been supplied by the Education Department and how many from other sources (for example, school councils)?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Education Department does not supply computers to schools except in circumstances involving the loan of equipment for the trial of particular materials or programmes of use. As examples of this, ten Apple II microcomputers were loaned to schools (complete with a range of software) for periods of one month per school during 1980-83, to allow schools to experience use of a microcomputer in their own classroom environments before coming to any decision on purchase. This loan programme was managed through the Angle Park Computing Centre.

Specialist peripheral equipment (graphic tablets, music synthesisers, additional disk drives and printers) is available for loan to schools from the APCC if a case is put for that loan. Equipment that is supplied as a result of donation to the Education Department or through projects conducted with private companies, the Curriculum Development Centre or the Schools Commission is placed in schools and the information gained from these projects is disseminated to other schools. For example:

A classroom set of Tandy equipment allocated to the Mitcham Primary School has been used to provide information related to computers and primary school writing that has been of considerable value in developing similar programmes of use in other schools.

A classroom set of Commodore equipment was installed at The Heights School for use in the middle school section to investigate suitable applications for low level equipment to complement a more sophisticated set of equipment purchased by the school for senior school use.

Curriculum Development Centre grants have been sought and won to allow a Computers and Writing Project to be conducted, involving eight computers at Para Vista High School, and a Girls and Computing Project, involving another eight computers at Gepps Cross Girls High School and The Heights School.

A project with IBM will result in the installation of 16 IBM personal computers in each of Campbelltown and Wirreanda High Schools.

A small amount of equipment has been acquired through Commonwealth funded programmes (for example, a classroom set of microcomputers at Morphett Vale High School) through individual school submissions. Education Department schools currently receive a school grant that may be used by the school to acquire resources that are needed to support the curriculum. No specific allocation is made for the purchase of computing equipment; nor has any been in the past.

The proportion of school grant funds and funds raised through the local community that is used to purchase computer equipment is determined by each school. Schools are not required to detail the sources of funds when they seek approval to purchase computer equipment, although they are required to certify that the purchase has school council approval and it is expected that the council is fully involved in the decision making process that leads to the purchase.

With regard to the stock of computers in each school, a questionnaire was sent to all schools at the beginning of the school year and data from subsequent equipment purchase approvals has been used to update the information obtained from the questionnaire. The information that has been obtained in this way indicates that there are approximately 1 600 microcomputers in Education Department schools (although it must be realised that the figures increase each week as additional equipment is acquired). I should also stress that the number of computers in particular schools is not, of itself, a particularly useful statistic isolated from the type of equipment, the range of peripherals, the software and courseware that is employed, the use of the equipment within the curriculum and the computer literacy of the school staff.

DALHOUSIE SPRINGS

33. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: Has Dalhousie Springs at Mount Dear Station, recently purchased by the Government at a cost of \$750 000, been subject to any Aboriginal land rights claims?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: No.

SPECIAL EMPLOYMENT INITIATIVES UNIT

42. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Labour: Has the Special Employment Initiatives Unit been formed within the Department of Labour and, if not, when will it be formed and, if so, what sections of the existing Depart-

ment will or have been included and will additional staff be required within the Department for its establishment?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The Special Employment Initiatives Unit has been established within the Department of Labour. The Unit comprises the section of the Department which administers the Self Employment Ventures Scheme. An additional four staff have been allocated to the Unit.

SCHOOL LIBRARY RESOURCE CENTRES

66. **The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. What 'expanded services' will be available to school library resource centres in 1985?

2. What 'very substantial improvements' will be evident at school level following reorganisation of the School Libraries Branch?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. Mr J. Dwyer, Principal Education Officer, together with two professional officers, has been transferred from the former School Libraries Branch to the Curriculum Directorate specifically to form a new Library Resources Development Unit, which will concentrate on the development of strategies for the provision and maximum utilisation of resources in schools.

An additional position of Project Officer has been established and advertised. The successful applicant will join the Library Resources Development Unit. The application calls for a person with experience as a teacher-librarian, and awareness of R-12 curriculum and current developments in library automation.

Additional library adviser positions are being established at Area level, as follows:

Area	1985	Increase on 1984
Adelaide	2.0	+0.5
Eastern	1.0	+1.0
Southern	1.0	+0.6
Western	2.0	+0.6

(The library adviser position in the Northern Area is being retained)

Moreover, a Superintendent (Curriculum) and a Superintendent (Student, School and Community Services) is being appointed in each area, and all of these officers are expected to take a keen interest in Library Resource Centre services. As a result of the above initiatives there will be a significant expansion of services to school library resource centres in 1985.

2. Past experience has been that the services of skilled advisers have led to very substantial benefits at school level. In this case, it is the reason for the intense interest, which has been widely expressed, in increasing the support staff for library resource centres, and I am very pleased that a significant increase is to be made next year in this area.

It is anticipated that substantial improvements will be evident in such things as the knowledge of school staff about the availability of resources, changed attitudes perceived by many teacher-librarians as desirable in some schools, towards the place of library resource centres in serving the curriculum, increased use of library resource centres (at least in some schools), and the increased expertise and knowledge of teacher-librarians, who will, generally speaking, have stronger support and access to a wider range of information.

ADOPTION

67. **Mr OSWALD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare: Is the Government reviewing legisla-

tion to allow adopted children to have access to files that will permit them to find out the names and other details of their natural parents?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The Government is not currently reviewing adoption regulations. I am awaiting the outcome of reviews and proposed legislative changes in several other States before deciding what steps are necessary for South Australia. A small number of minor changes to regulations have been made recently. They did not deal with the question of access to information about natural parents.

MITCHAM GIRLS HIGH SCHOOL

70. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Why has the letter dated 16 April 1984 from Mitcham Girls High School concerning upgrading of facilities remained unanswered and will the Minister personally apprise himself of the situation by visiting the school during 1984?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I have sought a report on the facilities at the school and am awaiting receipt of same. I propose to visit the school during the third term this year.

Mr G. RAMSEY

72. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Is Mr G. Ramsey, former Principal of the South Australian College of Advanced Education, on a period of secondment to the Federal Government or has he resigned?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Dr. G. A. Ramsey, formerly Principal of the South Australian College of Advanced Education, is on a period of secondment to the Federal Government position of Chairman of the Advanced Education Council. I wish to make it clear that the period of leave is without pay and simply provides a mechanism acceptable to both the Federal Minister for Education and Youth Affairs and me for Dr Ramsey to continue his existing superannuation. The period of leave is for his seven year term and has been granted on the conditions that: there be no obligation on the College to have him back as a staff member at some future time; he continue himself to meet the employee obligations to the fund; and as the College is funded from Federal funds and the South Australian Superannuation Scheme is an emergent cost scheme, Dr Ramsey's employer entitlements be met from Commonwealth funds on his retirement.

NURSE TRAINING

75. **Mr OSWALD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: In view of the Commonwealth Government's decision to move to full CAE based education for student nurses to be phased in from 1990:

- what is the future of nursing training in Whyalla;
- will the Regional Education Centre be involved;
- will the Regional Education Centre become part of the SAIT campus at Whyalla;
- is it intended that the Whyalla TAFE College play a role in future nurse training in Whyalla; and
- will Whyalla still be a training base for Whyalla, Port Augusta and Port Lincoln?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The honourable member's question appears to refer to the North-West Nurse Education Centre proposed to be based at Whyalla. It was proposed that this regional nurse education centre would provide an interim step in the process of improving educational facilities within the Eyre Peninsula by amalgamating the schools of

nursing from Whyalla, Port Augusta, and Port Lincoln. The Commonwealth Government's decision to support 'in principle' the total transfer of basic nursing education from hospital schools or nursing to colleges of advanced education means that the development of the North-West Nurse Education Centre must be reconsidered in the light of that decision. Detailed discussions will be held in the very near future.

In relation to the specific points raised in the question, I would indicate that:

- (c) it is likely the Centre would be associated with the Whyalla campus of the South Australian Institute of Technology;
- (d) It is doubtful that the Whyalla TAFE College would be involved in any major way since the Commonwealth's decision is to support a total transfer of nurse education to higher education not to technical and further education; and,
- (e) it is envisaged that Whyalla will continue to be the focus for nurse education and training in the northern area.

38-HOUR WEEK

76. **Mr OSWALD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism representing the Minister of Health:

1. When does the Minister intend obtaining an answer to the question without notice asked by the member for Morphett on 23 August 1984 concerning a deal between the Minister of Health and the unions over the timing of the implementation of the 38-hour week in hospitals?

2. In what month was a committee set up to investigate the implications of the implementation of a 38-hour week in our hospitals, on what date was the committee due to report and will the report be made public?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: On 4 November 1983 the Minister of Labour made an offer to the UTLC to establish a committee to investigate the ramifications of introducing a 38-hour week in the South Australian Health Commission. The offer did not make a commitment to date of operation, and indicated that reduction in hours in the health system must await substantial movement in similar employment areas in other public services.

The UTLC accepted the formation of the committee and its terms of reference on 1 February 1984. The Public Service Association and Royal Australian Nursing Federation had already accepted the proposal in late 1983. The first meeting occurred on 9 February 1984.

Subsequent to that meeting industrial action was initiated in the hospitals. On 23 February 1984 the UTLC was advised that Government would still not agree to a date of operation but that subject to the lifting of bans the committee could continue its work and once suitable offsets to minimize costs were agreed upon the Deputy Premier would refer the matter to Cabinet for its approval.

The UTLC was also advised at that time that Cabinet approval would not be delayed by any requirement for further interstate movement. However, any agreement reached would require ratification by the South Australian Industrial Commission in accordance with the wage indexation guidelines before it could be implemented.

No date was set for the committee to present its report to the Deputy Premier because of the need to fully identify

possible cost offsets to minimise the costs of introduction of the 38-hour week. The report will in due course be made public as part of the proceedings before the S.A. Industrial Commission to have the 38-hour week agreement ratified.

77. **Mr OSWALD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism representing the Minister of Health:

1. Upon the implementation of the proposal for the 38-hour week in South Australian hospitals, will staff be required to work two hours less per week, four hours less per fortnight or a 19-day month or will they be required to take time off in lieu which would be attached to their annual holidays?

2. Will staff in Government hospitals currently working a 40-hour week be paid for 40 hours if the hours of work are reduced to 38 hours per week?

3. What is the calculated cost in extra salaries to provide the replacement staff to keep all services at the present level if the 38-hour week is introduced into public hospitals?

4. Does the South Australian Health Commission intend to increase staffing levels in public hospitals to compensate for the loss of shift time by present employees?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

1. The preferred option for unions involved is a 19-day month. Investigations completed to date indicate that a 19-day month appears viable for non-nursing staff in hospitals. Accordingly, a date of operation of 1 October has been agreed, subject to agreement on substantial offsets to minimise the costs and ratification by the Industrial Commission in accordance with the wage indexation guidelines. Introduction of a 19-day month for nursing staff poses certain practical difficulties, and alternatives are still under consideration.

2. Yes. The existing weekly rates of pay will not be reduced by the introduction of the 38-hour week.

3. If additional staff were provided on a direct replacement basis to maintain current level of service and provide a 19-day month for both nursing and non-nursing personnel the increase in salaries and wages would be \$13.5 million (approximately). This figure does not take account however of any cost offsets that may be agreed.

4. Yes. The implementation of a 19-day month for service staff involves a critical review of current work practices, and the negotiation of offsets in order to keep staffing increases to a minimum.

TARCOOLA MAIN STREET

81. **Mr GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Does the Highways Department have any plans to seal the main street of Tarcoola and, if not, why not?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: Subject to the availability of funds, the Highways Department proposes to undertake this project next financial year.

REPLIES TO LETTERS

90. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism, representing the Minister of Health: When will the Minister of Health be answering the letters of 20 February and 15 June 1984 (reference: MH 70/82) from the member for Hanson?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The letters have now been answered.