

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 20 September 1984

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

### PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor's Deputy, by message, intimated his assent to the Bill.

### QUESTION

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that a written answer to a question as detailed in the schedule that I now table be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

### ELECTORAL ROLL

In reply to Mr **FERGUSON** (15 August).

The **Hon. G.J. CRAFTER**: Recent amendments and additions to the Commonwealth Electoral Act, which became operative on 21 February 1984, enable electors who consider their personal safety, or the safety of their families, to be at risk to apply for the suppression of their address from the printed electoral rolls.

As South Australia and the Commonwealth have a jointly maintained and printed roll for this State, the Attorney-General proposes to introduce complementary legislation on this matter during the present session of Parliament as part of comprehensive overhaul of the State Electoral Act.

### QUESTION TIME

#### MEDIA REPORTS

Mr **OLSEN**: Will the Premier name the sections of the media which he accused in a lunchtime speech of deliberately exaggerating the impact of the Government's higher taxes? In a speech today to the Australian Business Economists luncheon the Premier said that sections of the media had set out deliberately to exaggerate the impact of the Government's taxation measures. The Premier did not specify at which media organisations his accusations were directed. This is the third case of media bashing to come from the Government this week following the Minister of Transport's attack on the *News* and the member for Elizabeth's attack on Matt Abraham. The facts speak for themselves. The Premier has increased taxation by almost—

The **SPEAKER**: Order! The honourable Leader is now debating.

Mr **OLSEN**: The position is—as clearly reported in those newspapers—that taxation collections have gone up 39.7 per cent in South Australia—some 40 per cent. That fact is clarified and supported by the Budget documents tabled by the Premier in this House. That is in addition to the other Budget documents tabled in this House that indicate that the number of people unemployed is 4 500 more than when he came to office.

The **SPEAKER**: Order! The honourable Leader is now clearly debating this issue.

Mr **OLSEN**: The Budget papers tabled by the Premier clearly indicate the facts before the Parliament: there are 4 500 more unemployed—

The **SPEAKER**: Order! That is not my point at all. The point of the question, I understood, is that the honourable Leader wants the Premier to identify certain people whom he is alleged to have attacked in some way. What I am saying is that in explaining that question the honourable gentleman cannot canvass a whole range of Budget options and point out what is true and what is not true in his own opinion.

Mr **OLSEN**: The media has reported that the number of people unemployed is 4 500 more than the level when this Government came to office and the number of people employed is 1 900 fewer, despite his promises to create more jobs for South Australians. In the lunchtime speech the Premier referred to the attitudes of interstate business men to South Australia, but denied the opportunity to explain to the lunchtime audience the results of the Department of State Development research work undertaken in the Eastern States of Australia which indicates the contrary view: it tells a different story about the perception of South Australia of those interstate business men. Because these facts give no cause for the Premier's own exercise in media bashing today, I ask him to name the specific media organisations to which he was referring.

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON**: I am sorry that the Leader of the Opposition was not present, as were his colleagues the member for Mitcham, and the Hons Miss Laidlaw and Mr Davis from another place, who found it appropriate to attend and listen to my remarks about the South Australian economy and the Federal and State Budgets. He would have found it enlightening and, more importantly, he would have been able to put it in context.

I was certainly referring to the all too frequent tendency, which I think is generally accepted, that bad news unfortunately gets much more prominence than does good news and was suggesting that we should try to maintain some sort of balance. My remarks were quite general. I notice that the Leader of the Opposition does not mention the main burden of what I was saying to this gathering, which was that the attitude of the Opposition in this State—the falsehoods it is peddling—in fact are flowing out to the other States, causing confusion and undermining the strategies of recovery. I made that point.

*Members interjecting:*

The **SPEAKER**: Order!

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON**: The Leader of the Opposition, in his pathetic question about something at which he was not even present, has indicated just how negative and unconstructive is the Opposition.

*Members interjecting:*

The **SPEAKER**: Order! The honourable member for Hartley. Order! The honourable member cannot make himself heard.

### TOURISM

Mr **GROOM**: Can the Minister of Tourism inform the House how favourably Adelaide compares, particularly alongside Melbourne, as a tourist attraction, as one of the key factors now seems to be weather? My question arises following a lengthy and interesting report in today's *Melbourne Age*, headed 'Good reasons for discontent in our city's winters'. This report takes a serious look at Melbourne's weather pattern and includes some hard basic statistics. The major target, as one would imagine, is the unattractiveness of Melbourne's winters. But, what interested me most was that the reporter offered comparative statistics for Sydney and Brisbane, but not Adelaide. It occurred to me that this might be because we would come out in comparison too well. By way of final explanation, I imagine the Minister is

aware of the extent to which this State depends on winter weary Victorians for its tourist inflow. As I understand it, of trips made to South Australia from interstate, a total of 63 per cent originate in Victoria, mostly from Melbourne.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Minister.

*Mr Gunn interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. Our colleagues opposite seem to be obsessed with the media. I am not too sure of the point that the member for Eyre is making, but, if I heard him correctly, as usual he is incorrect. It is suggested to me that, in comparison to Adelaide, Melbourne is a holiday departure point. I certainly have had access to that article in the *Age* to which the honourable member refers, and I am not about to miss the opportunity to compare Adelaide's weather and Adelaide as a holiday destination with our friends across the border.

It is very interesting that the *Age*, in the key statistics published, carefully avoided Adelaide as a comparison and in fact, as the honourable member pointed out, compared Melbourne with Sydney and Brisbane. I think that the reasons it did not compare Melbourne with Adelaide are quite obvious, and I would like to give the House and our friends in Melbourne, particularly those thinking of coming to South Australia as potential tourists, some comparisons between Melbourne and Adelaide weather.

The *Age* notes that Sydney gets 2 450 hours of Sunshine annually. Melbourne, of course, has an average of 2 071 hours. However, the people in Victoria were not informed, and in fact would have to go to the *South Australian Year Book* to find out, that South Australia averaged over the past 92 years 2 525 hours of sunshine a year. Of course, as we all know, tourists like to see the sun shining. This is the place where they can be guaranteed that that will happen. Taking another example, Melbourne has much colder winters than we have in Adelaide. For instance, in May the average maximum in Melbourne in degrees Centigrade is 16.5; in Adelaide it is 18.5; in June, the average maximum in Melbourne is 14.5 and in Adelaide it is 15.6; in July the average maximum in Melbourne is 13.5 and in Adelaide it is 14.9; in August the average maximum in Melbourne is 14.9 and in Adelaide it is 16.1; and in September—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I am sure that honourable members are very interested in this. In September, the average maximum in Melbourne is 17.1 and in Adelaide it is 18.4. This is heavy stuff, as the honourable member (wherever he comes from) mentioned, because very few people other than perhaps the shadow Minister understand the relevance of the information I am giving to this House. Hopefully, it will filter through to the *Age* and possibly to that major market for South Australia in Victoria.

The final *Age* statistics related to days of rain. Melbourne averages 143 days annually and Adelaide averages only 120, with the exception of when the Minister of Water Resources feels that it is appropriate to fill the reservoirs, and I am sure that that is what is happening at present because the weather we have had during the last week or so is not typical of South Australia and I would hate any tourist to feel that it is.

**Mr Mathwin:** Would you like a drink of water?

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** No, I do not think that I will need a drink of water. Particularly in the December and January holiday season, in South Australia we have 10 days of rainfall annually and Melbourne has 18 days. A member of my departmental staff rang the Bureau of Meteorology and was given information by a Bureau officer who was completely unbiased, because he comes from a climate somewhat more inclement than that of Melbourne—I understand that he comes from England. My colleague the

Minister of Housing and Construction would be very interested to hear, and certainly it is widely acknowledged, that Adelaide's climate is less harsh than is Melbourne's, is drier and more stable, and he gratuitously offered the comment that our beaches are better.

If we add all those climatic indicators together, we come to the inescapable conclusion that there is good reason indeed for the more than half a million trips made in this direction from Victoria every year. South Australia's being the driest State in the Commonwealth does happily bring some returns, because most tourists like to go on holiday and be fairly certain that they will not be met with rainy weather.

### GENERAL RETAIL SALES TAX

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Does the Premier now support proposals for the States to be given the power to impose additional taxes, such as a general retail sales tax? In a report published yesterday, the Fiscal Powers Subcommittee of the Constitutional Convention has recommended that the States be given the power to impose a general retail sales tax. This was a possibility raised on a number of occasions by the former Premier, Mr Tonkin, as an alternative to pay-roll tax.

At that time, the present Premier constantly opposed and misrepresented the proposal. For example, in a press statement on 20 September 1982, without acknowledging that it was being proposed as an alternative to pay-roll tax, he said that a sales turnover tax would not only hit families but would also be a body blow to retailers and small businesses. However, since coming to office the Premier appears to have had yet another change of mind. He has thrown off the shroud of doom and gloom which encircled him and his Deputy for three years. In a letter to the Chief Executive Officer of the Constitutional Convention, the Premier has supported moves to give the States a broader tax base through changes to the Federal Constitution. His views were sought by the convention specifically in the context of giving the States additional powers to raise revenues through measures such as pay-roll tax. In his letter, dated 3 October 1983, the Premier supported a direct amendment to section 90 of the Constitution, which is the principal impediment to a broader tax base for the States. The Premier also said of the work of the Fiscal Powers Committee:

I trust that it will not be deterred by failures of the past or by negative attitudes which can continue to be expected from some quarters.

While the Premier's approach to this whole question was completely negative during his period as Opposition Leader, I ask whether he will confirm now that the realities of government have caused him to change his position to one of support for State powers to impose a general retail sales tax.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is confusing the general question with a particular proposal. I have not changed my mind on that proposal; I do not support a general sales tax. However, I certainly support—and I hope all honourable members would support—the rationalisation of our current tax structure which in a deplorable state. Indeed, if the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, as well as the Leader of the Opposition, had been present at the gathering at which the member for Mitcham and a number of other members on that side of the House had been present at lunchtime, they would have heard me raise the point that our tax system, and the respective—

*The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** No—powers between the Federal Government and the States are in a mess, and just one fact that I brought out in opposition establishes that. From our own revenue raising base, that is as a State Government, about 40 per cent of our revenue derives from pay-roll tax. There is general agreement that that is a regressive tax and a tax on employment.

*The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The honourable member said that I never acknowledged it as Leader of the Opposition. I would refer him to the policy speech and to various other occasions on which I made that point abundantly clear. However, let me repeat it again: I did not suggest that the replacement for pay-roll tax should be a general retail sales tax, and I am still of that opinion. So, I have not changed, but I certainly support—

*The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I do not know why I bother to answer these interjections, but let me put it very crisply and clearly: I have opposed the dependence of the State tax base on pay-roll tax and I believe that it should be eliminated. However, it cannot be eliminated unless we find some alternative range or group of taxing powers or taxes on exchange with the Federal Government. I do not accept that one of those should be a general retail sales tax. That is the position. It is vital that some changes are made in this tax structure as soon as possible in conjunction with the Federal and State Governments. The letter quoted by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is totally consistent with what I have just said.

#### INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

**Mr MAYES:** Is the Minister of Education aware of an article in yesterday's *Australian* which highlighted funding difficulties currently being encountered by the South Australian Institute of Technology, and what steps has he taken to assist the Institute?

**An honourable member:** What about other tertiary institutions?

**Mr MAYES:** A number of concerned staff have contacted me regarding this funding difficulty being encountered by the Institute of Technology. In particular, I refer to the article in the *Australian* of 19 September which stated:

The South Australian Institute of Technology is trying to extricate itself from the jurisdiction of the State Industrial Commission so it can chop back its academics' salaries to recommended levels. SAIT has taken the drastic step of asking the State Government to remove it from the commission's jurisdiction so it can begin paying its academics at the level demanded by the Federal Government.

It further states:

It has also asked the State Education Minister, Mr Arnold, to consider legislation which would make the tribunal's recommendations legally binding on the Institute, therefore superseding the commission's ruling.

Will the Minister reply to the question?

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** Yes, I am aware of the article that appeared in yesterday's *Australian*, and I have been aware of the issue for some time. It was drawn to my attention in 1983 when the council of the Institute pointed out the severe difficulties that it was going to have given the funding proposals from the Commonwealth in relation to the Institute of Technology. During the progress of the question there was an interjection, 'What about other tertiary institutions?' I have already indicated my concern in this House and stated the approaches that I am making in that regard. In this instance, a different kind of funding problem applies to the Institute: on the one hand it is paying wages that have been determined by a State wage setting tribunal

and, on the other hand, it is being funded by the Commonwealth on the basis of wages being paid at levels determined by a Commonwealth tribunal. Those two figures do not match and, adhering to the State award, as it is obliged to do, the Institute is paying about \$175 000 more than the sum for which it has been funded.

I have made a number of approaches to the Federal Minister stating the inequity of the situation with the South Australian Institute of Technology and the great difficulties with which it was faced. It really was adhering to a legal situation and was being financially penalised because of it. It is the responsibility of the Commonwealth to pick up that matter. In May this year I wrote to the Federal Minister, again reiterating the case, and went on to say that, if he was determined that it shall be that the Institute shall adhere to Federal wage rates, it was appropriate for the Federal Government to legislate accordingly to determine how wage rates should be set for the Institute of Technology and that, if the Commonwealth did not agree to introducing legislation like that, it was appropriate for the Commonwealth to provide the extra money for the Institute so that it could adhere to that to which it was supposed to adhere. The reply I got in the initial circumstances was not to accept my proposition. The Commonwealth has argued that it does not have to change the legislation, but that really leaves us in the same dilemma that we have been in all along. The Institute has put to me the proposition that I should consider State legislation in this matter.

I am having advice provided to me by the Tertiary Education Authority and Crown Law on the advisability of our even considering that question. When I receive that advice, I will inform Cabinet and we will make a determination on the matter. I firmly believe that the legislative responsibility in this regard rests with the Commonwealth and that it should be introducing legislation if it wants a determination made between two separate wage determining bodies. If it is not prepared to do that, it should be making funds available because, quite frankly, the Institute of Technology is not mis-spending this money or deliberately flouting regulations that are being laid down by the Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission. It is spending money according to constraints appropriately imposed upon it by wage determining authorities.

So, they would be unfairly penalised if they had to bear the \$175 000. The other point is, however, that quite regardless of the general issue the Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission has, upon my request, agreed to have discussions with the institute about the level of the amount. There is some query that the \$175 000 may be way in excess of what the figures should actually be. Those discussions are proceeding separately at this time.

#### ELECTRICITY TARIFFS

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Because a 14 per cent increase in electricity tariffs will increase the Government's tax take from electricity consumers by \$4 million in a full year, has the Premier reviewed the Government's 5 per cent levy on the Electricity Trust, as he promised to do last year? In a statement that was reported in the *Advertiser* of 1 November last year, following a 12 per cent increase in electricity tariffs (the second increase by the present Government since being in office), the Premier said that the Government would consider reducing the 5 per cent levy on the Trust. This is the levy that the present Premier, when he was Leader of the Opposition, constantly described as a form of backdoor taxation. If another 14 per cent increase in tariffs occurs soon (and the General Manager of the Trust has suggested that the increase could be even greater), the Government's

tax take from consumers would be increased by \$4 million in a full year, and that would occur unless the levy was reviewed.

The total cost of the levy this financial year is estimated at more than \$24 million, and the Government's revenue from the Trust has also been boosted by a further \$12 million following rearrangement of the Trust's debt servicing arrangements. This \$36 million in Government revenue taken directly from electricity consumers is about double the extra cost that the Trust faces from rising natural gas prices, which exposes a complete dishonesty. The Government's suggestion that the higher gas price is the major reason for the rise in electricity tariffs is very clearly exploded by this information.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I covered this matter in response to the Leader of the Opposition yesterday. I wish that the member for Light had accorded me the courtesy of listening. I was not aware of his joining in with the interjections that occurred at that stage—I thought that he was listening. I refer the honourable member to the answer that I gave then. The levy to which he referred has been part of the tax base since 1971: it is not the reason why electricity tariffs will need to rise this year. I repeat that and make quite clear that that is not the reason why tariffs will rise this year. The reason is quite clearly as has been spelt out.

First, a 22 per cent increase in the price of natural gas will occur from 1 January 1985, and that will be on top of a 20 per cent increase that occurred as from 1 January 1984 as a result of an agreement that was entered into, in an election context, by the previous Government. Secondly, it is due to the commissioning this year of the Northern Power Station which has resulted in the immediate taking into the ETSA accounts of the depreciation on that facility. Thirdly, it is due to the dramatic increase in insurance which must be paid by ETSA to cover the Trust against natural disasters. That will increase from something like \$56 000 to an amount in excess of \$5 million—much more than the amount to which the honourable member referred. Fourthly, a tree lopping programme will cost about \$6 million. Those elements alone are in addition to the ordinary inflationary effect. Not one of those elements is affected by the levy to which the honourable member referred and which is part of the tax base. If it is removed from ETSA (and I repeat again that it is not affecting the increase in ETSA tariffs this year)—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** It is not. It is not increasing it in any way whatsoever. If it is removed from that base, I invite honourable members to suggest from where the replacement income will come and what programmes will be cut. In the meantime, I reiterate that the matter is being kept under review. However, it is totally and absolutely untrue that it is having any impact on the increased tariffs this year, and it is about time that members opposite started telling the truth.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

## LAND PRICES

**Ms LENEHAN:** Is the Minister for Environment and Planning aware of a report stating that the Government is responsible for an increase in land prices? Does the Minister on behalf of the Government accept this as a reasonable statement of the real position, and in any event what is the Government doing about it? The member for Light was quoted on radio yesterday morning as blaming the Government for a 50 per cent increase in land prices because of a lack of serviced blocks of land for sale. As the Morphett

Vale East project which is earmarked for early development is in my district, my interest in this matter is quite obvious.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** Yes, I did hear the news comment to which the honourable member refers. While the facts of an increase in land prices cannot be denied (indeed, I predicted it and warned South Australians about this 12 months ago), I am perhaps a little surprised to hear the Opposition entering the list in relation to this particular matter.

It is not possible, of course, to produce serviced allotments either out of thin air or in a matter of a day or a week. I think it is perhaps a little instructive if I could rehearse, without unduly going on too long with the House, exactly what is at issue. The price of allotments, or indeed an increase in the price of allotments, really depends on two variables: one is the cost of servicing those allotments, because these days it is a requirement of the Planning Act that allotments can only be sold fully serviced; and the other is the supply and demand position.

Let us just remember the position from which we have come. There was a time in the mid-1970s when both private enterprise and the Land Commission were busy producing serviced allotments and this State was in a very healthy position, as it largely remains Australia wide in terms of costs. Then, of course, there was a dramatic slump, and when a dramatic slump occurs and people are left with serviced allotments on their hands, if they are in private enterprise there is not a quid in it for them to be producing more serviced allotments, so the private development industry, in the light of that market collapse, contracted severely. In those circumstances the only way of ensuring any growth of allotments is by that second mechanism—by having a Government agency able to produce allotments, because they are relatively insulated from market conditions compared with the private sector.

What we found was that a Liberal Government came in and drastically altered the Land Commission in such a way that it was no longer able to perform this function at a time when it was most critical that it should have been able to do so. That is the situation we had—

*The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** —when the member for Murray was Minister. Private enterprise, for obvious reasons, was not performing, because it could not get a dollar out of it, and the other mechanism was now denied the public. That is a situation we faced when coming to Government. We also faced a further situation in that a new Planning Act had been introduced which, although it was highlighted as being a means whereby there would be a considerable streamlining in the planning process, initially the reverse was the case.

I invite members to consider this particular mechanism. In order for a land division to be approved, there had to be a three stage application: there had to be an initial planning application for approval in principle; then there had to be a further application to determine the statement of requirements relating to services and infra-structure for allotments; and finally there had to be an application to obtain new titles. There had to be three applications, three fees and much paper work, in a system which was heralded as being deregulation. This Government has moved in order to streamline all those processes—to streamline the processes including servicing from agencies such as the Registrar-General's Office, E & WS Department and ETSA.

We have had very close discussions with the industry in this matter. We have also moved to vigorously use the mechanisms that are available to us: we are using the joint venture mechanism which was written into the legislation by the present Parliament with respect to the Tea Tree Gully-Golden Grove area.

We have used section 43 of the Planning Act in order to rezone very quickly parts of Morphett Vale East so that we can get those areas on the market. Only on 5 September 32.5 hectares of that land at Morphett Vale East was sold by auction to private enterprise on the understanding that the purchasers, within 12 months, put in applications for development. The only reason we got to that stage was that we were able to use section 43. The previous Government did not want section 43 in the legislation at all. When we moved to entrench it into the legislation about 12 months ago, that move itself was opposed by the Opposition in this place.

But for section 43, that application for rezoning would still be somewhere with the City of Noarlunga. We were able to move quickly on that, and that land is now in the hands of those people who do have the power for redevelopment. I make two further points: first, that servicing of blocks of land now on the market is, of course, at 1980s prices, whereas we had the backlog of many blocks of land which had been serviced at 1977 prices—in some cases higher prices than they were on the market because of the slump of the late 1970s.

Finally, I hope very soon to introduce legislation in this place in order to further facilitate the provision of serviced blocks of land in the Tea Tree Gully-Golden Grove area for which I anticipate unanimous support from the Parliament.

#### COUNTRY FIRE SERVICES

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** Will the Minister of Emergency Services tell the House what response the Government has received from the CFS board to the Public Accounts Committee report tabled last week and whether the Government intends to amalgamate the CFS with the Metropolitan Fire Service? The Minister told the House last Wednesday that the Government had given the CFS board seven days to respond to the Public Accounts Committee report. Volunteer members of the CFS have told the Opposition that prompt decisions need to be made because the next fire season will be with us in less than two months.

**The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT:** There are, in fact, two questions asked by the honourable member: first, will I report to the House my intentions in regard to the Country Fire Services? The answer to that question is 'Yes, when I am able.' The second question was: is it the Government's intention to amalgamate the CFS and MFS? There is no intention at this stage to amalgamate those two bodies. I am not in a position to make a statement today. I have only just—

**The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy:** Cross out 'at this stage' and put 'tomorrow'.

**The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT:** Who knows what is going to happen in five or 10 years time? I do not; I am not a prophet, and I am sure that no-one on the other side of the House is, either. I specifically used the words 'at this stage' because there is no intention at this stage to do so. The CFS will be taking a new direction. I will be in a position to make a full statement in the House when Parliament resumes after the recess.

#### ETSA TOWERS

**Mr HAMILTON:** I ask the Minister of Mines and Energy whether the restructuring of ETSA towers will be at the expense of and adversely affect the consumer with an all-electric home. Following the Minister's announcement on Tuesday, I received a call from one of my constituents—a resident in West Lakes—asking whether, in the light of the

Minister's announcement, he had been ill advised when he made the decision to have an all-electric home *vis-a-vis* a home using part electric and part gas appliances.

**The Hon. R.G. PAYNE:** I can assure the House that the position involving an all-electric home and a large family is being carefully considered in the design of a new tariff structure.

**Mr Baker:** What about my poor old dears?

**The Hon. R.G. PAYNE:** The honourable member can make representations on behalf of—as he describes them—his poor old dears. I think that the term used by the member for Mitcham in his interjection indicates his degree of concern in this matter. I stand here as a representative member of a Government that introduced a concession to assist people in meeting their electricity accounts, that concession now being available to 121 000 consumers in South Australia. The honourable member may care to reconsider this rather careless and patronising use of such a term (which I do not think belongs in this House at all) to describe people whom he wishes to bring to the attention of the House.

The final proposals are presently being refined. I do not want to give the House at this stage a preview because the changes deserve the most clear and detailed presentation and explanation so that they can be clearly understood. However, the effect of the tariff restructure on the average all-electric household will be negligible.

**Mr Becker:** What is 'average'?

**The Hon. R.G. PAYNE:** I would have thought that a former bank officer in this House, who is always telling us that he is in the numbers game, would know the meaning of 'average'. In winter, people in all-electric homes can expect fractionally higher bills and in summer fractionally lower bills, and that would be the case under the present structure.

**Mr Mathwin:** We've heard this one before.

**The Hon. R.G. PAYNE:** To answer the member for Glenelg's interjection, which he makes in a derogatory way, I point out that it is difficult to design a tariff structure, and that is why so much effort has gone into this. If the honourable member had been listening the other day, he would realise that the genesis of this idea was approximately 12 months ago, so it is not being put up in a haphazard way.

**Mr Becker:** You indicated this last Tuesday week.

**The Hon. R.G. PAYNE:** I did, yes. The member for Hanson, who is probably one of the more astute members of the Opposition and does occasionally listen, did correctly discern from an earlier remark I made that I was examining this question for some time. The effects on large families will be negligible unless their electricity consumption is well above average. It is interesting to note from the figures of the Australian Bureau of Statistics that the average consumption of large families is also highly correlated with income, and that does not really need much explanation, because people with large families obviously need to be fairly careful in budgeting not only for their energy needs but for any other needs in the household, and I am sure that my colleague the Minister of Education would bear me out in that statement.

It is worth reminding people that, if they believe their electricity consumption to be above average or considerably high and they do not know what to do about it, there are two avenues open to them, and they are both excellent ones: they can contact either ETSA or the Energy Information Centre, which was set up by the previous Government (and I give it credit for that). They can get excellent advice about budgeting and means of adjusting their energy demands which I think they would find very worth while.

### ORGANISED CRIME

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Will the Minister of Emergency Services, as the Minister responsible for the police, say what is the most serious aspect of organised crime in South Australia and whether the police need wider powers to deal with it? In his Ministerial statement yesterday, the Minister said that certain activities of motor cycle gangs were one aspect 'but by no means the most serious aspect of organised crime in South Australia.' His statement did not elaborate on what aspect of organised crime is the most serious. Nor did it address the question raised on Tuesday by the Leader of the Opposition about whether or not the abolition of Special Branch would hamper the police in its fight against organised crime.

The abolition of Special Branch also appears to have been inconsistent with previous attitudes expressed by the Labor Party about organised crime. For example, on 6 April 1982—just over two years ago—the Premier moved a motion in this House calling for a Royal Commission with terms of reference to consider, amongst other things, the establishment of a permanent crime commission to investigate and advise on organised crime, and to advise whether or not police powers are adequate to deal with organised crime and drug offences. In view of the reservations expressed previously by the Labor Party about organised crime and police powers, I seek further information from the Minister on the current level of organised crime in South Australia and whether there are adequate resources to fight it.

**The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT:** I will obtain a full report for the honourable member.

### TELEVISION BROADCASTS

**Mr MAX BROWN:** Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport make representations to both the management of channel 7—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Two matters are proceeding simultaneously.

**Mr MAX BROWN:** I will start again. Will the Minister make representation to both managements of channel 7 television and ABC television to obtain from them assurances that, if the respective channels directly televise the Melbourne and the Adelaide football finals, country people in this State will be afforded the opportunity to see the direct telecast through either the country commercial television stations or the ABC country television stations?

The Minister would be well aware that each year the direct telecast of such finals has become merely a matter of formality and, according to the *Advertiser*, it appears that this year will be no exception. However, it has not always been a formality as far as country viewers are concerned. In fact, only a few years ago everyone in Australia, as well as those in America, Japan, the Philippines and Hong Kong saw the Melbourne grand final, yet lo and behold the country people in South Australia did not.

I give fair credit because it is true to say that a very good coverage was available last year. However, I raise the question at this time because there is no guarantee that we will be afforded the same opportunity. I ask the Minister to make representations to both channel managements to see whether a suitable arrangement can be made for country viewers this year.

**The Hon. J.W. SLATER:** The question of transmitting major sporting event coverages to country centres—not only the Australian rules football finals but also major sporting events such as the Melbourne Cup, and so on—has been a matter of concern which has previously been brought to my

attention. Honourable members representing the West Coast would be well aware of what I am now saying. I have no objections to taking up this matter with station management, but I point out that the decision is based on possible equipment availability and, of course, on commercial considerations.

However, I certainly believe that the service can and should be improved so that country people have an opportunity to see first hand sporting events that are of significant importance to people not only in the metropolitan area of Adelaide but also in the country. So, the answer to the question is that I will make representations, but I remind the member and the House that the final decision rests with the stations themselves.

### STOCK GRAZING

**Mr ASHENDEN:** Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport say when a fence will be erected in a section of the Anstey Hill Recreation Park to allow stock grazing to take place? I refer to the section of Anstey Hill between North-East, Perversance and Lower North-East Roads and Range Road South. This is where the disastrous Ash Wednesday II fire started, affecting so much of the North-East Hills area last year. All this area is now under the control of the Department of Recreation and Sport. Part of it is natural woodland, but much of it was grazed prior to its purchase by a previous Government as part of the hills face zone.

I have been advised that fencing was purchased some time ago to allow the sections to be separated, but this fence has still not been erected. The erection of the fence would allow the grazing by sheep of the non-woodland area to keep the grass, and therefore the fire hazard, down. This practice has previously been used by the Government on land owned to the south of the area to which I refer. Will the Minister ensure that funds are allocated to allow the fence to which I have referred to be erected and for stock to be allowed to graze before the new fire season, which is almost upon us?

**The Hon. J.W. SLATER:** I will certainly get the information required by the member for Todd, although I believe that the area to which he refers is not under the jurisdiction of my Department.

**Mr Ashenden:** Your officers told me it was.

**The Hon. J.W. SLATER:** I will check out that matter for the honourable member, but I believe that the question should be directed to my colleague the Minister of Lands. Anyway, I will obtain the information for the member for Todd and advise him accordingly.

### ADULT LITERACY COURSES

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Will the Minister of Education advise the House of the Government's policy on literacy education for adults, and particularly how this policy is being applied at the Elizabeth Community College, and whether he is satisfied with the application of the Government's policy at that college? Constituents of mine have sought my assistance to stop cuts to the adult literacy programme at the Elizabeth Community College. It has been reported to me that the programme is being progressively cut by up to 50 per cent, and my constituents, who have sought my assistance, are students of that programme and are concerned about those cuts. It is illustrative to mention the details of the three constituents who have sought my assistance.

One constituent is undertaking a course to endeavour to lift her level of literacy prior to undertaking other studies

at the college. Another could not read forms or fill in Government applications and the like before she undertook study in this course, and the third told me that, as far as she was concerned, she could not read simple notices or newspapers. They all pointed out to me that there is no area of education more important or necessary for the life of our citizens or the welfare of our democracy than the literacy programmes that are being run for adults. They have advised me that six out of the 22 classes at the Elizabeth TAFE College will be closed and four tutors dismissed by or at the end of this year, and this is notwithstanding the fact that most of the tutors in the programmes, as I understand it, are volunteers and the classes are supervised by professional staff only to ensure the accuracy of the programming, etc.

I am told that 1 per cent of the total TAFE budget is used on adult literacy programmes, and I understand that the decision whether the programmes are extended or cut is at the whim of each college hierarchy. Whilst colleges are being squeezed for funds the literacy programme, certainly at Elizabeth, is being slashed. I understand that tutors are paid on an hourly rate with no security or holiday or sick pay. In all the circumstances, I ask the Minister to inquire urgently into this matter and advise the House of the Government's policy in this most important area.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I thank the honourable member for his question on this matter. Indeed, on 30 July this year I received from the Friends of the Adult Literacy Unit a letter raising precisely the issues raised by the member for Elizabeth with respect to the Elizabeth Community College. I had some investigations undertaken in regard to the matter, and I will provide some advice about that in a few moments. Before doing so, I want to say that the adult literacy courses supplied through the Department of Technical and Further Education are considered very highly by the Government. We believe that this is a priority area. I have advised the Department of Technical and Further Education that it is a priority area for the Government and that, in the allocation of resources that are made available to the Department, priority in regard to that area should be recognised.

It is one of a number of access programmes that really does provide the opportunity for people to participate in society at large, or not to participate—depending on what is available. One of the things that has happened with adult literacy programmes over the years is that they have been resourced in a different way from other programmes. The honourable member is quite correct in saying that much of the support is at the discretion of the individual colleges. They can determine the extent to which programmes offered by the Adult Literacy Unit, which is the central body, are actually expanded or reduced in terms of the number of students who can be given educational services.

The other point that needs to be recognised is that very few full time staff are involved in the Adult Literacy Unit. In addition to that, there is a significant part time instructor component (PTI, as it is known), and then, of course, there is a very significant and large volunteer component. I believe that the mix that they have in regard to the adult literacy programmes has been an appropriate mix of resources, but that from time to time perhaps the percentage mix has been inappropriate. I hope that it will be possible in the medium term to move away from the very heavy predominance of the use of volunteers in that area. Clearly, we must still make progress on that in that way.

With regard to the situation at the Elizabeth college, I want to make a number of points. The honourable member stated that there was concern that the programme would be cut by 50 per cent. Clearly, when I heard that I was concerned as well, and I approached the Department. It approached

the college, and apparently that assessment was based on proposals made within the college in July of this year, which was very early on in terms of its own financial budgeting for the coming financial year. It was without the knowledge of what financial allocation the college would receive. That information, from the college's point of view, has not been finalised at this point, either. All I can say is that some of the comments made in this House last week took the extent of the issue of TAFE funding to the hysterical level.

As a result of further consideration by the college, it has reassessed the situation and has advised the Director-General, who has advised me, that it is maintaining the level of the programme with some minor changes which have resulted in marginal cost savings for the college. The changes are as follows: one part-time instructor, who has been teaching an individual student, has been replaced by a volunteer to liberate the instructor for other duties. A basic English class, which had a maximum of 12 students, completed its course and was not recommenced because there was reduced demand for that class which did not warrant further continuation of it. Two small classes were combined, and a part-time instructor co-ordinator volunteer tutor has had a reduction of hours because the volunteer training programme which she was conducting was not required in term 3 of this year. That is not to say that that programme will not be required in terms 1, 2 and 3 next year. I believe that it will be needed as other volunteers come into the programme, and it is a very important thing that we are able to offer some support to volunteers. I am advised that the service to students has therefore not been affected.

New students from the waiting list are being accepted as vacancies occur, provided the course the college offers suits the particular needs of those individuals. I appreciate the fact that the honourable member raised the question in the House, because it has caused a lot of concern. I have received many letters about it, particularly in relation to the initial proposals that were being considered at the college base level. Certainly I, as Minister, the Government and the Department of Technical and Further Education recognise the importance of adult literacy, and the Elizabeth College has gone to significant lengths to ensure that that programme is maintained within the funding levels the college has available to it.

#### EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** Will the Minister of Education give an assurance that he will not allow any restructuring of early childhood education courses by the South Australian College of Advanced Education until the working party he established to examine this matter has reported to him? I ask the question because of a letter written by the Chairman of the Tertiary Education Authority (Mr Kevin Gilding) to the Acting Principal of the South Australian College of Advanced Education (Dr J. Maling), dated 10 September, which casts doubt on whether this in fact will be the case. The letter informs Dr Maling of the establishment of the working party, and its final paragraph states:

The reason I am writing this letter is, however, to inform you, and through you the council of the college, that the inquiry need not hinder the college's immediate decision about its Bachelor of Education and Diploma of Teaching restructuring since, with reference to early childhood, the *status quo* is likely to be maintained. Council may therefore feel confident that its approval of the present recommendations on early childhood are consistent with the establishment of the working party.

Since it was the present recommendations to which Mr Gilding referred that caused the concern that led to the

Minister establishing the working party, it appears that Mr Gilding is inviting the college to disregard the very purpose for which the inquiry was established.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** A few points need to be made about this matter. First, the letter refers to the *status quo* being maintained, and that is the advice I have received. Certainly, if there is any evidence that the *status quo* will not be maintained between now and the time the committee reports, I will advise the college of my opinion on that matter that no change should be made pending the report of the working party. However, I am a little amazed about the start of the question, when the honourable member asked would I 'not allow' any restructuring by the college.

The honourable member was a member of the Government that passed the South Australian College legislation, and I ask her to consider the wording that was built into it in relation to the capacity of the Minister of the day to allow or not allow anything within the South Australian College. As I have said on other occasions in this House, it is clearly an advisory capacity within the college. I have used that capacity to the full on this and other occasions, but the legislation does not provide me with the capacity to write a letter 'Dear Dr Maling, I do not allow . . . Yours sincerely, Minister of Education.' Therefore the question is quite inappropriate. It is not within my province to not allow those changes to take place.

The other point clearly is that the advice is that the *status quo* is being maintained, and therefore there is no problem on this issue at all. If it did happen that the council at its next meeting were to decide to revoke its earlier decision by the processes it would have to use to make the revocation and then determine that it would not follow the *status quo* with regard to the early childhood courses, I would most certainly contact the college and indicate my disquiet about the matter, as I am enabled, and limited, to do by the legislation.

## ESTIMATES COMMITTEES

A message was received from the Legislative Council intimating that it had given leave to the Attorney-General (Hon. C.J. Sumner), the Minister of Health (Hon. J.R. Cornwall), and the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. F.T. Blevins) to attend and give evidence before the Estimates Committees of the House of Assembly on the Appropriation Bill (No. 2) if they think fit.

## ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 16 October 1983 at 2 p.m.

Motion carried.

## STATE LOTTERIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the State Lotteries Act, 1966; and to make a consequential amendment to the Soccer Football Pools Act, 1981. Read a first time.

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

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

The Government has four main objectives in introducing this measure:

to enable the Lotteries Commission to conduct sports lotteries;

to allow unclaimed prizes to be retained by the Commission and offered as prizes in subsequent lotteries; to establish clearly the authority of the Commission to make rules governing the conduct of lotteries; and to make certain drafting improvements and to remove redundant provisions.

Prior to the last election, the Government gave an undertaking to provide the Lotteries Commission with the power to conduct sports lotteries, the proceeds of which would be used for the benefit of sporting organisations. The Bill seeks to give effect to this promise by inserting an appropriate provision in the Act and directing that the net proceeds from sports lotteries be paid into the Recreation and Sport Fund established under the Soccer Football Pools Act.

It is necessary to make quite clear the mechanism by which decisions will be taken on the number of sports lotteries to be conducted in a given year and the planning and promotion of such lotteries. Because of its expertise in the area, the Lotteries Commission will have much to offer on the planning and promotion side, but provision is made also for the Minister of Recreation and Sport and his officers to be consulted about such matters.

As the number of sports lotteries conducted in any year could affect the proportions of overall lottery proceeds which flow to the Recreation and Sport Fund and the Hospitals Fund respectively, the Bill authorises the Treasurer to regulate the total value of prizes which may be offered in a financial year in sports lotteries. The present legislation provides that prizes may be claimed from the Lotteries Commission for up to six months. Thereafter, they are transferred to the Hospitals Fund and may be claimed from the Treasurer for a further six months. In practice, the Commission administers all unclaimed prizes and imposes no cut-off date. Claims honoured after the statutory six-month period are deducted from subsequent transfers to the Hospitals Fund.

The Commission has requested a change to the legislation to enable prizes unclaimed after 12 months to be added to the prize pool in subsequent lotteries. Such a change would cost the Hospitals Fund about \$100 000 per annum in the first instance, but the Commission is confident that the 'jackpot' prizes which would result from such an arrangement would generate more than sufficient extra turnover to compensate for this loss of revenue. The Government has agreed to the Commission's proposal.

There are a number of matters of detail concerning the administration of lotteries which the Commission wishes to clarify and to make known to the public. These include the conditions of entry and participation in lotteries, the method of determining the prizes to be offered, the method of determining winning entries, and so forth. It was decided that the most flexible arrangement would be to provide the Commission with the authority to make rules governing such matters, subject to the approval of the Minister. These rules would be published in the *Government Gazette* and so would, as a matter of course, be available to the public.

The Government has taken the opportunity provided by the need to amend the Act to make certain drafting improvements as well. For example, the provisions relating to the keeping and presentation of accounts have been simplified and a requirement for an annual report inserted. In addition, a number of redundant provisions relating to the initial membership of the Commission and the operations of the Hospitals Fund have been removed (the operations of the Hospitals Fund are now governed by the Racing Act). I seek leave to have the remainder of the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.



### Remainder of Explanation

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the measure. Clause 3 amends section 3 of the principal Act by providing further definitions of expressions used for the purposes of the Act. Clause 4 amends section 5 of the principal Act by replacing the present provision for a fixed five-year term of office for members of the Lotteries Commission with provision for the term to be a maximum of five years. Clause 5 makes amendments of a drafting nature only clarifying provisions governing vacancies in the offices of members of the Commission.

Clause 6 also makes amendments of a drafting nature only relating to provisions governing meetings of the Commission. Clause 7 substitutes for the present section 10 a new section protecting a member of the Commission from personal liability for any act done or omission made in good faith in his capacity as a member of the Commission. The matters presently provided for under section 10 are, by the amendments proposed by clause 6, to be provided for under section 9 of the principal Act. Clause 8 inserts in section 13a of the principal Act (which provides for borrowing by the Commission) a new provision empowering the Commission to invest any moneys held by the Commission that are not immediately required for any other purpose in a manner approved by the Treasurer. Clause 9 repeals section 15 of the principal Act which deals with the accounts of the Commission and the auditing of its accounts. This matter is to be provided for by a new section 18a inserted by clause 13.

Clause 10 amends section 16 of the principal Act which provides for the Lotteries Fund and the application of the proceeds of the Commission's operations. The clause deletes subsections (3) to (8) which provide for three matters: the application of moneys in the Lotteries Fund; unclaimed prize moneys; and the application of the Hospitals Fund. The clause substitutes a new subsection (3) dealing with the first matter, the application of the moneys standing to the credit of the Lotteries Fund. The proposed new subsection provides that those moneys shall be applied by the Commission in the payment of amounts required for the provision of prizes in lotteries; in the payment of amounts from time to time approved by the Treasurer for the capital, administrative and operating expenses of the Commission; in payment into the Recreation and Sport Fund of amounts required to be paid under proposed new section 16a; and in payment into the Hospitals Fund, as from time to time required by the Treasurer, of any balance remaining after making allowance for the amounts previously referred to. The matter of unclaimed prizes is now to be dealt with in proposed new section 16b. The third matter, the application of the moneys in the Hospitals Fund, no longer requires separate provision in the principal Act. With the removal of the present provisions under subsections (4) and (5) for payment of prize moneys into and out of the Hospitals Fund, the application of the moneys in that Fund will be regulated under section 146 of the Racing Act, 1976, the provision providing for that Fund.

Clause 11 provides for the insertion of new sections 16a and 16b. Proposed new section 16a provides for the conduct of sports lotteries. Under the proposed new section, the Commission is required in each financial year to conduct as part of its lotteries for that year a series of lotteries to be known as sports lotteries, the total value of the prizes for which is to be within a range of amounts fixed by the Treasurer. The planning and promotion of such lotteries is to be undertaken by the Commission in consultation with the Minister of Recreation and Sport and persons nominated by that Minister. Upon the determination of the winning entries in each sports lottery, an amount is to be paid from

the Lotteries Fund into the Recreation and Sport Fund established under the Soccer Football Pools Act, 1981, being an amount equal to the difference between the total value of the tickets sold in the lottery and total value of the prizes won in the lottery.

Proposed new section 16b provides that, where a prize is not collected or taken delivery of within 12 months from the relevant day, the prize is forfeited to the Commission and an amount equal to the value of the prize shall be applied by the Commission for the purpose of additional or increased prizes in a subsequent lottery or lotteries conducted by the Commission. The proposed new section provides that where a cheque has been issued by the Commission in payment of a prize, the prize shall not be regarded as having been collected or taken delivery of if the cheque has not been presented for payment. The relevant day is, under the provision, to be the day on which the winning entries in the lottery are determined where that takes place on the same day through some procedure carried out by or on behalf of the Commission, or in any other case, as, for example, with the Instant Money Game, on a day determined under the rules of the Commission (made under proposed new section 18).

Clause 12 makes an amendment to section 17 that is consequential on the provision under proposed new section 16a (1) (b) for 'jackpotting' unclaimed prizes. Clause 13 substitutes for existing section 18 (which deals with the payment or delivery of prizes), proposed new sections 18, 18a and 18b. Proposed new section 18 provides that the Commission may, with the approval of the Minister, make rules, not inconsistent with the Act, providing for or regulating the practices, procedures and operations of the Commission. Amongst the rules proposed, are rules which would regulate the payment or delivery of prizes in various ways according to the different types of lotteries now conducted by the Commission. Proposed new section 18a replaces the present section 15 and provides for the keeping of accounts by the Commission and their audit by the Auditor-General. Proposed new section 18b would require the Commission to submit to the Minister (and the Minister to lay before Parliament) an annual report on the operations of the Commission.

Clause 14 amends section 19 of the principal Act which provides for various offences in relation to lotteries and the operations of the Commission. Under the clause, monetary penalties are increased from \$200 to \$1 000, apart from the penalty for the offences involving fraud which, if the offence is prosecuted summarily, is to be \$2 000 instead of the existing \$200, or, if the offence is prosecuted upon information, \$5 000 instead of the existing \$1 000. The clause amends subsection (8) (a) which permits any agent of the Commission to display a notice bearing the words 'Lottery tickets sold here' without further words or symbols. Under the amendment, an agent would instead be permitted to display a notice to the effect that he is an agent authorised to sell tickets in lotteries conducted by the Commission. The clause amends subsection (10a) which prohibits the distribution, display or publication, without the written authority of the Commission, of a notice or advertisement in which the word 'Lotto' (whether with the addition of 'Cross', 'X' or any other words, letters, symbols or characters) is used as a title or description of a lottery other than a lottery conducted by the Commission. Under the amendment, the prohibition will be extended from use as a title or description of a lottery to use in connection with any lottery or game (other than a lottery of the Commission) or for any advertising, promotional or commercial purpose.

Clause 15 increases the maximum penalty that may be prescribed for offences against the regulations from \$200 to \$1 000. Clause 16 makes a consequential amendment to

section 17 of the Soccer Football Pools Act, 1981, which provides for the establishment of the fund known as the Recreation and Sport Fund kept at the Treasury. Subsection (2) of that section provides that the moneys paid to the Fund under the Soccer Football Pools Act are to be used to support and develop such recreational and sporting facilities and services within the State as are approved by the Minister of Recreation and Sport. The clause amends this subsection so that it also provides for the moneys paid to the Fund that are derived from the sports lotteries conducted pursuant to proposed new section 16a to be used for those purposes.

Mr OLSEN secured the adjournment of the debate.

### COMMISSIONER FOR THE AGEING BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 3, (clause 7)—After line 7 insert the following paragraph:

(a) to ensure as far as practicable that financial and investment advice is available to the ageing.

No. 2. Page 3 (clause 7)—After line 10 insert paragraph as follows:

(ga) to assess the incidence of discrimination against the ageing in employment and to promote action to overcome such discrimination.

No. 3. Page 3, line 11 (clause 7)—Leave out 'subgroups' and insert in lieu thereof 'individual groups'.

No. 4. Page 4, lines 4 to 6 (clause 11)—Leave out subsection (2) and insert new subsection as follows:

(2) The Minister shall cause a copy of a report of the Commissioner made in accordance with subsection (1) to be laid before each House or Parliament within 14 sitting days of his receipt of the report if Parliament is then in session or if Parliament is not then in session within 14 days of the commencement of the next session of Parliament.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** I move:

That the amendments be agreed to.

The four amendments which were passed in the Legislative Council clarify a number of aspects of this legislation. The first amendment (moved by the Hon. Mr Milne) ensures that the Commissioner give specific consideration to the financial and investment advice available to the ageing in our community. Obviously it is a matter of considerable concern to persons upon retirement and in the period immediately prior to retirement that financial investment advice is available to them.

There is considerable concern in the community that some people may receive inadequate or defective advice, and that advice could severely harm the enjoyment that those people may have in their retirement years. I think that the amendment will ensure that the Commissioner turns his mind to this aspect of our community and gives assistance within his powers.

The second amendment deals with discrimination against the ageing in employment. The first two amendments are covered in a general way in the substantive parts of the Bill, but the amendments serve to highlight aspects of the problems facing the ageing. This amendment seeks the assistance of the Commissioner to ensure that discrimination against the ageing in employment is considered and assessed and that the Commissioner promotes action to overcome such discrimination. Obviously we have established within this State and Federally tribunals and rights for persons who are discriminated against so that those rights and remedies may be pursued before appropriate authorities. This will ensure that those amongst the ageing who suffer in this way are advised of the rights and remedies that are available to them.

The third amendment is a minor wording change by leaving out 'sub groups' and inserting 'individual groups', which perhaps clarifies that expression. The final amendment is one which tightens the reporting to Parliament by the Commissioner and the time limits within which the responsible Minister shall cause a copy of the report to be laid before each of the Houses of Parliament. The Government accepts those amendments in the spirit in which they were moved.

Motion carried.

### TRANSPLANTATION AND ANATOMY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 11 September. Page 733.)

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Coles):** The Opposition supports this Bill, which is to amend an anomaly, as one could describe it, in the principal Act which has proved to inhibit in practice the manner in which the Lions Eye Bank of South Australia makes available eyes for corneal grafts. The matter was dealt with in another place and I do not propose to canvass the issues in detail other than to reiterate the tributes that have already been paid in another place to the Lions Save Sight Foundation and to the Flinders Medical Centre, which, under the direction of Professor Douglas Coster, has done extraordinarily valuable work in South Australia in this field. This work has served South Australia extremely well.

It is one of the many areas in which this State is pre-eminent, not only nationally but internationally, and it is a superb example of the way in which voluntary organisations in this State work with professional and statutory bodies in order to achieve standards of exceptional medical excellence. As the Minister's second reading speech indicates, the majority of eyes come from the Coroner's cases at the City Mortuary. The practice which the eye bank has followed is to have the excision of the eyes undertaken by a specially trained technician.

If the law is amended, as is proposed in the Bill, to enable that excision to be undertaken by a person other than a medical practitioner, as long as the authorisation is provided by the Director-General of Medical Services, that will enable the present satisfactory system to continue to operate in accordance with the law. On these grounds, the Opposition fully supports the measure and extends to all those involved our commendation and good wishes for the continuance of an excellent programme.

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

### APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. J.C. Bannon:

That the House note grievances.

(Continued from 19 September. Page 1029.)

**Mr LEWIS (Mallee):** Before I describe the stinginess of Singapore Airlines and the stupidity and greed of Government monopolies—like the E & WS Department's charges for digging trenches—I will tell honourable members what I think would be a good solution to the problem that has occupied the House over the past couple of days in relation to the contents of the state of the Treasury at the time the last election was announced.

That contention could be easily overcome if we were to introduce measures into this place which simply required the Under Treasurer—at the time the Government or any other constitutional mechanism announced that there was to be a poll—to give a statement of the condition of the Treasury (checked for arithmetical errors, and so on, by the Auditor-General) to the Electoral Commissioner. The Electoral Commissioner would then circulate it to all members of Parliament who were recontesting their positions in Parliament, as well as to all candidates as they nominated.

There could be no doubt then about how much money was in the kitty at the time the election was called. In such circumstances it would not be possible for a Premier ultimately elected to claim that the previous Government or the previous Premier had in any way misled the public or the Parliament during the course of that election campaign, nor could he or she say that the promises made during the course of that campaign could no longer be kept because there were insufficient funds present in the Treasury to enable them to do it, or indeed that they found debts that they did not know existed. By making this amendment to the present fashion in which we administer elections and affairs of State where they relate to the constitutional functions and responsibilities of the kind to which I refer, we would do away with all this debate and do away with all the deception and literally the lies that are being told one way or another.

Someone has to be right and someone has to be wrong. I have made up my mind that my Leader just does not fudge things and that indeed in no way has the Premier to date addressed the substantive matters to which the Leader drew attention. However, I want to avoid that in future and I want to enable the public of the State or the nation to understand that it is not possible for politicians to make one claim and a counterclaim against that claim in this deceitful fashion. It will help all of us restore the position of members of Parliament and the esteem in which they are held in the community somewhere back to where it ought to be.

Let me turn to the matter of Singapore Airlines. If it is good enough for that airline company to use the Education Department's high schools to get free publicity and a good public relations exercise going about a scheme whereby it puts on promotional flights for students from high schools, and if it is good enough for that company to give freebies to the Premier, then I would say that it is good enough for it not to discriminate against the people and students at secondary level in the communities that I represent. I would have thought that this Government would have paid attention to things like that, where there is positive evidence of discrimination against secondary students in rural areas.

Earlier this year Singapore Airlines in fact made secondary school promotional flights available to high school students only. The programme received a good deal of publicity and I have received a letter from the spokesman of the Area School Principals Association, pointing out to me the concern that was felt by area schools around the State in that they were discriminated against. Those Principals of area schools contacted Singapore Airlines and were simply told that the company had decided not to include area schools because it had to draw the line somewhere. If that is not discrimination, I do not know what is. It was irritating to all those Principals, as many of them, parents and members of the school councils have mentioned to me since, but as they pointed out, probably nothing could be done. However, I take up this matter now not only as a lesson to Singapore Airlines and its Publicity Promotions Manager in South Australia, Mr Nolan, but to any other firm that is thinking of doing the same thing. They will get the same treatment

from me if they discriminate against the people in the communities that I represent. Be warned!

The next matter to which I wish to refer is the monopoly of certain Government agencies, such as the E & WS Department, and the way in which it discriminates against the interests of people I represent because it insists on using day labour to do certain jobs in the communities for the people who wish to become supplied by a service from those Government agencies. In this instance I refer to a situation that arose in Meningie. A trench had to be dug in Meningie in soft grey sand, about 10 m long, to enable the installation of reticulated potable water to a block of land. That resulted in the owners of the block of land (Cleggetts) being required by the E & WS Department to pay a fee of \$850. I could have dug that damn trench in the morning before lunch; in soft grey sand, with a shovel and a mat, 10 m would have been an easy job. One could knock it off in four hours—no sweat.

**Mr Hamilton:** How deep? How wide?

**Mr LEWIS:** On level ground. As it turned out, the E & WS Department required Mr Cleggett of Meningie to pay \$850. Mr Cleggett happens to be a contractor and often does jobs for the E & WS Department, having his own back hoe. He was refused the opportunity or in any way the chance to make a contribution of his own efforts in digging that trench and installing the pipe. No-one can tell me that it would have cost \$850 to buy the pipe, dig the trench, install it and backfill it. It could have been done manually, buying pipe at retail prices (and this did not include the costs of the meter) for less than half that fee; yet the Department insisted on the fee being paid. The Minister had the gall to write back to me when I drew it to his attention and concluded his letter by saying:

It would appear that following their submission to you, the Cleggetts considered the Department's quotation for the work as the Director-General and Engineer-in-Chief has informed me that they paid the required contribution on 6 July 1984. In the circumstances—

says the Minister—

it seems that the matter has been resolved to the Cleggetts' satisfaction.

That was his statement. It was in no way to the satisfaction of the Cleggetts. They were over a barrel. They had signed a contract to build a house and, had they extended the time within which they negotiated with the Department, rise and fall clauses in the contract would have resulted in the cost of the house escalating by far more than \$850. The Department has a monopoly and had them over a barrel, and that is crook. I think that individual citizens ought to be given the opportunity of doing that kind of work for themselves or obtaining the services of a local contractor, rather than meeting the cost of paying departmental daily labour to travel to and from the job and in addition to take an exorbitant amount of time in the process of getting the work done.

The next matter to which I wish to refer relates to a question I asked the Premier and Treasurer the other day, wherein an item in the *News* of 11 September by Stephen Middleton reported that flats might be built on the Torrens River.

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

**Mr BECKER (Hanson):** Last night we had a detailed statement from the Premier and Treasurer in reply to contributions from members on this side of the House, and again today we had a statement from him at a business luncheon, the unusual step being taken of criticising the Opposition for its attack on the Government's financial management. The Premier expressed concern about the fact

that the negativeness of the criticism could affect South Australia's standing in the Eastern States.

I do not think that would occur. It would be expected to be the responsibility of the Opposition to point out to the Government if it has any failings or if it has made any mistakes, because the sooner the mistakes are rectified the better it would be for the State. Let me reassure the Premier that I am confident that my colleagues and I do everything we can at every opportunity to promote South Australia when interstate, or even overseas. Certainly I do, and I will always continue to do that, irrespective of the Government of the day, because the Government is on the right track when it now wants to promote the lifestyle of South Australia and attract business executives to reside in Adelaide and administer their companies from the centre—as we call ourselves—of Australia.

That can be done. We should try to become the commercial hub of Australia. I like the idea that one of the foreign banking licences could well go to a company that will establish its headquarters in South Australia. I hope this occurs. I would like to see more of it. However, to do this, we have to prove that we are good financial managers, and basically we are. Any attempts that we make to highlight weaknesses is done in good faith. However, in his statement to the House last night the Premier, when reading from various documents and using information from documents, referring to the former Treasurer, said:

... the former Treasurer attempted to balance his Budget. He used a short-term expedience of capital works funds to buoy up, balance or pay recurrent costs. That had not been done before. It was done consistently and to a greater extent during the period of the Tonkin Government.

The key phrase there is, 'That had not been done before.' I would like to draw the Premier's attention to page 79 of appendix VII of his Financial Statement, delivered on 30 August 1984 at the second reading of the Appropriation Bill (No. 2). There one will find transfers from Revenue Account to the Loan Account. In 1976-77 it was \$24 053 933; in 1977-78 there was a further transfer of \$3 419 129; in 1979-80, there was a transfer of \$15 542 583; a total of \$43 015 645.

Over a similar period transfers from the Loan Account to the Revenue Account from 1978-79 were \$5 662 433; 1980-81, \$37 268 336; a total of \$42 930 769. This means that in 1978-79 there was a transfer of \$5.6 million from the Loan Account to the Revenue Account, but for the two previous years there were transfers from the Revenue Account to the Loan Account. I criticised the then Premier and Treasurer (Hon. D.A. Dunstan) for making those transfers because I believed that it was wrong to use Revenue Account funds to prop up the Loan Account. Revenue Account funds were there for the running of the day to day expenses of the State. Similarly, I was critical in 1978-79 when the \$5.6 million was transferred from Loan Account to Revenue Account.

So, with all of the swapping of funds, the Premier criticised the former Treasurer (David Tonkin) for transferring \$37.2 million from the Loan Account to the Revenue Account in 1980-81. What did all that do? What it all added up to, as I have tried to demonstrate, is that that period evened up the amount of money taken from the Revenue Account to the Loan Account: the money was then subsequently paid back from the Loan Account to the Revenue Account.

So, within a sum of \$84 876—which is a very small amount compared to the total amount we are discussing—there has been a balance of the Loan Account and the Revenue Account. What I did not like—and again I was critical, and I was always critical—was the merging of the two accounts, the Loan Account (which is the capital works account) with the Revenue Account and calling it the Consolidated Account. What the Treasury did in doing that was

to deny Parliament two shots at the Budget: one was at the Revenue Account budget and the other was at the Loan Account budget or capital works programme. We have one account: we have consolidated figures and with them one gets a false impression, because in 1981-82 (that was the period of the Tonkin Government) there was a deficit on the Revenue Account of \$61.2 million and a surplus on the Loan Account in that same period of \$61.7 million. So, Treasury and the financial affairs show almost a balanced situation but in fact there was a huge deficit on the day to day running of the State and a huge surplus on the Loan Account. So, the Government was not fulfilling its work programmes—there again is a problem and very poor economics.

The Premier as Treasurer can take credit if he wants or he will hold the record at this stage and go into the *Guinness Book of Records* for presiding over the greatest deficits that have ever hit the State Treasury. In 1982-83 the deficit on the Revenue Account was \$108.9 million. There was a surplus on the Loan Account of \$51.8 million. In 1983-84 there was a deficit of \$29.7 million on the Revenue Account, and on the Loan Account there was a surplus of \$28.1 million. In the wash-up this means that there is a deficit on the Consolidated Account of \$64.7 million, and that will be very expensive to finance—it has been and it will continue until that amount is repaid, until we can balance the Consolidated Account. It is poor financial management. It means that there will be increased costs or there will have to be a further run-down in the Loan programme or the works programme to finally balance the Consolidated Account. The deficit on the Revenue Account over the three year period 1981-84 was \$199.9 million—that is bad financial management.

I wanted to take the opportunity to refer to how we can save some money, but time does not permit at this stage. However, I do believe—and I have a Question on Notice—that the Government should seriously consider dropping one Ministerial portfolio merge several portfolios under the 12 remaining Ministers, and give serious consideration to appointing Ministerial secretaries from members of Parliament. We could save somewhere between \$300 000 to \$500 000 per annum. That is the area we should be looking at. If we are to prune down the Public Service, then we ought to look at this House as well.

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

**Mr KLUNDER (Newland):** The Parliament deals with a large range of issues, from issues of great moment and vast expenditure to quite small items dealing perhaps with only one person and one principle. I intend to deal with such a small issue today. I intend to speak about what was then the Salisbury College of Advanced Education and now an annexe of the South Australian College of Advanced Education and a student called Paul Johnson. In 1981, Mr Johnson studied English at the Salisbury College of Advanced Education and was awarded a grade called a P2—pass 2 level.

In all Mr Johnson's studies this was the lowest grade that he had ever been awarded, and he was concerned that the grade that he had been given was an incorrect one. He went to the lecturer to ask whether the grade could be altered and was told, quite correctly, that there were appeal provisions. Mr Johnson exhausted all those appeal provisions over two years, to no avail. When I checked the information that he gave me, I found two things: first, that he was quite correct and that with the grade he had been treated unjustly; and, secondly, that the college was using a system of marking and manipulating those marks which was beyond doubt the

silliest thing that I have come across in 18 years of teaching experience.

The Salisbury College of Advanced Education used the grading system of A, B, C, D, and F. At the end of the semester it turned the grades to percentages. That is a silly practice. Grades were introduced originally because percentages were too precise a demarcation for a subject like English. To change grades to percentages months later both defeats the purpose of giving grades in the first place and adds to the difficulty associated with a long time delay and memory problems on the part of the lecturer. Having converted those grades to percentages, the college then changed them back to a different set of grades—not the A, B, C, D, and F of the original grades, but to a distinction, credit, pass 1, pass 2 or fail. If anyone is wondering how an educational institution, whose job purportedly is to train the next generation of teachers, can get itself into a horrible mess like that, I invite him to join the club. I do not know, either.

The English course that Paul Johnson did consisted of three sections, one of which consisted of two essays. He was invited by the lecturers to do either two or three essays and he did three. That added up to 50 per cent. There was also a journal which he was supposed to keep and which was worth 25 per cent, and a group exercise was also worth 25 per cent. The college, in taking the three essays, averaged the grades by a process which I cannot quite understand, and gave him a wrong percentage. It no longer insists on that adjustment of his three essays for that 50 per cent. For his group participation, Mr Johnson gained a C, which has a minimum of 55 per cent, and for his journal he received a D, which has a minimum of 50 per cent. The three essays that he did gained the grade of D, with a minimum of 50 per cent, a C, with a minimum of 55 per cent and a B, with a minimum of 65 per cent.

When those percentages are added together and divided by three, it adds up to a mark of some 56 $\frac{2}{3}$  per cent and, when that is combined with the two grades from the other two sections of the work, the overall grade has to be a minimum of 54.59 per cent—even assuming that for each and every piece of the work that he was given he gained the minimum possible mark that could be given by the college for that grade. The college authorities then, in one of the nicest bits of pedantry I have heard for some time, argued that 54.59 per cent was below 55 per cent and it could not award a P1 pass as that was from 55 per cent upwards. The fact that the P2 pass goes from 50 per cent to 54 per cent apparently meant little to them, because the fact that he was above 54 per cent apparently was acceptable, whereas the fact that he was below 55 per cent was not. How the mathematics and science departments in that college live with the fact that 54.59 per cent is closer to 54 per cent than it is to 55 per cent is something that beats me completely. That, unfortunately, is the simple part.

We now get to the complicated bit. I have with me photocopies of the lecturer's comments on each of the three essays. On the second essay, which was given a C mark (which means a minimum of 55 per cent and a maximum of 64 per cent), the college lecturer makes a number of pertinent comments about the essay and suggests there are some problems with the style of the essay. The grade given was, as I said, a C. The final comment by the lecturer was that, without the stylistic problems, it would have been a B. That is crucial, because I cannot for the life of me, after 18 years of teaching experience, see how one could argue that an essay has to be a minimal C (that is, 55 per cent) and indicate that it would have been a B (that is a minimum of 65 per cent) without a few minor problems. It is just not possible. If, in fact, Mr Johnson's marks for that essay had been slightly above 55 per cent (say, 58 per cent), or if he

had just 1 per cent extra for each of his marks above the minimum, he would certainly have gained a P1 mark, even by the college's peculiar methods of calculation.

Life, unfortunately, becomes even more complicated. In each of a number of documents, and from my discussions with the former Principal of the South Australian College of Advanced Education and with various other people who made up one of the appeal tribunals, I found the rather peculiar view that the English Department's global view of Mr Johnson's ability was in some ways as important as, if not more important than, the marks that he gained. There I have to take issue with the college again. Before Mr Johnson went into that course it published a document entitled 'An outline of course organisation for English II, Spring Semester 1981'. One of the rules in that document was 'that the final grade for the term will be a composite average of the grades for three areas'. It is nothing to do with global views by lecturers or any other such nonsense. It was a straight out indication that they were the rules by which the situation would be conducted.

A college, from a student's viewpoint at least, is a very large, monolithic organisation which, as far as students are concerned, holds all the cards. It sets the rules. It gives the lectures, sets the exams, marks the exams and virtually determines a student's future by deciding whether he passes or fails. If such a college sets rules and then does not bother to abide by them, it becomes virtually impossible for students to know what kind of options and chances they have, and any chance of making sense out of the academic world disappears entirely.

The second problem that I found both from discussions I have had and correspondence I hold is that the marks given to a student are not necessarily correct. For instance, Mr Johnson's lecturer, in a letter to one of the appeals tribunals, writes that he later re-marked one of Mr Johnson's essays and found that it should have received a lower grade. I am sure that that lecturer did not mean to imply that the marks given by a lecturer may vary from time to time, depending on when he marks the essay. However, that is the implication of what he said. Furthermore, I was told during my discussion with college authorities (at which the very senior echelon of the college was present) that encouragement marks are often given. In other words, a student is often given a mark higher than he deserves because it is hoped that it will encourage him to do better next time.

**Mr Baker:** Is that the Susan Ryan system that you are talking about?

**Mr KLUNDER:** We will not talk about which Party tries to get by on words rather than actions. We therefore have a situation where the marks that a student can get can be rather meaningless. They can be inflated because of an encouragement factor or be either deflated or inflated because the lecturer's marks vary from one marking session to the next. The student at the college may in fact well wonder what his marks actually do mean, but the problem is that the marking system is wrong: it is clumsy, contains systemic inaccuracies and is not the kind of system that an intelligent education community ought to impose on its students.

It is plainly silly to combine grades before changing them to percentages. It is plainly silly, too, to set rules regarding marks and then claim that it is not the marks but the global judgment that counts. I believe that Paul Johnson has been unjustly dealt with by the college and that, if the college were to go by its own rules, it would recognise the stupidity of trying to pretend that a particular student got nothing but the absolutely lowest mark for every possible piece of work that he had handed in, especially in view of the comments written on some of those essays.

I tried to resolve this situation by first going to the college to inquire, then by writing in to the Minister—albeit knowing

that the Minister would have to reply that the college was autonomous—and finally having to go back to the college and talk to the very highest officers there and telling them what kind of problems would ensue if they consistently went ahead with that sort of method.

**The Hon. H. Allison:** It sounds like the Marx Brothers, doesn't it?

**Mr KLUNDER:** It does rather. It really is a very strange organisation. I believe that an injustice has occurred and that it should be fixed.

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

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra):** Since the \$2 623 million Budget was introduced a week or two ago, the Premier has sought to defend its content, and he has done so under a barrage of criticism from members of the Opposition. Most of that criticism has been directed to the apparent need by the present Government to increase taxation by an enormous amount since its coming to office a little over a year ago. Indeed, some of that criticism has concerned the kind of expenditure in which the Government has indulged. In these few minutes that I have available to me in the closing hours of this debate, I do not propose to canvass these matters in detail. I believe that Oppositions, in particular, over the years have been faced with a difficult task of expressing their point of view, particularly at Budget time, when some members quite rightly have great concerns about the expenditure of the Government of the day, at which time restraint has been called for while inevitably others are requesting that expenditure be provided for special areas of need.

Generally, Oppositions of both political persuasions have been criticised for that two pronged approach. That has occurred not only during this session but also indeed throughout the period that I have been in this House. I believe, however, that the present Government has demonstrated in a number of ways a lack of capacity to manage its affairs, and that indeed if it applied itself more effectively and more religiously to the job of financial management it could reduce the State's deficit and therefore the need to continue to tax the community in the way that it has done.

I refer to the time when the Liberal Party was elected to Government in 1979 and cite as a first example a situation that I inherited as Minister of Agriculture. One of the overseas projects in which the State was involved at that time was a contractual arrangement with Libya. That had been up and running for several years, but quite clearly we knew from the contract details what we had been saddled with as a State; this was admittedly due to some of the circumstances that prevailed in that overseas community when the project was founded. I agree that, in regard to the negotiations, Colonel Gaddafi and his second in charge whom I subsequently met (Bashir Joudeh from Libya) were, to say the least, difficult people with whom to negotiate on a business basis. However, the contractual arrangement was loose, and my concern for loose contractual arrangements was again reflected following a briefing that I received about a further contract that we had inherited in relation to Algeria.

The Government ceased to be involved with Libya in June 1980 when South Australia was in a position to decide whether it should renegotiate a further stage of the operation or pull out, and we chose the latter. The Algerian contract was clearly an embarrassment. In fact, I went to that country twice during the period that the Liberal Government was in office. Over that time I set out to fix up the loose ends that were associated with South Australia's commitments in that dry land farming contract. In fact, it was so loose in content that the project would have been of little value to the Algerians had it proceeded along the lines that existed at that time and, indeed, it would have done little for South

Australia's image on the world agricultural scene. Therefore, I have had some experience in these matters and I am aware of the Labor Party's business acumen in relation to entering into contracts of the kind that I have described.

It seems that more recently the Government has again fallen into an unfortunate situation with respect to the ASER project. A few months ago when that project, which I support in principle, was announced publicly in South Australia the estimated cost was \$140 million. Part of that amount was to come from within South Australia and the rest from outside sources. Within a period of a few months the estimated cost of the project rose by \$20 million to \$160 million. I agree that the Government can argue that the convention component of the project was redesigned and enlarged, involving some additional costs. However, in recent days it has been estimated that by 1986 the project will have cost between \$170 million and \$200 million. The Government cannot press a case based on its failure to have regard for inflation, for example, because when the initial figure was announced it related to 1986 actual cost, allowing for an interim annual inflation factor. This demonstrates the Government's lack of grip on major financial projects.

We have heard a lot about the philosophy of the present Government in relation to its desire to increase the size of the Public Service, and, if it has not happened yet, certainly 3 300 additional Public Service employees will have been added to the Public Service in South Australia during the present Government's term of office. The cost of maintaining that additional number of public servants is about \$70 million a year. That money could be saved and could provide some relief to the public from taxation. That option should be excised as a demonstration of constraint.

We must consider the inordinate amount of money that has been spent on the so-called protection and/or policing of the activities at Roxby Downs recently. I do not want to canvass that matter at any great length but, whether the actual cost of sending police to that regional protest was \$1.6 million, \$1.8 million or \$2 million, it was a lot of taxpayers' money down the drain which, I suggest, could have been spent on more useful State projects. The sooner the Government takes a real grip of its administrative responsibilities and directs what shall occur at places like Roxby Downs, bearing in mind the rights of individuals to protest, the better it will be. It certainly did not do so in the initial announcements in relation to that matter, when, for example, it was publicly announced that there would be no arrests, thereby condoning, if not encouraging, the protesters to test the Police Force of this State in their activities and demonstrations.

One could go on and on, but I want to use the remaining time that I have to refer to one or two other matters. During 1981-82 and 1982-83 Samcor made a trading profit at Gepps Cross, but under the present Administration there has been an annual loss during 1983-84 of nearly \$2 million. Further, we find that it will cost about \$2 million to fix a leaky concrete roof at the Festival Plaza. Had the contractual arrangements been tight, prepared, entered into and concluded on a businesslike basis, that situation would not have occurred, either. In fact, the contractor would have been required to come back and fix it. However, the contractors have flown, and there is no money held for contingencies. In regard to the Festival Centre, there has been a 35 per cent increase in the deficit this year, amounting to an annual deficit of nearly \$6 million. There is another facility that but a few of the State's residents use. It is a great facility, but it is run at an incredible expense to the community at large. I think that some of these expenditures need to be cut down in order to smarten up the Budget and reduce the necessity to apply the sort of taxation levels with which we are faced at the moment. There is another matter

that I want to raise in relation to a Bill that went through this House in the past few days. On behalf of the—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The other matter will have to wait, as the honourable member's time has expired.

**Mr INGERSON (Bragg):** Thank you for the opportunity to speak again in this grievance debate. It is interesting, as many members have pointed out, to note the changing taxation level that has come about in the two years of this Government. It is highlighted again today by the headline in the *News* which reads 'Power charges rise may be more than anticipated'. That article highlights again the serious problem surrounding electricity charges. I think the argument put forward by the Government that major users of power need to be considered at a higher level is not an area about which I would disagree. However, I am concerned that again the major group of employers, the group that employs more than 60 per cent of the workers in this State, is ignored when changes in the tariff scale are talked about, and that is small business. That group seems to have been ignored again.

It concerns me that when we talk about the management of money, the management of money by this Government, and in particular by Labor Governments, we find that the major area of increase is in the State debt (which means interest paid on moneys borrowed and repayments to the sinking fund). In 1970-71 that debt was \$74.3 million and the projected debt contained in the Estimates for 1984-85 is \$243 million. In that 14-year period, of which the Liberal Party governed for only three years, the State interest debt, the loose money, money that is really of no value at all to the community, is a lost payment to the community, has increased by \$169 million.

It should also be remembered that during that 14-year period the Labor Government sold one of the valuable assets of this State, the railways, and a significant amount of that money went into the repayment of the State debt and yet over that period an increase of \$169 million has occurred in the State interest debt line. What is more important is that in the past two years the increase has risen by \$40 million, and one-quarter of that line debt will occur by the end of this financial year. From the period 1982-83, when the debt started at \$203 million, to the proposed debt, which is most likely to be achieved, of \$243 million, in fact, our interest payments, the money that comes out of the collection of money to be used in this State, have increased by \$40 million. What those figures show is that an extra \$40 million has been wasted; it has been paid out under this line for interest.

In a reply the Premier gave last evening he mentioned my name in reference to an increase in expenditure. The comments referred to recreation and sport because I believe more money ought to be spent in that area. All the grandstanding that has been done by the Premier and members on the other side about the achievement of our athletes will be to no avail if money is not put into that area. I note with interest today that the Government has decided to introduce a sports lottery so that money can be placed into this area, and I welcome that move. It is interesting to note that last evening the Premier criticised me for recommending an increase in the expenditure on sport and recreation and yet today a Bill was introduced which is doing exactly what I recommended.

**Mr Mathwin:** It's time we got some rapid action.

**Mr INGERSON:** I thank the member for Glenelg. It is nice to know you get rapid action once you put something forward. It is most unusual for that to happen under this Government, but I am happy to see it happen.

Another area of concern about which the Government ought to be doing something is in the area of facilities for

disabled people between the ages of 18 and 25 years who are currently living in the Regency Park Centre. Up until now when disabled youngsters have reached the ages of 18 to 25 they have left Regency Park and have been admitted to the Julia Farr Centre. That is no longer possible because of the change in direction and a change in attitude by the administration of the Julia Farr Centre. This has been caused mainly because the Julia Farr Centre is now recognised as a nursing home, simply for financial reasons. I do not object to this change occurring because of financial reasons but I am concerned about the families who have children who have been educated and trained at Regency Park. There is now nowhere for these disabled youngsters to go. It is causing great problems to a significant number of the parents of these youngsters. I believe between 20 and 30 families are unable to cater in their own homes for these disabled youngsters who have been trained but have nowhere to go.

I believe the Government is considering a proposition that the Housing Trust build some units for these trained young people to live in, with a trained person who can act virtually as a mother for them. That programme will take two or three years to develop, but there is an immediate problem to be solved. What is this Government going to do about the problem facing these 20 to 30 families? I ask the Minister of Community Welfare to look at this problem so that it can be remedied as soon as possible.

I turn now to the ASER project. The Premier has talked a lot about this project and has advanced its advantages to the community as a whole, but very few people have been able to see a model of the project. The Adelaide City Council and many people have criticised the project, especially the 23-storey building, the lack of parking spaces, and other planning problems. The member for Alexandra talked about the cost, but we have not seen a model displayed publicly. So that much of this concern can be alleviated, I wonder whether the Premier would release a few more details about the project so that we could all see what is really going on. In the address the Premier gave to the House about the project he mentioned that the Industrial Development Committee of this Parliament would have to look at the guarantees. I ask the Premier when this will happen so that this very important Committee can have a look at the guarantees, because I am concerned, along with the member for Alexandra—

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

**Mr MATHWIN (Glenelg):** I wish to deal briefly with some matters that affect the aged, particularly in the Glenelg area, which I have the honour to represent. Last night I attended an annual general meeting at which the Glenelg Committee of the Ageing presented a report, which I found quite enlightening. The committee had researched the Glenelg area and compiled statistical data and information relating to environmental factors, and it intends to continue this work. The committee's findings revealed that in the 1981 census Glenelg's population had decreased to 13 306 from 15 237 in 1972. The survey also showed that Glenelg has the highest percentage of elderly people per head of population in South Australia—over 30 per cent.

**The Hon. R.G. Payne:** Is that the council area?

**Mr MATHWIN:** Yes. The Brighton council area is very close to this; it is third in the State, with about 26 or 27 per cent. In Glenelg 4 730 people are over the age of 60 years and 1 568 over the age of 75 years. Of those, there are 478 males and 1 090 females. Why females are going crazy at present wanting to be on an equal footing in all sections of the community—with the jobs, stresses and concerns of males—beats me, because here we see that there are 478 males over 75 years of age compared to 1 090 females. The proof of the pudding is in the eating, and that

proves to me that at the moment females appear to have a colossal advantage in not experiencing the stresses and strains that are perhaps at times experienced by the male population.

These figures reveal that 3 086 people live alone. That means that they need assistance and encouragement to remain within their own houses or units, and this is very important. In order to meet this need, more voluntary organisations should be encouraged to help these aged people remain at home. Organisations such as Meals on Wheels and other services provide this assistance, while certain hospitals provide day care centres. In Glenelg we have a very good senior citizens club.

**Mr Ashenden:** And a very good member.

**Mr MATHWIN:** Of course, and that helps relieve the situation, no doubt. The senior citizens club organises outings for people, and there is a very good craft centre in which older people are able to display their skills and from which finance is sometimes provided in the form of assistance to members.

At present, I believe that Glenelg badly needs a mini bus. In the Brighton area a mini bus provided by the Crawford family some years ago helps considerably to transport people living in their own homes to shopping centres, local clubs—such as the bowling and senior citizens clubs—and the library. I know that Marion has a mobile library, but Glenelg and Brighton do not. So, a mini bus purchased for use by aged people in Glenelg would be most welcome. I hope that some time in the future an organisation may see fit to give financial assistance for the purchase of such a bus.

The report to which I referred also states that South Australia's population is ageing more rapidly than that of any other State, with an additional 4 000 people each year attaining 60 years of age. That is quite staggering when one considers the need to provide facilities for people in this age group. We are all aware that this will increase even faster in years to come, up to the year 2009. The report also states that Glenelg's total population of 6 053 people received an income of less than \$6 000 per annum, or \$115.38 per week. Of those people, 4 724 received less than \$4 000 per annum, or \$76.92 per week. This represents a great problem for the people concerned.

We hear of rapid rises and the escalation in the cost of electricity affecting these older people who need extra help. In the past they were encouraged to go all-electric in their houses for many reasons, one being that a few years ago electricity was cheaper. Having an all-electric house now, in some cases, will be a handicap to those people who rely on that type of power to keep comfortable and warm. I am sure that many members have visited these people in their homes and seen them huddled in dressing gowns with blankets over them trying to keep themselves warm. That is very hard to take, and the Government needs to reassess electricity costs especially bearing this in mind. In recent days we heard about electricity charges in this State, and the Government must consider the great hardship that the escalation in the cost of electricity will cause this group of people.

Another matter that affects aged people is the height of steps on buses, a matter that has been mentioned previously by the members for Morphett and Hanson. It may seem unimportant to people who have never had this problem, but the steps are too high. The Minister recently replied that little could be done about the problem, but I believe that it would not take much to modify the design of bus steps in order to relieve this hardship on these people who for one reason or another must use public transport and have to struggle on and off buses. Maybe they do not own a vehicle or maybe they are too old and have lost their confidence to drive and retain a licence. One would not expect an aged person to ride a bicycle. It is up to the

Minister to do all in his power to have bus steps redesigned to facilitate travelling on public transport by these good fine people.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Plunkett):** I call the honourable member for Murray.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Murray):** I want to refer to a couple of matters in this debate. However, at this point I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

#### ABORIGINAL LANDS TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendment:

Page 1, line 32 (clause 3)—After 'authorised officer' insert 'appointed with the concurrence of the Commissioner of Police'.

Consideration in Committee.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** I move:

That the amendment be agreed to.

The amendment requires that the Police Commissioner concur with the appropriate Minister in the appointment of persons other than police officers to exercise the powers vested in those persons under this legislation. The Government is pleased to accept the amendment, because of the further assistance that it will give to the effective administration of this important piece of legislation.

Motion carried.

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

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 5 p.m.

Motion carried.

#### CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION (EXTRA- TERRITORIAL OFFENCES) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

#### APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Debate on motion to note grievances resumed.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Murray):** I give my strong support to the proposed project to construct a walking trail along the Victor Harbor railway line. It is a proposal which has had some publicity and on which a small group of enthusiastic people is working very hard. I have already written to both the Minister for Environment and Planning and the Minister of Transport, asking for their support for the project. At this stage I have not received a response, but I hope that the Government will give the project its full support. The Victor Harbor railway line traverses areas which are not otherwise seen by the public: they are areas which are very different and which contain some magnificent scenery.

Of course, those who have travelled on the train in previous years would recognise that there are some surprises as well. The idea of the proposal to create the walking trail is to commemorate the name of the late Jack Colmer, and it is truly worthy of consideration and implementation. Jack Colmer was a member of the South Australian Police Force for most of his life. I was privileged to have Sergeant Colmer



responsible for one of the police stations in my district for some time. He was probably one of the most respected members to have served with the Police Force in this State. I believe it is most fitting that the late Jack Colmer be remembered by the creation of this walking trail.

I think it is something that the State Government should support enthusiastically. Of course, it will be necessary for discussions and for agreement to be reached with Australian National, but I suggest, contrary to what has been said by Dr Williams, there are no insurmountable difficulties. Dr Williams has indicated some concern, but I am sure that that is the result of little effort being given to looking closely at the project. I am sure that there are no problems as far as safety is concerned.

There is plenty of land on either side of the track that can be set aside, and physically all that is needed is a bobcat to clear the trail. It is a low cost project. There is a desperate need for more walking trails in the Hills area. It is not a matter of having to purchase land, as was the case with the Heysen Trail, for example. The land is already there: it is Crown land and I am sure that the majority of people in this State would recognise it as an exciting concept. The trail is complete. The usage by Australian National is now down to an absolute minimum. Two members of the Police Force and members of the *Advertiser* editorial staff first proposed and now support the project.

I am aware that these people have already walked the trail. They have had the opportunity to try it out from Belair to Victor Harbor. That walk was reported in the *Advertiser* and was very successful. Along the way they had the opportunity to stay overnight at various country hotels. I am sure that the walk itself will do a great deal for tourism in this State.

The establishment and promotion of such a trail has endless possibilities and would be a tremendous boost to tourism. It is an opportunity that should not be missed, especially with the increase in outdoor activities and the proliferation of joggers, bushwalkers, and so on. The history of the Adelaide-Victor Harbor line could also be emphasised and promoted in this way, either with or without train trips. Such a trail would be unique and it should be supported. I hope that the Government will give the proposal serious consideration. I assure Ministers opposite that I will continue to give this project my strongest support, and I commend the people who are working hard to promote it. I look forward to a positive response from the Government.

The other matter that I refer to relates to my concern for drug problems. I have had considerable contact with parents in my district who are concerned about the involvement of their children in drug taking. Although I recognise that some community support is available (and I commend the work of the Alcohol and Drug Addicts Treatment Board and the Health Commission) it is mostly at the deeply involved level of police apprehension or in the medical recognition of a drug problem.

More community group support and advice should be available at the first contact level. Parents should be able to recognise the needs and anxieties of their children and have some knowledge of the problem so that they can help and advise their children when they first encounter the problem. It seems to me that, when parents first become aware that a child is taking drugs, they feel that the family alone must deal with it and absorb the stress. Although I recognise that social workers are available in many areas, there is no specific community support group.

In talking to parents it was suggested that an opportunity should be provided for parents concerned about teenagers becoming involved in the smoking of marijuana to get together to express and discuss their concerns and seek, as a group, professional help. I strongly support that move.

Such groups could be effectively comprised of parents and young folk who have already dealt with the problem and could also include trained social workers, support from church groups, and so on.

There could be many such regionally based groups over the State to work with schools, families and other related youth groups. I was pleased to see that one of the schools in the Adelaide Hills is seriously considering this matter. The District Welfare Club Association has proposed that a conference entitled 'Children, Drugs and Parents' will be held in the very near future. Attending the conference will be a student counselling adviser from the Wattle Park teachers centre, people from the Alcohol and Drug Addicts Treatment Board, personnel from the South Australian Police Department Drug Information Unit, and so on. The conference will provide information for interested people and parents so that they can learn to recognise their children's needs, how to help and, of course, information will be available in relation to preventive measures.

The seminar will include a section on helping children to say 'No', and this is an aspect which must be pursued. Parents tend not to accept the fact that children can and do make their own important decisions and frequently make a choice. Pressure by the so-called peer groups becomes effective when a child is not equipped to handle such pressures. There is a very real concern and a very real need for an opportunity to be provided to speak on these matters.

**Mr MEIER (Goyder):** What a rare occurrence we had in this House last night when the Premier got up to reply to the Opposition's contribution to the debate on the Appropriation Bill. It is very clear that the Premier does not know which way he is heading. He is drawing at straws to find something that will produce some credibility for his Government, and I am afraid that he failed abysmally last night. It must have been an embarrassment to the Premier's Government to have to sit there while he spoke. I notice that he had the giggling gaggle behind him and, on his cue, they responded accordingly. However, it did not hide the fact that he could not produce anything to offset what the Opposition had said during its part in the debate on the Appropriation Bill.

*The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:*

**Mr MEIER:** Exactly! The Premier endeavoured to gain some political capital or kudos from the Treasury memo that he tabled. It took only two years to table that memo. The Premier has been trying to ignore it for so long that he thought, 'All right, I cannot ignore it any longer. I must accept that it is there,' so he tabled it and made certain statements about it. The Premier said that he felt that the Leader of the Opposition had ignored one of three important factors, namely, seasonal conditions. The Premier said:

Finally, the third point mentioned was seasonal conditions. At that time this was not mentioned.

The Premier was referring to approximately two years earlier. He continued:

The Leader interjected previously and said that I mentioned this and that there was a third point. However, in his December statement he did not mention that point . . . He made no reference to seasonal conditions. But, indeed, it is in the document, and I am glad that the Leader has discovered it in his second reading of it.

Let us look at what the truth is. Last night, the Leader of the Opposition, in relation to this one point, said:

The Premier said that in my speech on 16 December 1982 I did not refer to the third point contained in the Treasury papers, that is, drought relief and the cost thereof. If the Premier would like to read page 267 of *Hansard* of 16 December 1982 he will see that reference in *Hansard* which he said less than 20 minutes ago I did not mention.

That puts paid to what the Premier said in that respect, and so many other points could be dealt with in a similar way. I wonder how long the Premier can manage to keep going as head of his Government. The Premier seems to like to try to take the limelight when he thinks it might suit the populace. A classic case was in the announcement of the so-called safety package for road users. What happened to the Minister of Transport, the obvious spokesman on that matter? That Minister was not allowed to appear on television and be the front runner. Oh no, the Premier said, 'I will handle this one, thank you.' So he did, and the poor Minister of Transport had to take a back seat. Or is it 'the poor Minister of Transport'?

Perhaps the Premier has realised that the Minister of Transport cannot handle his portfolio. If one looks at the statements that he made in this House this week, one can perhaps see that the Premier is well aware of the problems that he has in his Government, first, with the Minister of Transport. Earlier this week we heard the Minister call the *News* 'the grubby little newspaper'. Do we find any sympathy with that statement coming from the Government side? Do we find the Premier coming out and saying, 'I support my Minister'? In the *News* of 19 September we find the following report:

'The *News* was not a grubby little newspaper,' the Premier, Mr Bannon, said today.

So, the Premier realises that he cannot back his Ministers in statements like that, but he realises that his Ministers are not performing to the standards that he wants. How can they perform, anyway, when they are dealing with a Premier and Treasurer who does not know how to handle the economy? In this State we have the phrase, 'Let's make South Australia great', but I believe that this Government is now using the slogan (and indeed has been doing so during its term of office), 'Let's make South Australia break.' That seems to be the Government's motive. It is determined to break the State.

It told the people that it would not increase taxes, yet the Government introduced two new taxes. It claimed that charges could not be used as taxes, but it has proceeded full bore to increase charges and taxes. The Government is simply sitting on South Australia and seeing how much it can take before it breaks. Obviously, the Government's slogan is 'Let's make South Australia break.' From being one of the lowest taxed States in Australia, we are fast reaching the position of being the highest taxed State, and it is a disastrous position. I feel so sorry for Mr Average, who has been slugged left, right and centre. Even in today's *News* we see the headline 'Power charges may be more'. The report states:

Electricity charges could rise more than first thought and there might be another increase next year...

So, the break is going on. For what reason I do not know, but there is a deliberate determination to sit on South Australians and see when they will actually crack.

**Mr Ferguson:** You want us to spend more money on your electorate.

**Mr MEIER:** The member for Henley Beach interjects and says that I want more money for my electorate. The Premier attacked certain members for asking for more money, and stated:

That contribution stood by itself, totally by itself, because successive members of the Opposition, the members for—

including Goyder—  
all called on the Government to increase expenditure in some particular area.

**Mr Groom:** Is that your shadow Minister's speech?

**Mr MEIER:** The member opposite who is looking for a seat on the front bench interjects. How embarrassing it was for the Government when the Leader of the Opposition

replied to the Premier. Government members snuck out the door quietly and left only one solitary Minister on the front bench, and he had to take it all. I will pay homage to the member for Hartley, who came back into the Chamber after a while. He obviously could not let the one Minister take it all. He obviously realises the weakness in the Government benches and is biding his time. At least the member for Hartley will be able to do far better than any other member sitting on the Government side, but to what extent only time will tell.

The interjections by honourable members interrupted the point that I was making about the accusation that I sought more money for my electorate. What a way to go! It seems that the Premier is trying to dictate to the back-bench and the Opposition that they should decide the Government's priorities. He is virtually telling the Opposition, 'We do not know how to run the State. I guess that your people should be doing it.' Yet the Premier does not want any requests, because he does not know how to handle them. Another member in this place made it clear that our job is to represent our constituents.

I would hope that the Premier would recognise that all members here, be they Government or Opposition members, are here to represent their constituents and to push for all they can to see that things in their electorate are put before the Government. It is up to the Government to make a priority list of what is to be undertaken and what is not to be undertaken. However, the Premier has the cheek to say that he does not want any requests from members of the Opposition. My word, my constituents are not too happy—

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

**Mr BAKER (Mitcham):** I believe that the Premier is quite unwell. I dare not say that the Premier is quite crook, because that has been a much used word lately. Honestly, his comments in responding to the Budget statements made on this side of the House lead me to the conclusion that either he has left his intelligence behind or that he is going through a bad period at the moment. I would like to take up the point that the Premier made during the debate. He named a number of honourable members who asked for public sector resources.

I wish to take up this point, because I am going to detail a few of the requests that I have made to the Government along with the background to them. For example, I wrote to the Minister of Transport concerning the difficulty that elderly citizens have crossing Belair Road. I asked that he provide Highways Department officers to consult with Sunset Lodge and other organisations in the area to see whether they could overcome the problem. The net result was that traffic lights were installed. That solution has provided a great deal of satisfaction to my residents who cross that road. They can now do it in safety. Previously we had deaths and injuries of such citizens. I wrote to the Minister and I am not ashamed of so doing.

I wrote to the Minister of Education about the state of some of our schools—which I will not name—but each has had some difficulty with the Minister over a period of time. I know that one of my schools has a bituminised yard which is breaking up, causing a number of injuries, and the Minister is responsible. I wrote to him about the situation. I wrote to the Minister of Water Resources when there was a delay in the assessment of a property being resubdivided, because that person had to sell the property to ensure that his business could survive. I do not make any excuses for the fact that I wrote to the Minister in that regard.

I wrote to the Minister of Community Welfare about the Wanslea situation, because I believe that Wanslea provides a magnificent service to the community at large—the home

aid service. I could recount a dozen letters which have had financial implications. Governments are there to make decisions, and local members are there to express concern about local communities. If the Premier wishes to indulge in these tactics, let me warn him that he is departing from the principles upon which Governments must operate. The Government is there as a servant of the people and, if the people are not being served properly, it is up to everyone (including honourable members opposite) to bring it to the attention of the Government.

To use these examples as a means of saying that the Opposition wants Government expenditure to be boosted is quite nefarious. The Government has to determine priorities on a wide range of issues, including benefit to the

people. It is about time the Premier decided to do a little bit of soul searching and cost cutting in the areas needed. It is no good his saying that we will add to staff so that we can meet that commitment. This Government has to embrace the word 'efficiency'.

The next issue with which I want to deal from the Premier's speech is related to the great play the Premier made on the \$13 million deficit on Consolidated Account for the September quarter 1982-83. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it a statistical table headed 'Consolidated Account—State Government Finances, 1972-73 to 1983-84'. It is for statistical purposes only.

Leave granted.

Consolidated Account—State Government Finances \$100 000

	Receipts	Full Year Expenditure	Surplus	Receipts	September Quarter Expenditure	Surplus
1972-73	520 866	524 777	-3 911	115 128	109 017	+6 111
1973-74	641 967	645 368	-3 401	135 807	132 285	+3 522
1974-75	828 985	820 601	+8 384	166 735	169 366	-2 631
1975-76	1 036 985	1 034 698	+2 287	240 086	225 968	+14 118
1976-77	1 174 025	1 183 180	-9 155	271 906	273 326	-1 420
1977-78	1 167 196	1 192 063	-24 867	266 884	283 781	-16 897
1978-79	1 264 705	1 258 252	+6 453	296 237	295 893	+344
1979-80	1 384 589	1 384 584	—	318 544	316 029	+2 515
1980-81	1 548 299	1 554 884	-6 585	350 148	345 595	+4 553
1981-82	1 705 499	1 766 772	-61 273	390 540	396 280	-5 740
1982-83	1 923 808	2 032 765	-108 957	437 240	450 241	-13 051
1983-84	2 160 679	2 190 399	-29 720	501 540	495 597	+5 943

**Mr BAKER:** This table is quite revealing as to what part a September quarter plays in a financial year. For example, in 1972-73 the September quarter revealed a surplus of \$6.1 million; yet the deficit for the financial year was \$3.9 million. The position in 1973-74 was similar. In 1974-75 we had a deficit on the September quarter of \$2.6 million; yet a surplus on the financial year of \$8.4 million. In 1975-76 we had a surplus of \$14 million on the September quarter and a surplus on the total Budget of \$2.3 million.

I am attempting to explain that the September quarter provides no guide as to the final outcome of the year. In certain situations there has been an absolutely reverse relationship between the September quarter and the financial year results. Either the Premier does not know anything about finance or he is trying to be dishonest to this House; people can make up their minds on that issue. Either way, he stands convicted. He has made great play of the fact that there was a \$13 million deficit shown only from September. If he had read that document carefully he would have clearly understood that the Treasurer said, 'Look, this is the financial situation. Your Budget strategy is on target. There are some worrying signs in one or two areas.' He did not say that we would finish up with a massive deficit. He said, 'Your Budget strategy is on line.' It amazes me that the Premier has sought to distort the truth in the way that he has presented the statement to the House. As I said, he either does not know his finances or he just cannot tell the truth.

I will now take up the issue of the wages money to which he pointed in that same speech. He said:

A round sum of \$80 million was set aside to allow for wage increases in the 1982-83 financial year—\$74 million for general salary and wage increases and a further \$6 million to take account of incremental increases in the Public Service. Of the \$74 million available to meet wage and salary claims, \$69 million had already been spent by the end of September 1982.

That is untrue. The document said that the impact of the wage increases that had been laid down for the whole of the 1982-83 year to that date would be \$69 million and, in the event of the wage pause, which at that stage had been laid down by the Prime Minister, we had budgeted a surplus in that rounding account.

Again, the Premier misled the Parliament, and he was quite scurrilous in the way that he attempted to fudge the situation. What did the Premier do when he came to power? What he did about his budgets and about his friend, the Minister of Health, who could not control a fowlyard, let alone a Budget of significant proportions. The Premier of this State has been crying poor since the moment he took office. He misled the people deliberately prior to the 1982 election. He knew that there would be some difficulties; yet he said, 'I will not increase taxes.'

No Government can ever make a commitment like that, but he did. He deliberately told an untruth, despite realising that there had been a difficult Budget situation in the previous year, 1982-83, and despite the fact that he understood that rural conditions were poor. Yet he promised that there would be no tax increases. If we are to be honest with the people, we have to start to campaign and put forward policies that can be achieved and met within the Budget's concerned.

The Premier has been totally dishonest. He continues to blame the Opposition. He has asked how much longer he should wear sack cloth. If the Premier continues to tax the people of South Australia in the way that he has done and if he continues to tell untruths, he will be wearing sack cloth until the next election, following which he will be sitting on the benches that are now occupied by the Opposition.

**Mr GUNN (Eyre):** I am pleased to have this opportunity to bring to the attention of the House one or two matters that are of concern to me. First, I refer to some of the comments which the member for Semaphore uttered in the House and which were widely reported yesterday. The member for Semaphore has been a most pleasant member of the House, and I have enjoyed his company. I think that he cast his aspersions rather widely and that some of his comments were ill-considered. I point out to the honourable member that the only place where he will see well behaved Parliaments is in countries that do not have a democratic process of government. I suggest to the honourable member

and to those who seem to support his comments that a little more thought should be given to these matters before rushing into making statements such as those uttered by the member for Semaphore.

On a number of occasions the Premier has referred to the Tonkin Government's decision to reduce the revenue base of South Australia, and he has implied quite strongly that the decision to abolish succession duties and a number of other taxes was quite wrong. Where does the Premier think that the economy of South Australia would be today had those taxes not been abolished? There would have been an absolute exodus from South Australia of funds and capital which would have been reinvested in Queensland and Western Australia. Once the decision was made by those other States to abolish succession duties, South Australia had no alternative but to do the same. Of course, there was no justification for the imposition of that sort of taxation, anyway. What would have happened is that those who could not liquidate their assets would have mortgaged them and have invested the money elsewhere. That would have left in South Australia a large number of mortgaged properties.

People were no longer prepared to tolerate the sort of humiliation they were subjected to in regard to death duties and the sorts of things that took place, such as the closing of bank accounts and the prying inspectors. I think that the Premier would be ill-advised to continue in that vein. I do not know whether he is trying to lay the groundwork for the reintroduction of a new system of taxation, say, a capital gains tax, a wealth tax or something along that line. If that is so, then heaven help the South Australian economy. I think that that would be an unwise course of action.

I have received a letter from the Clerk of the District Council of Kanyaka-Quorn who has complained about the Engineering and Water Supply Department's offering the council its old depot for an amount of \$10 000, even though the Valuer-General had valued the property at \$3 600. The council wishes to acquire that property for the State Emergency Service depot. It would be a most suitable location for that worthwhile organisation. I point out to the Minister in charge of the Engineering and Water Supply Department that Quorn is the gateway to the Flinders Ranges. Thousands of South Australian and interstate tourists visit the area regularly, and it is essential that emergency service equipment be available and that it be kept in a suitable building. It appears that this is penny-pinching by the Government.

From time to time the Premier has said that the Opposition has demanded that the Government cut taxes and increase expenditure. However, it has done nothing of the sort. The Government can provide \$5.8 million to the Festival Centre to cover its losses last year, and millions of dollars in other ways. But when it comes to looking after people in these isolated areas, it is like drawing blood out of a stone. I appeal to the Minister and his departmental officers to use a little common sense so that this building can be made available at a reasonable price. Personally, I believe that the building should be transferred to the district council but, if the Department is not prepared to do that, it should make the building available at the valuation of the Valuer-General. That is a reasonable course of action. If the Government can find \$5.8 million to subsidise the Festival Theatre, it will have no trouble whatsoever in finding money in this instance.

I could go through the Auditor-General's Report chapter and verse citing funds to subsidise the Jam Factory, the State Transport Authority, and so on. But it is apparently impossible for the Government to provide funds to extend the water supply to isolated communities in my district. That cannot be done. When it comes to a small expenditure of a few thousand dollars to assist this council, it appears

that nothing can be done. I appeal to the Minister to be a bit more reasonable in his approach to these matters. The Clerk of the council expressed concern to me that they may lose this opportunity, and that would be quite wrong. I sincerely hope that common sense will prevail in this matter.

I have been concerned for some time about the problems faced by people in my district and other isolated communities. I refer particularly to the surcharge on electricity. This Budget has done nothing to address that problem, yet the Government is taxing the Electricity Trust to the extent of \$24.6 million. It would take only a very limited sum to place those people, who currently have to pay a 10 per cent surcharge for their electricity, on the same rate as that applying to people in the rest of the State. There can be no justification for denying people at Denial Bay (which is west of Ceduna) and farther west of Ceduna water supply from the mains. I fail to see how hundreds of millions of dollars can be found for such projects as O-Bahn and so on when there is no money for water supply in these areas. The time is coming when these people will have to be listened to and, because they cannot get a fair go, the members who represent them will have to become more difficult than they have been in the past. There is no justification for this state of affairs.

These people have continually been put off. I fail to see why we can spend tens of millions of dollars to filter water for the northern suburbs and why everyone claps their hands and says that that is a great thing when my constituents do not have water laid on. Many people have to cart water in trucks. Yet in 1984 we are told that \$100 million can be spent on O-Bahn and \$100 million can be spent to filter Adelaide's water, but \$2 million cannot be expended over two or three years to extend the water supply to Ceduna. It is not fair and reasonable, and I challenge any member in this House who is a reasonable person to explain why these people should be discriminated against. You, Mr Deputy Speaker, would know that funds are provided for other projects. Each day members extol the virtues of the Government's spending money on sporting complexes. That is well and good, but I believe that we should come back to bread and butter issues first. Roads, water supply and housing are the basic necessities of life. People are entitled to have a roof over their head, to have decent roads to drive on, and to be supplied with water at a reasonable cost.

I could speak at length about the problems in my district, and I note that there has been no allocation in this Budget in regard to education for people in isolated areas. Few members would realise the number of school buses that are required—no consideration is given to that. People are still inflicted with daylight saving. Little children must get up and catch buses before the sun comes up, some of them having to catch the express bus from Penong to Ceduna—45 miles. The parents of those children have to cart water to make a living. This is 1984; these people are South Australians, and they pay their taxes. The rural industry has built this State and it is still the most significant factor in the economy.

These people are entitled to a fair go. I know people can say that I continually get up and whinge on their behalf and I make no apology for that. I have lived in an isolated community all my life. People say that we do not have to live there, but people are born in that part of the State and they are entitled to a fair go. The more I go through the Auditor-General's Reports and the Budgets the more annoyed I become when I think that if Governments really wanted to help these isolated communities there is nothing standing in their way. The Premier could find the money if he wanted to.

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

**Mr EVANS (Fisher):** First, in the 10 minutes I have available to me I wish to refer to the Country Fires Services and to the Metropolitan Fire Service, which is called by many people the South Australian Fire Brigade. I was concerned at the report which was brought down by the Public Accounts Committee and which in the main condemned the administration of the CFS. I am not as excited about it as are some members of the Committee or others who have spoken against the CFS board. I believe that some of the background of the organisation needs to be known.

Perhaps the administration of the Metropolitan Fire Service should be gone through with a fine tooth comb. It has a budget of \$25 million to cover the metropolitan area. It has the best equipment available, which it has had for a long time—I am not condemning it for that, but it is a factor that has to be considered. It employs 913 paid officers and it gives good service. The officers work under pretty favourable conditions that are laid down by arbitration courts. I respect the service it gives. However, I believe if it was gone through with a fine tooth comb by the Public Accounts Committee it would find similar areas of concern about expenditure, with people having meals or whatever—the sensational bits the news media picked up first. I believe in the CFS or the Fire Brigade there is a need for senior people to go out and dine, as do business people in the community when they wish to communicate with people interested in what they are doing.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr EVANS:** I do not wish to name the member who has just interjected. I do not want to get him excited. The Country Fire Services has to give fire protection and prevention to some degree to vast areas of the country regions of South Australia with 38 paid officers. All the other workers are voluntary. I ask the Public Accounts Committee to go back and look at the background of that organisation. In its early days the men went to fight fires with wet bags, shovels and rakes. People who were working on the land, people who were close to the fire and people who were living in the area but commuting to other places for work had to learn how to protect themselves against bushfires.

After the war people bought secondhand army vehicles and other derelict vehicles that had to be restored and they put together their own fire-fighting units with little or no help from Government. A little bit of help was received from local councils in those early days, and more recently larger sums have been made available. The service is now one of which the people in those communities should be proud. Their womenfolk backed them by helping them to fight fires and they were also involved in fund raising. Of course, the women of that area were conditioned to those circumstances. Suddenly, in the late 1970s and early 1980s the Government decided that it needed a more professional approach towards the administration of the CFS. Governments started to give them money to enable them to operate efficiently.

The Government said that it would give them a bigger headquarters to administer, more administrators and a larger board, mainly made up of people who had a background of working with a volunteer service in the field—local identities with a good knowledge and understanding of fire fighting and general knowledge of the local community. Then, suddenly, within a few years of setting it up, Parliament investigates the administration. Admittedly the administration has gone wrong to some degree in some areas, and in particular so far as money is concerned. However, why are we so harsh in our criticism? If any group of us had been given the same task—to pick up that same organisation with its lack of equipment, its volunteers, and tried to administer it and get it on its feet in that short term—we

might have found ourselves in the same hole as some of the members of that board.

It is all right for those who can sit back and say that they have worked in a particular area of finance so they understand all the circumstances. I do not think that that is necessarily the case. I believe that the CFS will pull through. I do not want to see the Public Accounts Committee being used as a step towards unionising the CFS and towards having more paid people in that organisation and getting rid of the volunteers. That is the first step that has been taken by way of the report introduced into this place. Let the members who are saying 'No' now tell me the same story in five years, because that is what is happening. It has suited some of the people looking into this organisation to find fault with it so that there is an opportunity to get rid of the volunteers. I say that something may have gone wrong to a degree at CFS headquarters, but I am proud of the work done by the volunteers and by the organisation as a whole and I support it to the hilt. One honourable member mentioned a couple of individuals, one of whom lives in my district. We have never been close friends, but we have had a great respect for one another's views on different subjects, even though our views have differed on several occasions.

I now turn to the subject of work on schools and hospitals about which the member for Davenport spoke yesterday. In particular, he referred to the Hawthorndene school in my district. Over the years I have made a practice of doing what I believe is the right thing in relation to approaches made to me by schools or other groups wanting help from the Public Buildings Department. I must say that I have admired the school councils and staff in almost every case because they have never come to me until they have found that all of the normal approaches that they are entitled to make through the system have not worked. Then, in desperation, they come to me. I have never gone to them and asked what they wanted me to raise or what they wanted me to stir. I have always left it to the schools. I have admired their councils, staffs and principals for the way they have worked, regardless of what their political views may have been. They have sought to solve problems themselves.

When these problems have not been solved and I have been asked to take them up I have done so through the proper channels. I have never taken that as an opportunity to stir about such matters in this House or in any area of the news media until I have reached the end of my tether. Over the years I have gained nine or 10 new schools or major upgradings in my district. I am proud of that, as I know the community is. There are still schools that need work done on them, such as Coromandel Valley school, which needs painting. There is also the upgrading of Hawthorndene, Eden Hills, Mylor and Stirling East schools. Those things cannot all be achieved at one time; the schools understand that. As long as I get co-operation from Ministers and the Public Buildings Department I will stick with the system that I have worked with over the years. I am confident that if we all had our problems solved in any one year we would have a magnificent system, but we would not know where to spend the money in the next year. I hope that my representations on behalf of Hawthorndene, Eden Hills, Coromandel Valley, Mylor and Stirling East will be met as soon as possible, and I will keep on pushing Ministers until I have achieved that goal.

**Mr Becker:** What about Coromandel Valley Oval?

**Mr EVANS:** If the member for Hanson wants to look at the Coromandel Valley oval he is welcome any time: he might catch a couple of trout in the creek.

Motion carried.

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

That the proposed expenditures for the departments and services contained in the Appropriation Bill (No. 2) be referred to Estimates Committees A and B for examination and report, by Tuesday 16 October, in accordance with the time tables as follows:

Estimates Committee A

*Tuesday 25 September at 11 a.m.*

Premier, Treasurer, Minister of State Development, Minister for the Arts, The Legislature

Legislative Council  
House of Assembly  
Parliamentary Library  
Joint House Committee  
Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works  
Legislature, Miscellaneous  
State Governor's Establishment  
Premier and Cabinet  
\*Department of the Premier and Cabinet  
Public Service Board  
Premier, Miscellaneous

Treasury  
Treasurer, Miscellaneous  
\*Treasury Department  
State Development  
Minister of State Development, Miscellaneous  
\*Department of State Development  
Arts  
Minister for the Arts, Miscellaneous  
\*Department for the Arts

*Wednesday 26 September at 11 a.m.*

Minister of Health

Minister of Health, Miscellaneous

\*South Australian Health Commission

*Thursday 27 September at 11 a.m.*

Minister for Environment and Planning, Minister of Lands, Minister of Repatriation

Services and Supply  
\*Department of Services and Supply  
Lands  
\*Department of Lands  
Minister of Lands and Minister of  
Repatriation, Miscellaneous

Environment and Planning  
Minister for Environment and Planning, Miscellaneous  
\*Department of Environment and Planning

*Friday 28 September at 9.30 a.m.*

Minister of Tourism, Minister of Local Government

Tourism  
Local Government

\*Department of Local Government  
Minister of Local Government, Miscellaneous

*Tuesday 2 October at 11 a.m.*

Minister of Education, Minister for Technology

Education  
\*Education Department  
Technical and Further Education  
\*Department of Technical and Further  
Education

\*South Australian Teacher Housing Authority  
Minister of Education and Minister for  
Technology, Miscellaneous  
Office of the Ministry of Technology

*Wednesday 3 October at 11 a.m.*

Minister of Housing and Construction, Minister of Public Works

Public Buildings  
\*Public Buildings Department

Minister of Housing and Construction and Minister of  
Public Works, Miscellaneous  
\*Office of Housing

*Thursday 4 October at 11 a.m.*

Minister of Community Welfare, Minister of Aboriginal Affairs

Community Welfare  
Minister of Community Welfare and Minister of Aboriginal  
Affairs, Miscellaneous

Estimates Committee B

*Tuesday 25 September at 11 a.m.*

Deputy Premier, Minister of Labour, Minister of Emergency Services, Chief Secretary

Labour  
Auditor-General's  
Police

\*Police Department  
Minister of Emergency Services,  
Miscellaneous

*Wednesday 26 September at 11 a.m.*

Minister of Mines and Energy

Mines and Energy  
\*Department of Mines and Energy

Minister of Mines and Energy, Miscellaneous

*Thursday 27 September at 11 a.m.*

Attorney-General, Minister of Consumer Affairs, Minister of Corporate Affairs, Minister of Ethnic Affairs

Electoral  
Courts  
Attorney-General's  
\*Attorney-General's Department

Attorney-General, Miscellaneous  
Public and Consumer Affairs  
Corporate Affairs Commission

*Tuesday 2 October at 11 a.m.*

Minister of Transport, Minister of Marine

Transport  
 \*Department of Transport  
 \*State Transport Authority  
 Minister of Transport, Miscellaneous  
 Highways

\*Highways Department  
 Marine and Harbors  
 \*Department of Marine and Harbors  
 Minister of Marine, Miscellaneous

*Wednesday 3 October at 11 a.m.*

Minister of Water Resources, Minister of Recreation and Sport

Engineering and Water Supply  
 \*Engineering and Water Supply Department  
 \*South-Eastern Drainage Board  
 Minister of Water Resources, Miscellaneous

Recreation and Sport  
 \*Department of Recreation and Sport

*Thursday 4 October at 11 a.m.*

Minister of Agriculture, Minister of Fisheries, Minister of Forests, Minister of Correctional Services

Agriculture  
 \*Department of Agriculture  
 Minister of Agriculture and Minister of  
 Forests, Miscellaneous

Fisheries  
 \*Department of Fisheries  
 Minister of Fisheries, Miscellaneous  
 Correctional Services  
 Minister of Correctional Services,  
 Miscellaneous

\* Works and Services (Payments of a Capital Nature)

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I move:

That Estimates Committee A be appointed, consisting of Mrs Appleby, Mr Baker, the Hon. B.C. Eastick, Messrs Ferguson, Hamilton, and Olsen, and the Chairman of Committees (Mr M.J. Brown).

Motion carried.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I move:

That Estimates Committee B be appointed, consisting of Messrs Ashenden, Becker, the Hons Peter Duncan and E.R. Goldsworthy, Messrs Gregory, Plunkett, and Whitten.

Motion carried.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 5.17 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 16 October at 2 p.m.