

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 14 December 1982

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

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

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

Pinnaroo Area School Redevelopment,
South-East Community College—Stage III (Timber Technology Facilities).
Ordered that reports be printed.

PETITION: CLASS SIZES

A petition signed by 33 parents and teachers of Gilles Plains Primary School praying that the House urge the Government to reduce class sizes in South Australia was presented by the Hon. Lynn Arnold.

Petition received.

PETITION: ANIMAL EXPERIMENTS

A petition signed by 106 members of the Anti-Vivisection Union of South Australia praying that the House oppose the use of animals in laboratory experiments was presented by Mr Ferguson.

Petition received.

PETITION: SPEECH AND LANGUAGE DISABILITIES

A petition signed by 1 007 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Ministers of Education and Health to provide better assessment and treatment facilities for children with severe speech and language disabilities, improve public awareness about these facilities, increase co-operation between the services, and increase the number of speech pathologists and support teachers was presented by Mr Klunder.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the following written answers to questions, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 1, 3 to 5, 8, 10 to 12, 14, and 17 to 22.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- I. South Australian Superannuation Board—Report, 1981-82.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

- I. Art Gallery Act, 1939-1980—Art Gallery of South Australia—Photographs forming part of the Report, 1981-82—
Regional Cultural Centres Act, 1976-1980.
- II. Northern Regional Cultural Centre Trust, Report, 1981-82.
- III. Eyre Peninsula Regional Cultural Centre Trust, Report, 1981-82.
- IV. South-East Regional Cultural Centre Trust, Report, 1981-82.
- V. Riverland Regional Cultural Centre Trust, Report, 1981-82.
- VI. South Australian Museum—Report, 1981-82.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

- I. Coast Protection Board—Report, 1980-81.
- II. National Parks and Wildlife Service—Report, 1980-81.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

- I. Dried Fruits Board of South Australia—Report, year ended 28 February 1982.
- II. South Australian Egg Board—Report of Auditor-General, 1981-82.

By the Hon. R.G. Payne, for the Minister of Transport (Hon. R.K. Abbott)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- I. Road Traffic Act, 1961-81—Regulations—Defect Notices and Labels.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

- I. South Australian Trotting Control Board—Report, 1981-82.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: ETSA CONCESSION SCHEME

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: In reply to a question last Wednesday, I informed the House that a committee had been established to oversee the implementation of the ETSA concession scheme. Following the receipt of information from that committee regarding an anomaly that had arisen in the eligibility criteria for this concession, State Cabinet yesterday approved of the payment of the benefit to service pensioners in the same circumstances as other eligible pensioners. It is estimated that 15 300 service pensioners and their families will benefit from this extension of the concession. It is further estimated that the additional cost to the scheme in a full year will be \$765 000.

The Department for Community Welfare is making arrangements for posting to all potential service pension beneficiaries the appropriate application forms. Every effort will be made to have these arrangements completed before Christmas. I have spoken to the State President of the R.S.L. today, and he has welcomed the Government's swift action in this matter.

The South Australian ETSA concession scheme is the most comprehensive of its type in Australia. It is estimated that more than one quarter of all households that consume electricity in the State will receive assistance in paying their ETSA bills, which have risen so dramatically in recent years.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: MURRAY RIVER

The Hon. J.W. SLATER (Minister of Water Resources): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The reason for this Ministerial statement is the continuing series of articles about the Murray River appearing in our South Australian press, culminating yesterday in an attempt to imply that Murray water salinity was a potential threat to the public health of the people of South Australia and no doubt was cause for personal worry to a lot of people. Initially, I welcomed these articles, as they drew attention to the problems of the Murray River. As I stated in my press release last week, 'any publicity which will encourage the Federal Government to take action at the national level to solve this national problem is welcomed'.

I also said that there was no need for alarm regarding the security of our water supplies and that it was vital that the issue was not exaggerated, because this could have a serious effect on the tourist industry associated with the Murray River in South Australia and generate loss of confidence in investing in South Australia. I expected that the press would have given a balanced view of the Murray River situation. Unfortunately, that has not been the case so far, and I must now set the record straight for the benefit of this Parliament and indeed to allay the concerns which have been generated in the minds of the public.

Let me say at the beginning that the Murray River is not dying, it is not dead, it is not in crisis, and it is not a public health problem. The Murray River is a magnificent river and its importance to South Australia cannot be over-emphasised. It provides the water supplies for most of the people of South Australia and this year will provide some 85 per cent of Adelaide's water requirements; it provides the water for 40 000 hectares of irrigation along the river in South Australia; it is navigable from the border to Goolwa and is a recreation and tourism resource of uncalculable value; and, equally importantly, it supports a wide variety of natural fauna and flora.

The basis for the present concern is that the South-East region of Australia is in the grip of the worst drought on record, and intakes to the Murray River are consequently also the lowest on record. When a similar drought occurred in 1915 the river virtually stopped flowing and salinity at Berri was at the unusable level of almost 7 000 e.c.u. (electro-conductivity units). Today, the flow at Berri is 4 800 megalitres per day and the salinity is 630 e.c.u. That is not to say that we can be complacent about the health of this great river, and I can assure this Parliament that the Government will vigorously pursue the continued improvement of the flow and quality of the water in the Murray River in South Australia.

At the beginning of winter this year (1 June), River Murray Commission storages had excellent holdings totalling 58 per cent of capacity. The River Murray Commission's September review highlighted the extremely low winter intakes, and the commission very responsibly adopted a two-year planning strategy based on the assumption that there would be a second very dry year in 1983. On the basis of the records, this would be an extraordinary sequence of events and represent the worst drought ever experienced.

The commission agreed that South Australia, New South Wales and Victoria would share the available water over this 22-month period to 1 June 1984 equally, and that at the beginning of next winter there would be a million megalitres of water held in River Murray Commission storages. Under this arrangement, South Australia would receive its full entitlement of 1 850 000 megalitres in 1982-83 and 90 per cent of its full entitlement in 1983-84. Obviously, if the intakes next year are average or better, all States would benefit, although it would be unlikely that South Australia would receive more than its entitlement in 1983-84 because of the low level of storages.

Having regard to the fact that South Australia has received a 25 per cent increase in entitlement since the commissioning of Dartmouth Reservoir and that there have been no additional irrigation diversions approved, this was a very satisfactory agreement. In its December 1982 review, the River Murray Commission has established that storages are 210 000 megalitres below expectation, mainly due to lower than predicted intakes into the system from the Darling River, reflecting the continuing severity of the drought. It was agreed that this short-fall would be shared by the three States over the period to 1 June 1984.

This means that South Australia will receive 3 445 000 megalitres, instead of 3 515 000 megalitres over the two-year period 1 June 1982 to 31 May 1984, that is, 93 per cent of entitlement. It also means that quantity of water is not a problem and there is no need to contemplate water restrictions to any Murray River water users in South Australia. The whole South Australian emphasis of present investigations in the Engineering and Water Supply Department and in negotiations which are proceeding in the Planning and Management Committee of the River Murray Commission at this very moment is on water quality, that is, when is the best time for South Australia to reduce its previously planned water usage by 70 000 megalitres. Water quality is therefore the most important concern.

With respect to public health aspects, it has been pointed out in the press that the salinity of Murray water is higher than the desirable level recommended by the World Health Organisation. This desirable level is based not on public health implications but on palatability, and most people would agree that the desirable level is rainwater which contains almost no dissolved salts. The important fact is, however, that Murray River water contains less than half of the permissible level recommended not only by the World Health Organisation but also by the National Health and Medical Research Council of Australia and the Australian Water Resources Council.

There is absolutely no evidence to suggest that there are any health implications in drinking Murray River water. Irrigators are the other people who will be concerned with water quality. The predicted salinity level at Waikerie during the coming irrigation season is 1 070 e.c. units increasing to 1 120 e.c. units in early May. During the last irrigation season, the salinity level at Waikerie rose to 1 100 e.c. units and to 1 200 e.c. units in May. In 1975 (pre-Dartmouth) the same figures were somewhat higher at 1 300 and 1 500 e.c. units, respectively. There is plenty of room for long-term improvement but I am sure that irrigators will draw some comfort from these figures.

I have been asked, 'But what if the drought continued for three years?' That is a hypothetical question and based on the records is statistically almost inconceivable. Such a remote possibility would certainly require some form of restrictions in 1984. Under these circumstances, can you imagine the problems in Melbourne, where they are having severe restrictions after one dry year? The fact is that Australia's long-term weather patterns will have to change dramatically for this to happen. I am sure members will agree that we cannot plan on that basis.

I am sure that all members will agree that the only conclusion which can be drawn is that, in spite of the drought, South Australia's supplies from the Murray are secure. Nevertheless, the Government has initiated a comprehensive water conservation campaign which will commence early in January next year.

QUESTION TIME

The SPEAKER: Before calling on questions, I advise the House that, in the absence of the Minister of Transport,

questions normally directed to that Minister will be taken by the Minister of Mines and Energy.

WAGE PAUSE

Mr OLSEN: I direct my question to the Premier. Now that the Premier is aware of the position of the union and employer groups with which he has been consulting on the implementation of a wage pause, can he say what action he intends to take to bring South Australia into line with all other States in the implementation of some form of wage pause? This morning a meeting convened by the United Trades and Labor Council rejected a wage pause. In radio news interviews, the Secretary of the council, Mr Lesses, stated:

A wage freeze is definitely rejected. What we are complaining of is that there is no consideration for any price freeze, and it is incompatible to have one without the other.

The position of the unions has not changed since a wage pause was first proposed by the Federal Government. On 23 November, the Assistant Secretary of the Trades and Labor Council, Mr Barklay, was quoted in the *Advertiser*, as follows:

The South Australian union movement was definitely dead against a wage freeze. It hasn't proved successful in the past and it won't prove successful now. On the same day, leaders of seven unions, including the Public Service Association and the Institute of Teachers, rejected the wage freeze proposal. Obviously, the Premier's consultations with these unions since those statements were made have failed to change their attitudes. At the same time, the position of the employer groups has been equally clear. Both the Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the South Australian Employers' Federation have indicated support for a 12-month pause.

Newspaper editorials have interpreted that the Premier's continuing refusal to give a commitment on a wage pause must be due to the difficulties he is having with the union officials. Further, newspaper reports indicate that the response of the other Labor Premiers, in New South Wales and Victoria, has been much more decisive. Both have frozen Public Service wages and State charges following last week's Premiers' Conference. As the position of the union and employer groups in South Australia is now clear, I ask the Premier whether he will at least follow the lead given by his Party colleagues in New South Wales and Victoria to implement some form of wage pause immediately and, if not, why not.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I take it that I am to reply to the question and not to the explanation, which included further questions in it, and that is what I intend to do. The question, as I understand it, is what action would I take to bring South Australia into line with all the other States. The fact is that there is no consistent line with all the other States. Regrettably, the intransigence of the Commonwealth at the Premiers Conference one week ago prevented such an approach being taken.

It may well be that some editorialists and others, perhaps in the light of internal disputes about the interpretation of events in Canberra, have chosen to believe that a process of consultation in an attempt to arrive at some form of consensus over how to grapple with our economic problems is a bad thing. I do not happen to agree with them and I do not believe that the South Australian community does. I believe that all those to whom I have spoken in employer groups and in the trade union movement have appreciated the briefing that they have been given, appreciated the understanding of the Government's position, and appreciated the opportunity to have some input into it. It has been a very valuable process indeed.

On Thursday, we will be making submissions to the bench of the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission that is being convened which will set out our position. Our position will be all the stronger for the consultation that has taken place. There has been modification of views, and there

certainly has been a greater understanding. If we are to achieve some form of economic recovery package, which includes a six-month wage pause, it will be because of the efforts of people like myself, despite the Opposition's attempt to sabotage it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

TELEPHONE CONVERSATIONS

Mr TRAINER: Is the Premier aware that a senior Ministerial adviser, formerly employed by the Leader of the Opposition when he was Chief Secretary, illegally tape-recorded his telephone conversations with journalists and others without their knowledge or permission? If so, does the Premier believe that this was not done on the instructions of the former Chief Secretary, and what action does the Premier intend to take on this serious matter?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, this matter has been drawn to my attention. Apparently, several 90-minute tapes were left in the office of the incoming Chief Secretary. I have not heard these tapes, and I have no intention of listening to them, but I am told that they include private off-the-record discussions between whoever it was and journalists and others who were contacting the then Chief Secretary's (now the Leader of the Opposition) office. I understand that these tapes have been sent to the Secretary of the Australian Journalists Association, Mr Rust, for his safe-keeping and that no transcripts have been taken of the tapes. I would be sure that the recordings were not made with the authority or knowledge of the Leader of the Opposition when he was Chief Secretary, and I am sure also that he will agree with me that this is a serious matter. However, I certainly do not intend to take any further action.

WAGE PAUSE

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Has the Premier, as Treasurer, estimated how much the Government would save in salaries and wages if the Government were to implement a 12-month wage pause? Public statements made by the Premier in recent days indicate that he is facing considerable difficulties in implementing his election promises within the constraints of the State's tight budgetary position, a position of which the Government of which I was a part made no secret over the three years that we were in office. We made perfectly plain to the public that we were in very tough economic times and that we were cutting the cloth to suit.

Based on the extent to which the Budget round-sum allowance for salary increases is being drawn on this year, it is likely that the Government could save at least \$40 000 000 in the first half of the 1983-84 financial year if it agreed to a 12-month wage pause for all public servants. This has been realised by the two Labor Premiers in the Eastern States who are, of course, going full steam ahead with a wage pause. Such a saving would considerably ease the Budget position. I ask the Premier to what extent he has considered this factor in his review of the Budget and in establishing his attitude to the implementation of a wage pause.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Again, I will answer the question that was asked and not the question that was in the explanation. There will be a statement on State finances. In the Under Treasurer's report, that aspect (the impact of wage increases) will be directly referred to. I make the point that, whether it be for six months, 12 months or five years, wage freezes or wage pauses of the sort being discussed

ultimately have an end. Equally important with what happens in instituting and during such a pause is what happens when we come out of it, and that question has not been fully addressed by those who have enthusiastically been lured into the concept of a wage pause or wage freeze being the answer to our economic ills. If they had any experience in industrial relations and the realities, that certainly would qualify the way in which they approached it, and we might well get a little more support from the Opposition in what we are attempting to do with the economy. The Deputy Leader will find the figures detailed in the statement shortly.

ST MORRIS PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr GROOM: Will the Minister of Education give urgent consideration to the needs of the St Morris Primary School in relation to its potential loss of a teacher from its staffing numbers in 1983? I am informed that in 1983, as a consequence of a staffing formula, the school may lose a teacher. The situation is of great concern to parents and staff, because the loss of a teacher would seriously disrupt school programmes and may mean the winding down of the school's art centre, which has been developed to its current high standard over many years. The St Morris Primary School comprises 64 per cent of children with ethnic backgrounds and consequently has special needs.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I can assure the member for Hartley that I will be investigating closely the matter he has raised. That school is one of a number of schools that has been drawn to my attention as having special needs requiring further examination. While I cannot give him an exact response at this stage as to the outcome of deliberations, I advise that the Government is very conscious of addressing needs in education in an appropriate and proper way. The Government does not depend on an annual renegotiating on the way in which things are done but picks up on-going needs in various localities. It was with that intention in mind before the election that we talked about having a proper study made of needs-based staffing and funding principles. Those sorts of issues will come up and will be looked at in a practical way from the start of the 1984 school year.

I appreciate that that leaves us with the 1983 school year. I can assure the honourable member, as I assure all members, that we are looking at all those matters and are hoping to address them as well as we can, given the resources we know to be available to us at this time. Indeed, some of the 231 staffing positions we have ploughed back into the education sector which the previous Government would have denied to that sector will be used for that very purpose. As to the specifics of the St Morris Primary School, I hope to get back to the honourable member on that matter within the next couple of days.

WELFARE HOUSING

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Does the Minister of Housing agree that South Australia is now obliged to implement a wage pause because of his personal reaction to the Commonwealth's decision to make extra funds available to the States for welfare housing? Yesterday the Commonwealth announced that it had approved \$100 000 000 extra funding for the States and Territories for welfare housing. Such funds will be part of the estimated \$300 000 000 which the Commonwealth expects to save as a result of a wage pause for Commonwealth public servants. In response to the decision, the Minister has been quoted as saying that any money coming to South Australia to ease the long waiting list of

the Housing Trust will be gratefully received. He also said that it would give the Government the chance to develop sites for housing in Brompton, Bowden and other areas and to expand the Housing Trust's design and construct scheme.

As the Minister has so openly endorsed the Commonwealth Government's decision to give these extra funds, I now ask him whether he will also endorse the decision which has made these funds available, namely, the implementation of a 12-month freeze. If he will not, will he, as Minister, accept that South Australia has no moral entitlement to these extra funds?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I would have thought that, in his first question to me as Minister, the member for Light would have asked a more sensible question. I am sure all members—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister will resume his seat. There is so much interjecting going on that I cannot hear the answer.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Of course, as Minister of Housing, I will be extremely grateful for more funds being made available to this State for public sector housing. I am sure all members know that the 25 000 names on the Housing Trust waiting list is a matter of concern, not just to me as Minister but to all members of the House. However, the honourable member did not mention that the \$100 000 000 coming to the States is conditional upon legislation being passed in Canberra. We have no guarantee of that. I have pointed out to the media that, if strings are attached to money coming to this State, I will make further representations to the Government in Canberra.

WHYALLA CRIME

Mr MAX BROWN: Will the Chief Secretary have discussions with police officers in charge of the Major Crime Squad to ascertain whether it is considered that some reward should be offered for information that might lead to the apprehension of the murderer or murderers involved in the death of Bunny Newchurch in Whyalla? I understand that the Major Crime Squad has no clues in this case and appears to have reached something of a stalemate. I question whether, to assist the investigations, the offer of a reward might be appropriate.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I am well aware of the concern of the member for Whyalla and the community in Whyalla that this crime should be solved as soon as possible. Information I have received from the Police Department indicates that significant leads are still being followed by the police and that at this time it is not contemplated that a reward is necessary. I will follow up this matter with the Commissioner of Police for my colleague and bring down a report for him should circumstances have changed.

WAGE PAUSE

The Hon. M.M. WILSON: Despite the Premier's answer to the question of the Leader of the Opposition, does he not agree that his attitude to the proposed wage pause is promoting unease among people, is less than crystal clear, is kow-towing to the militant unions, and is 'puzzlingly independent'? Editorials in both the *Advertiser* and the *News* have criticised the Premier's approach to the implementation of a wage pause following last week's Premiers Conference. The editorial in last Wednesday's *News* described the Premier's initial response to the outcome of the Premiers Conference as 'weak'. This was followed by another *News* editorial on Friday which made the following points:

Mr Bannon's policy is less than crystal clear . . . In the eyes of many his present attitude suggests that he is kow-towing to the militant unions.

Last Friday's *Advertiser* also expressed concern about the Premier's position. It said that he was 'taking a puzzlingly independent approach to the national wage freeze proposal', and that in his search for a consensus he was in danger of ignoring the consensus that existed already over the need to take urgent action to redress the severe economic problems facing Australia. The *Advertiser* also commented on the lack of clarity in the Premier's approach. The article continued:

His package has not been clearly defined yet, but at least one disturbing element emerged from his Ministerial statement this week—he wants an 'expansionary' policy. That approach would produce short-term gains, but ultimately mean higher inflation and fewer jobs. It is worrying, too, that he appears not to accept the philosophy behind the freeze.

'The Commonwealth has not said what happens at the end of the pause,' Mr Bannon said. 'In fact, the Commonwealth has said, very clearly what should happen; there must be no explosive catch-up scramble for higher wages once the freeze ends, because that would destroy vital gains in productivity and profitability, and therefore destroy employment prospects. Preserving jobs is the purpose of the whole exercise.'

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The short and direct answer to that question is 'No.'

STONY POINT

Mr WHITTEN: Is the Minister of Mines and Energy able to provide any information concerning a proposed oil refinery at Stony Point? The *News* of 7 December 1982 carried an announcement concerning a \$15 000 000 refinery. The country edition of the *News* of 7 December 1982 contains a report headed 'Refinery start in 1983', date-lined Whyalla, which states:

Work on the proposed \$15 000 000 refinery at Stony Point near Whyalla may start early next year.

The *Advertiser* of Thursday 9 December contained a report on page 13 concerning developments at Stony Point. Among matters mentioned was a \$1 000 000 fire barge that was to come from Marine Industries at Port Adelaide. Further, it stated that by mid-1984 a fractionation plant would be in operation that would provide crude condensate, propane, butane and ethane. However, no mention is made of a refinery.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Yes, I can give the honourable member some information. A report on a proposal for a refinery to be built at Stony Point by Galaxy Oil has been received by my department. A copy of that report has been received by the Premier's Department. The Department of Mines and Energy is now examining this report and is having further consultations with the company preparatory to a meeting of the working party that was established by the previous Government to assist the company with its proposals.

In summary, the proposal has the general support of the Government. I think it is fair to say that it had received support from the previous Government. The Premier and I have met the principals of the company and we have conveyed that general support to them. We will continue to provide all the support we can for this project.

WAGE PAUSE

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Has the Minister of Water Resources considered whether a 12-month wage pause would allow the Government to limit increases in water and sewerage rates; if so, to what extent, and, if not, why not?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The short answer to that question is, 'No.'

HOUSING RELIEF

Mr HAMILTON: Will the Minister of Housing tell the House what action to date the Government has taken to relieve the plight of many home purchasers who have been struggling with mortgage repayments and those who are unable to meet the high cost of rent?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: This Government was highly critical of the lack of response from the previous Government prior to the election on relief for home mortgage assistance. Since coming to office, it has already directed the Housing Trust to treat with some concern those who are seeking relief. Over this last month the trust has approved another 18 applications for mortgage relief, now totalling 73 families who have been given assistance. I am not satisfied with the current scheme, and hope to announce a new scheme in the new year. I am unable to give the member for Albert Park any details now as the review is still in progress.

On rents, we have seen a marked increase in applications for assistance. An additional 333 families have been given assistance since this Government came to office and some 529 families now receive benefits. This scheme is likewise under review and I will be looking to a new programme in the new year.

NORTH HAVEN

Mr PETERSON: Will the Minister of Environment say what is the attitude of the Government towards the sale of portion of the North Haven harbor development to private developers? The previous Government announced the offering for sale of a section of the harbor. It employed consultants and prepared pamphlets; the sale was advertised, but I believe that at the last moment the offer was withdrawn. The then Opposition opposed the sale. It spoke out against the sale, and later the Minister was quoted as saying that the sale may go ahead. Although there are some marked advantages to the Port Adelaide community and the State, I suggest, through the sale of portion of this property, some confusion now exists in the community about what is happening, and I would like the point clarified if possible.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The matter is under very active consideration at this stage, and the House, and the honourable member in particular, will be informed as soon as a decision is taken.

PARLIAMENTARY SALARIES

Mr BLACKER: Will the Premier say whether he will take the lead on wage freezes by recommending to the Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal a 12-month wage freeze on Parliamentary salaries and allowances? It is obvious that the community is looking for a lead from our State leaders, and it is expected that our leaders should be prepared to demonstrate their sincerity by example and peg Parliamentary salaries and allowances. If members of Parliament are prepared to tighten their own belts, then it would not be unreasonable to expect members of the community to do likewise.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am not familiar with the provisions of the Parliamentary salaries legislation, but I

certainly would like to look at that in order to give a definitive answer. However, if there is to be some kind of national wage pause, certainly I think that it is most unlikely that it will be of a 12-month duration. I make it quite clear that that has not been gaining support, interestingly enough among employer groups as well as among unions in other States. If there is to be some form of general pause then, of course, politicians, members of Parliament, along with any other groups in the community, should not be seen as exempt from it. I think that that certainly should be taken into account by all of us, but I do not think that we have reached that position at this stage.

TOURISM

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: In view of the Government's stated commitment to tourism development, and in view of the labour intensive nature and employment potential of the tourist industry, has the Minister of Tourism asked his department to assess the effects on jobs in the industry of (a) a 12-month wage freeze and (b) continued wage increases, and, if he has not done so, will he do so?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The short answer to that question is, 'No,' but I think that the member is entitled to a longer answer; unfortunately that is also, 'No.'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! This time I will not be able to hear the question.

SEATON TRAFFIC LIGHTS

Mr FERGUSON: Will the Minister representing the Minister of Transport inform the House whether his department has had any negotiations with the Woodville council over the installation of traffic lights at the corner of Frederick Road and Trimmer Parade, Seaton? This corner can be considered a death trap; two deaths and 260 accidents have occurred there in the last two years. Local residents have staged demonstrations at the intersection in recent years to draw public attention to the danger. As children on bicycles use the intersection on their way to and from Seaton High School, there is an urgent need to make it safer.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The honourable member has asked whether, in representing the Minister of Transport, I am aware of any negotiations that may have taken place. I am sure he will understand when I inform him that, of course, I am not aware of any such negotiations. It may be that some negotiations took place with the former Minister. Certainly, the accident figures that the member has given the House demonstrates that some attention is needed in relation to traffic conditions at the corner. The honourable member can rest assured that the Minister of Transport will give attention to the matter and that I will draw the question to his notice.

LEGISLATION

Mr BECKER: Does the Premier intend to request that his Government legislate for abortion on demand and to decriminalise the use of marihuana? I refer to an article in the *Sydney Morning Herald* of Monday 8 November 1982, under the heading 'John Bannon, pro politician, likes the private life', as follows:

While Bannon's low-key administrative style is the same as Wran's and Cain's, he is well to the left of both on such issues as abortion and decriminalisation of the use of marihuana. But he believes the push for reform should come from the back bench,

not from the Leader. 'As Leader of the Party,' he says 'I don't think it is my role to lead social reform movements. My job is to implement Party policy.'

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The answer to the question is, 'No.' I think that the statement read out by the member answered his own question.

FRIENDLY TRANSPORT COMPANY

Mr MAYES: I direct my question to the Minister of Mines and Energy, representing the Minister of Transport.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister of Water Resources is out of order.

Mr MAYES: Will the Minister of Transport report to the House about the progress of negotiations for the purchase of Friendly Transport, situated at 719 South Road, Black Forest? Friendly Transport has been based on South Road for many years. The manner in which the transport operations have interfered with and continually encroached on the residential character and amenity of the area was first raised by the residents in October 1981.

The Hon. M.M. Wilson: It has been there for 11 years.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MAYES: The member for Torrens has again interrupted me. The site has been used for this type of operation for more than 20 years. Large transports have been coming and going into and out of residential streets. The operation of this company has caused considerable discomfort and inconvenience to the residents of Black Forest and it has also created a hazard to children as well as in relation to the residential use of this area. In June last year the former Minister of Transport said that the matter was being looked into. However, to date, there have been no further progress reports about the extent of those negotiations. Will the Minister provide the House with a report?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The address given for Friendly Transport is in the electorate of Unley, but it is reasonably close to the Districts of Mitchell and Ascot Park, as the member would understand. Over the years that I have been member for Mitchell, which is one year longer than the existence of this problem (according to the former Minister, who informed the House by way of interjection that it was 11 years or so), I have become aware of problems associated with that location. If I remember correctly, the former Minister told the House on an earlier occasion about the duration of the problem. He said that negotiations were proceeding and he hoped that they would come to a satisfactory conclusion for all concerned. I inform the member for Unley that I expect that the present Minister of Transport will continue with those negotiations until a successful conclusion is reached, and I will ask him to bring down the report that has been requested.

VETERINARY OFFICER

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: Will the Minister of Education, representing his colleague in another place, the Minister of Agriculture, ascertain whether it is true that, during the Minister's consideration of the appointment of a senior veterinary officer for central region, two officers of the Department of Agriculture went to Melbourne to placate two unsuccessful and irate applicants?

It has been reported to me from two sources now that a considerable number of applications were received for that senior position and that two of the applications were lodged by departmental veterinarians (Dr Geoff Neumann and Dr Robinson) attending the epidemiology course in Melbourne.

Although both officers are highly reputable and competent, and one in particular was supported by the department for the position, neither got the nod from the Minister. Allegedly, to top it off, the Minister sent Dr Holmden and another officer to Melbourne by plane, all at public expense, for a day to smooth over the unsuccessful applicants and explain why the Minister had chosen to go away from the department's recommendations and extend his favour in another direction.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I might say that the honourable member's questions are nearly as long and rambling as his answers used to be when he was Minister.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I will most certainly refer that matter to my colleague in another place and call for his report on this matter. However, I do pick up a couple of comments that the member for Alexandra made in the way of grave imputations. I would say that when the honourable member reads the actual text of his question he will realise that some of those imputations are actually on officers of the department of which he was formerly the Minister, and that is a matter that concerns me. I will call for a report from my colleague, and that report will be brought down in due course.

YATALA SECURITY HOSPITAL

Mr GREGORY: Can the Chief Secretary, representing the Minister of Health, tell the House what action he proposes to take to avoid any repetition of the recent escapes by two inmates of the security hospital in the grounds of Yatala Labour Prison in the District of Florey? Whilst the area itself is quite large, it is surrounded by residents of Florey, and every time there is an escape those people become concerned for their personal safety, particularly when the escapees are found in their backyards. One of the amazing features of the security hospital is that, despite the publicity and actions of the previous Government in installing television cameras, the Government failed to install sufficient cameras in the security hospital to enable prison officers to view the eastern wall. This wall, in effect, becomes blind from observation, and that is how the two people concerned were able to escape from the security hospital.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I think it ought to be pointed out to the House at the outset that the record of security in South Australia, both in its correctional services institutions and in the security hospital, is the best in Australia, although that, of course, is no comfort at all to residents in the honourable member's electorate who live in the area surrounding Yatala Labour Prison and the security hospital. One of the bad effects of this escape involved the nature of the two people concerned, and fortunately the police were able to apprehend the escapees within a short time.

As a result of the escape from the security hospital, the Minister of Health and I visited the premises, and it was obvious that one of the real security problems existing there was the construction programme that was under way. The honourable member quite rightly draws the attention of my colleague to the problems with security so far as surveillance is concerned and the blind spots that currently exist. The Minister of Health has established a committee of inquiry which is chaired by a professional person from Victoria and has representation on it from the Police Department and the Attorney-General's Department.

It is expected that a report will be brought down to the Minister of Health before the end of January, and it will be made available to the honourable member. I will refer

the honourable member's question to my colleague in another place so he can have a full report.

PARLIAMENTARY SALARIES TRIBUNAL

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Will the Premier say why the new Government appointed members of the Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal as recently as 2 December 1982, as reported in the *Government Gazette*? Has the Government asked the tribunal to sit, and what action has the Premier taken to ensure that the tribunal does not meet for purposes of determining a wage increase at a time when a wage freeze is being proposed for at least the next six months?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: As to the first question, members were appointed to the Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal because the Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal Act requires there to be members of the tribunal.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: As to the second part of the question, I refer the honourable member to the answer I gave the member for Flinders a moment ago.

REMAND CENTRE

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Will the Chief Secretary say what action the Government intends to take to immediately construct an urgently needed remand centre now that the present Government has axed the well advanced plans of the Liberal Government to build such a facility?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: There is almost a sense of *deja vu* about that question. I point out to the House that in 1979 the previous Corcoran Government had selected a site at Regency Park, and funding proposals were under way to allow for the construction of that facility, which would have been available for remandees in South Australia in the middle of 1983. It took almost two years of the Tonkin Government to cancel that decision, and in the meantime no action was taken. It was cancelled on the spurious grounds that the location was required for the extension of the goods yards at Regency Park. Any examination of the area would show that a major drain exists between the goods yards and the industrial land on which the remand centre was to have been constructed. It was a good site but the Minister of Public Works (the member for Davenport) overrode the Chief Secretary. In a cynical move the Government sought to place the remand centre in the middle of an old urban area in Adelaide without regard to the feelings of the local community. The Regency Park site was at least 500 to 550 metres—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: What's the current Government going to do?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: —from the nearest houses. That certainly was not the case at the Bowden-Brompton site. I am encouraged by the honourable member's question because the member for Davenport, of all people, finds it an attractive commercial proposition. As we have his support we are looking at his part of Adelaide to ascertain whether suitable land is available for a remand centre. We have the support of the honourable member as he is enthusiastic about having this facility in his electorate. I am hoping to have discussions with him on that. On coming to Government we immediately honoured our pre-election commitment to cancel the decision to construct the remand centre at Bowden-Brompton. Discussions have already been held between the Public Buildings Department and officers of

my department, and a more appropriate site is currently being sought.

My understanding is that, although there will be a minor delay, the previous Government had not acquired the land at Bowden-Brompton to start the construction of the remand centre so that if there had not been a change they would still be fighting legal battles with people at Bowden-Brompton, and construction of the remand centre would not yet have started. The timing of the construction has not changed at all. This Government will construct a remand centre, which is the most critical aspect of reform in correctional services, as speedily as it can.

Fortunately, the delay has enabled this Government to plan a building more appropriate to the 1980s penal design than was the one which the previous Government was intending to construct and which, incidentally—in the twentieth century—included communal showers. These people are not prisoners and they have not been convicted of a crime: they are merely remandees, and yet the Government of which the honourable member was a member was supporting the construction of communal showers. That is not going to happen with the present design.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! From up here it looks like a bad day at St Trinians. Can we have more order. The honourable Chief Secretary.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Thank you, Sir. What the previous Government intended is not going to happen with the design we are now proposing. It will be a building that will be more compatible with the area in which it will be constructed, and it will be a better facility for those people who will be held in custody there. Whilst I regret the previous Government's decision, which was a bad decision, in one sense now that we are back in Government there is an advantage because we will build a remand centre that is in keeping with modern penal attitudes. I am certain that if we do not have a remand centre when the next election is held in South Australia we will be much closer to having one, whereas the only decision the previous Government made was to transfer the building from a site that was appropriate to one that was inappropriate. It had not acquired the land and it had got nowhere. The people of South Australia can be absolutely certain that that performance will not be repeated.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

Mr PLUNKETT: Can the Minister of Education say what is happening about the reorganisation of the Education Department proposed by the former Government?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The reorganisation of the Education Department proposed by the previous Government had not been completed by the time that Government was thrown out of office so one of the things that I was anxious to look at as the incoming Minister was exactly what stage had been arrived at. Members will recall a number of proposals concerning the possible amalgamation of regions into zones, and there were other proposals concerning the way in which the central administration of the department would operate. I have had a chance to look at the draft report of the reorganisation committee and I have already given some advice to the Director-General and to the department on this matter.

In giving the advice I am shortly about to relate to the House, I thank the reorganisation committee for the work it has done. It has given a considerable amount of time and energy to looking at the most appropriate way of handling departmental administration. However, I believe that a number of things need to be looked at further, and perhaps

that is not because of the committee's own desires but because of some of the restrictions that were put on it by the former Government. Accordingly, I have advised the Director-General that I wish no action to be taken to appoint officers to any new positions at this stage, and I have asked that the draft report be referred to senior officers of the Education Department for their consideration and comment. It concerns me indeed that that had not happened previously, and in an area such as education, the development of which requires consultation for its ongoing health, I am concerned that those officers were not given the opportunity to have their input into how the department in which they would work later on would be structured.

Likewise, I wish that the consultations would involve organisations and people who have a connection with the Education Department beyond the central administration of that department and similarly with the Public Service Board. When this matter has been further considered and we have come up with a package which meets the working needs of education in this State and on which education personnel will have had the opportunity to have had their say, we will bring down our final recommendations on this matter. When that happens I believe that any changes that take place will be truly to the benefit of that ultimate purpose in the educational system, namely, the students in the classrooms of this State.

AQUATIC CENTRE

Mr EVANS: When does the Minister of Recreation and Sport intend to announce the go-ahead for the aquatic centre off Hindley Street for which the Fraser Commonwealth Government has made available \$3 750 000?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: Because of the economic mismanagement of the previous Government and the fact that, as members on the other side may be well aware, it has been necessary to undertake a review of capital works and the Budget proposed by the previous Government, the aquatic centre being subject to that review, I will determine this matter when the review has been completed.

CONSERVATION

Mrs APPLEBY: Is the Minister of Environment and Planning concerned that the United Farmers and Stockowners have accused the Government of not properly consulting with them over a series of decisions and that the majority of the matters listed fall within his portfolio? The United Farmers and Stockowners have claimed that the Government is making decisions without consulting them and have instanced an increase in the number of national parks; a possible reduction in the 1983 kangaroo harvesting quota; the cessation of clearing in the northern Mallee; farm development restraints on Kangaroo Island; and the keeping of Alsatian dogs on Kangaroo Island. Have the United Farmers and Stockowners responded to the Minister's subsequent invitation to come and talk?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: When I read the report to which the honourable member has referred I was concerned because it seemed to me, in view of the issues that were being raised by that body, that really they were only interested in picking a fight rather than looking at the substance of the issues involved. However, I have subsequently been reassured that this is not the case and that that body will shortly be seeking to discuss certain general matters with me, although at this stage they have not responded to my invitation to 'come and talk' as I think the headline read. My colleague the Minister of Local Government can respond

in relation to the matter of Alsatian dogs, but in relation to those other matters that fall within my portfolio, they refer to the proclamation of the Gosse Crown lands as part of the national parks system. There had been long consultations on that matter. All that could be said had already been said. I merely, with the approval of my colleague, took action which the previous Government should have taken a long time ago in relation to that matter.

The clearance of the scrub in the Mallee must have read as though there was some general Government prohibition on the matter when in fact, on closer examination, the U.F. and S. was referring to my compulsory acquisition of a particular property over which there had been much negotiation with the landowner. I do not see that I am under any obligation to discuss with the U.F. and S. every acquisition, compulsory or otherwise, that is undertaken by me in the interests of the national parks system. If in fact we are talking about some sort of general prohibition in relation to the Mallee or any other area, that is different. However, we are talking about only one other particular piece of land.

In relation to the general increase in the number of reserves under the national parks system, of course I have made no policy for that. Thus far, with the exception of compulsory acquisition, we are talking about areas which were already in Government ownership of one sort or another and which could not be properly managed by the National Parks Service because they were not so proclaimed. Proclamation was the obvious thing to do to allow proper management of those areas. I make no apology for any decisions that I have made along these lines. I think they have been made quite properly after a good deal of detailed negotiation in relation to these matters, in some cases over a number of years. My invitation to the U.F. & S. to come and talk remains open.

FREEHOLD LANDHOLDER

Mr LEWIS: Will the Minister of Environment and Planning say what are the names of the two Government officials who he has just admitted he despatched to Maggea, in the North Mallee, to kick off the farmer and his family from the property that they had been given full permission from officers of the Minister's department and the Department of Lands to freehold less than 12 months ago?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: This Government, of course, by definition was not party to any sort of permission in relation to freehold 12 months ago. As to the specific information that the honourable member requires, I will take advice on that and get back to him.

DEPARTMENT FOR COMMUNITY WELFARE

The Hon. H. ALLISON: During the recent election campaign the present Premier said that when in Government he would see that the Department for Community Welfare would adopt a more caring attitude. In view of the concern that this statement created among Department for Community Welfare officers, can the Minister of Community Welfare explain to the House exactly how his staff have demonstrated a lack of caring?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The honourable member seems to have misinterpreted comments that he has attributed to the former Leader of the Opposition. The concern that we had, as an Opposition, was with the lack of concern and care shown by the former Government, not by officers of the Department for Community Welfare. In fact, we had great sympathy with the tasks that were being asked of those officers under a Government that obviously gave a very low priority to the field of community welfare; indeed there

were cut-backs in that area of more than 200 full-time equivalent positions which were removed from that department, apart from the individually funded programmes that were diminished. Therefore, the honourable member obviously has set out to misinterpret that in a mischievous way, and I can only put on public record the greatest appreciation for the work done by the officers of that department, indeed in very difficult circumstances, often requiring great skills and compassion.

MINISTERS' WIVES

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: Will the Premier say whether the Government employs any Minister's wife and, if so, who are they and in what positions are they employed?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am not aware of any Minister's wife who is employed. If the member is vitally interested in this matter I will obtain a report for him.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: FINANCIAL REVIEW

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: At the time of the last election I made it clear that one of the first acts of a Labor Government would be to carry out a complete review of the Budget for the 1982-83 financial year. Obviously, as a new Government we needed an accurate assessment of the financial situation so that we could determine the ways and the pace at which our election commitments would be put into effect. Treasury has now carried out the review of the 1982-83 finances as I requested. I intend to table the document, which has been prepared by the Under Treasurer, and, as I have already made clear, the Government is anxious that the statement I am now making, and the review itself, should be debated by the House.

In August the previous Government brought down a Budget which it claimed aimed at a balance on the Consolidated Account. Admittedly, this balance was to be achieved after an expected \$42 000 000 deficit on recurrent operations was compensated for by diverting an equal sum from capital works funds, a pattern of financial juggling with which we have become all too familiar. However, the Treasury review now indicates that this forecast is hopelessly inaccurate, particularly as regards recurrent expenditure. Indeed, I must say that the picture is far worse than I had ever contemplated.

My Government now finds that the deficit on recurrent operations will exceed the estimate made by the former Treasurer in August by a minimum of \$30 000 000. That is, without any additional calls on Government expenditures, without taking into account the commitments of the new Government, and assuming no increases in costs for the remainder of the financial year, the deficit on recurrent operations will be approximately \$72 000 000.

Any additional costs, either from price rises or increased wages and salaries, will of course add to this deficit. Unfortunately, the former Government seriously miscalculated the timing and the impact of movements in wages and salaries and, as a consequence, the round-sum allowance set aside for such increases was inadequate. It has already been fully committed and indeed it will require an additional \$5 000 000 to cover the rises already awarded by the courts.

Consequently, the blow-out of the deficit on recurrent expenditure could be as high as \$55 000 000, to give a

recurrent deficit for 1982-83 of some \$97 000 000. Unfortunately, Treasury can give no indication that this deficit is likely to diminish during the next few years. Indeed, on the basis of certain assumptions, which are spelt out in the document, and without implementing any new policies, it estimates that the recurrent deficit will be about \$100 000 000 in both 1983-84 and 1984-85, and will probably increase in 1985-86 following the loss of the benefits of the hospital cost-sharing agreement.

I can only assume that the former Government was fully aware of the seriousness of this situation, which has obviously been developing over the past few years. It is a matter of record that it inherited an accumulated surplus from the Corcoran Government, so it is reasonable to suggest that the deterioration in our finances began with its coming to office.

It would have been improper to ask the Under Treasurer to comment on events which took place before the election—and indeed, I have not done so. But, in light of the deficit which his review reveals, there must be considerable doubt cast on many of the financial statements of the former Government. For example, in 1979-80 it claimed a surplus of \$37 400 000 and in 1981-82 a further surplus of \$15 000 000. I said at the time that these surpluses were cosmetic and contrived. It is now obvious that this was the case. Needless to say, the information now available also calls into question the claims made often in this House by the former Treasurer that he was pursuing a course of responsible financial management.

Honourable members are entitled to ask how this critical situation was allowed to develop. Members of the former Government will have an opportunity to explain that as best they can, and I urge them to do so. However, the review does make clear the cause of the immediate problems which have made this year's Budget so inaccurate. With the exception of the additional interest on the public debt due to earlier loan raisings by the Commonwealth, they stem mainly from over-runs due to the inability of Ministers to control the spending of their departments; extra commitments made by the then Government during the election campaign; or from direct costs for which no provision was made in the Budget.

This latter category is most disturbing. In 1982-83 the South Australian Government will have to find \$9 000 000 for drought relief, yet no allocation was made in the Budget for such expenditure. However, the former Minister of Agriculture has made clear that this oversight was of no consequence to him. In the *News* of 19 November he is quoted as follows:

‘... the money was there—I had Cabinet approval,’ he said. ‘The former Premier, Mr Tonkin, gave me an open cheque book.’

I am not in any way suggesting that persons affected by the drought should not get relief. However, given the predictions of a poor season this year, any responsible Government should have made some specific provision for drought relief. However, the former Government chose not to do so. Also, as the Under Treasurer has now reported, the money was not as easily found as the Minister's ‘open cheque book’ attitude would indicate.

More scandalous is the question of extra costs of pumping water brought about by the dry conditions. On 10 August, the former Minister of Water Resources told Parliament that the cost of additional water pumping would be up to \$4 000 000 in excess of the pumping costs of 1981-82. Yet, when the Budget was brought down two weeks later, less was actually provided to cover the costs of pumping than in the previous year. This is despite the fact that in earlier dry periods during the 1970s extra provision had been allowed for.

I have also mentioned extra commitments made by the former Government during the election campaign. Members will see from the Budget review that Treasury estimates the cost of the remission of finance fees payable by Sagasco will be \$4 000 000. It is worth noting that the decision to remit the fee was announced by the former Deputy Premier on 19 October, and at that time he said publicly that it would cost \$2 600 000.

Without canvassing the merits of the decision, I simply point out that it has resulted in a further discrepancy of \$1 400 000. I leave it to the House to judge whether these items were among those left out of the calculations in an attempt to contrive a balanced Budget for the coming election.

As to the future, the Government has taken steps to bring into immediate effect four of its major election commitments. These are: concessions to pensioners for electricity bills, a concession which has now been extended to service pensioners; an immediate increase in the exemption level for pay-roll tax in advance of the implementation of our promise to substantially alter the Pay-roll Tax Act; an increase in exemption from stamp duty in respect of the purchase of a first home; and the retention of a number of teaching positions rather than allowing them to reduce in line with declining enrolments.

Members will see from the Treasury document that the cost of these commitments in 1982-83 is estimated at about \$7 000 000. There will, however, be a slight increase in this figure due to the further extensions of the electricity concessions for service pensioners. However, I would stress again that the grave situation which this document reveals relates to the position of the State's finances as this Government found them and is in no way a result of any expenditure commitments that we have made.

As members will be aware, over the last few years the former Government has financed the deficit on recurrent expenditure by diverting capital works funds. In Opposition, we consistently warned that this course of action was putting at risk the State's ability to finance capital works projects and other infra-structure needed for development. The review by the Under Treasurer now makes it clear that the cost of projects either under way, or which have been planned for commitment, makes it unlikely that any more than about \$10 000 000 would be available in 1983-84 to support recurrent expenditure.

Furthermore, it is suggested that, in 1984-85 and 1985-86, it will be difficult to hold back any capital funds at all. Consequently, the option of financing large recurrent deficits through capital funds, which was the hallmark of financial administration under the previous Government, is simply no longer available.

Finally, the Under Treasurer has put forward a number of options for dealing with the problems which the review has identified. Clearly, South Australia is faced with some very stark choices. Treasury cash can be run down, but the implications of this should be obvious to all members. Capital funds can be held back, but only at the cost of essential projects necessary for the State's development. Government services can be reduced, but this would also impose a burden on the community, or possibly only add to unemployment at a time when, because of the state of the economy, more and more people are losing their jobs.

The Under Treasurer has also put forward the option of increasing the State's revenue collections. He is aware, as would be all members, that in Opposition and on coming to Government, I made it clear that we did not wish to introduce new taxes or raise the rate of existing taxes. However, I would point out to the House that the Under Treasurer has advised that this may be the least objectionable of the choices which face us.

I have made no decision on any of the options put forward, nor will I until the Government has had the opportunity of examining the full details of the Budget. I have, however, taken steps to ensure that the inquiry into the State's revenue base, which I announced during the election, is established as a matter of priority.

The financial position of the State is extremely grave. We came into office just four months after the financial year had commenced, less than three months after the Budget was actually brought down, to find that the predicted outcome was already hopelessly inaccurate. The Budget presented to this House in August was both incomplete and dishonest. It was clearly a document designed for an election—not so much in what it handed out, but in what it attempted to keep hidden.

The Tonkin Government's mismanagement of the State's finances has made our task extremely difficult. The problems have been compounded by the employment crisis in manufacturing and the impact of the drought. However, I can assure the House that steps to overcome these difficulties will be given the highest priority by my Government. I now table the Budget review prepared by the Under Treasurer, and I give notice that on Thursday next I will move that the statement and the document I have just tabled be noted.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MEMBER'S REMARKS

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr OLSEN: I refer to the allegation made in the question asked this afternoon by the member for Ascot Park. I place on record the fact that while I was Chief Secretary, I was not aware that my press secretary was taping telephone conversations in the manner alleged by the member for Ascot Park. I want to make it clear that I do not in any way condone the practice described by the member.

At 3.25 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

ALSATIAN DOGS ACT REPEAL BILL

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Minister of Local Government) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to repeal the Alsatian Dogs Act, 1934-1980. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The Alsatian Dogs Act, 1934-1980, was introduced in 1934 to prevent the possibility of German shepherd dogs getting out of control, breeding with dingoes and becoming a threat to the sheep industry. The Act prohibits the keeping of Alsatian or German shepherd dogs in certain parts of South Australia. The prohibition applies within the pastoral areas of the State generally north, north-east and north-west of Port Augusta, the area of the District Council of Hawker, the pastoral areas within the boundaries of the City of Whyalla and on Kangaroo Island.

In 1980 the Act was amended to allow interstate travellers to obtain permits to take their German shepherd dogs with them when travelling through the prohibited areas in the north. In addition, a number of townships have now been exempted from the provisions of the Act.

The restrictions against German shepherds have recently been called into question. Little evidence has been found to back a common claim that German shepherds could breed with dingoes and become a danger to livestock. The C.S.I.R.O. reported that theoretically inter-breeding could occur, but trial matings have been unsuccessful. There are now a number of breeds in South Australia such as Belgian sheepdogs, Groenendaels, and Norwegian elkhounds which are similar in size and conformation to German shepherds, as well as other large dogs such as Dobermanns and Rottweilers. These breeds do not suffer the same restrictions.

Since the lifting of the prohibition in the northern townships the Government has not received any reports that it has been to the detriment of the pastoral industry. The Dog Control Act now provides a number of provisions for the effective control of dogs throughout the State. In particular section 46 (2) provides:

The owner or occupier of any enclosed paddock, field, yard or other place in which any horse, cattle, sheep, swine, goats or poultry [in this section referred to as 'livestock'] are confined, or any person acting under the authority of that owner or occupier, may lawfully shoot or otherwise destroy any dog that is found therein and is not accompanied by some person.

South Australia is now the only State with a specific Act that discriminates against German shepherd dogs and their owners. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 repeals the Alsatian Dogs Act, 1934-1980.

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

GOVERNMENT FINANCING AUTHORITY BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 8 December. Page 31.)

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition supports the principles of the Bill before the House, but there is one matter to which we are opposed. It is my intention to move an amendment to clause 16, which I will deal with in a moment. The previous Government introduced a similar Bill earlier this year, but that measure was not dealt with by Parliament before the election. The main purpose of the Bill is to establish a new statutory corporation to act as a central borrowing authority on behalf of semi-government authorities in South Australia. The arrangements for raising funds for semi-government authorities, other than the Electricity Trust of South Australia, have become increasingly unsatisfactory, although they have generally worked well in the past.

There are several reasons why the fund-raising activities of the authorities have become less satisfactory, and the Government clearly sees the financing authority as a way of easing these difficulties. The Opposition supports the actions taken by the Government in proceeding with this measure. This concept was introduced by the former Treasurer. All credit to the former Treasurer for bringing forward a proposition of this nature.

One of the key reasons why fund-raising has become more difficult is the relatively small size of the borrowings by individual authorities which has restricted the range of fund-raising techniques available. With capital markets becoming more complex, public loans as a fund-raising method have not been practicable. The investing public of South Australia

has had limited opportunity to contribute directly to public sector fund-raising for the benefit and development of the State.

Apart from the Electricity Trust, South Australians wishing to invest in a Government-backed security generally have had to subscribe to loans of interstate or Commonwealth Government authorities. The restricted size and nature of borrowings by individual authorities have curtailed the development of secondary markets in the State's semi-government securities. This development is necessary if markets are to be tapped in as much depth as is desirable to compete with larger borrowers, such as Telecom. The system has meant that debt allocations to particular authorities have been determined more by what has been available from lending institutions at the time they borrowed than by their individual needs and requirements.

The purpose of this Bill is to establish arrangements so that borrowing and on-lending to these authorities can be centralised. The authority will enable most of the existing problems to be overcome, although Loan Council constraints still apply. The establishment of a central borrowing authority is not new to Australia and has been under notice for several years in South Australia. I believe that the Government's decision to adopt procedures drawn up by the previous Government will be of considerable benefit both to the individual authorities and to investors in South Australia.

The Bill before the House differs in three respects from the Bill drafted by the previous Government. In clause 16 the Government has altered the wording so that the statutory bodies which may be directed to deposit with the Government Financing Authority are to be prescribed by regulation. I believe that this clause has weaknesses which should be avoided. If there are not the numbers in one House to disallow, then the banks and other statutory bodies obtaining money from the public are under threat. I therefore propose to move amendments to clause 16 which will overcome this possible weakness. There are also alterations in clause 18 (3) of the Bill introduced by the previous Government, but these can be accepted.

Clause 21 is a new matter but, as statutory bodies are dependent partly or wholly on Government funds, the Opposition has no objections to this clause. The establishment of the Government Financing Authority will overcome many of the difficulties semi-government bodies are having in obtaining finance at reasonable rates and with reasonable certainty and, subject to the outlined amendment to clause 16, the Opposition will support the measure.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I appreciate the Leader's remarks. As has been mentioned, it is not a novel concept, but it is one that we should move to establish as soon as possible. I appreciate the Leader's co-operation.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 7 passed.

Clause 8—'Quorum, etc.'

Mr BAKER: Subclause (1) refers to the size of the quorum. Clause 6 provides that the authority shall consist of three or four members, while clause 8 (1) provides that one less than the number of members of the authority shall make a quorum. Subclause (2) provides that a meeting can proceed in the absence of the Chairman and the Deputy Chairman. Subclause (2) appears to be invalid when read in relation to subclause (1), which provides that one less than the number of members of the authority can form a quorum. Can the Premier say whether subclause (2) should be amended to strike out all words appearing in line 41 after 'Authority'?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, a logical reading of the clause suggests that the honourable member is correct. If one fewer constitutes a quorum and no business can be transacted without a quorum there is no point in the authority's meeting. That is a valid point. Perhaps an amendment should be drafted. The clause can be amended in the course of debate in another place.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! This matter will be looked at. If the member for Glenelg wishes to speak to the clause he may do so.

Mr MATHWIN: I wish to speak to this clause because of the matter raised by the member for Mitcham. Obviously the mistake is an oversight, and I suggest that the Premier report progress to allow it to be corrected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! As obviously the clause may have to be amended, I intend to defer this matter until after a suitable amendment is prepared.

Consideration of clause deferred.

Clauses 9 to 15 passed.

Clause 16—'Power of semi-government authorities to borrow moneys from or deposit moneys with the authority.'

Mr OLSEN: I move:

Page 6, lines 6 to 13—Leave out paragraphs (a) and (b) and insert paragraphs as follows:

- (a) may borrow moneys from the authority; and
- (b) may deposit with or lend to the authority any moneys of the semi-government authority that are not immediately required for the purpose of the semi-government authority.

I think it is worth repeating that the Government has altered the wording so that statutory bodies which may be directed to deposit with the Government Financing Authority are to be prescribed by regulation. I believe that that provision has weaknesses in it and certainly ought to be avoided. Logically, if there are not the numbers in one House to disallow them, the banks and other statutory bodies obtaining money from the public are under some threat. For that reason, I do not believe that the clause in this Bill which has been amended by the Government over that which we introduced is warranted.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Government is not prepared to accept the amendment. The thinking behind it was reflected in the debate that occurred when this measure was considered previously. Certainly, some attention has been paid to the comments and the debate that took place then, because the powers of direction in the original Bill were too sweeping (that has been conceded), and it certainly gave the Treasurer powers which, in terms of the effective working of the authority, were probably not necessary. So it was not surprising that some concern was expressed about that clause.

What we have done by adding subclause (2) in this current measure is, if you like, to make a compromise between ensuring the effective operation of the central borrowing authority but at the same time providing some form of protection to individual semi-government authorities in this area. That, of course, is provided by the regulatory authorisation which is required to be considered by Parliament. I think that that is a reasonable approach to the concerns that were raised earlier. I think that the Leader's amendment in going beyond that could affect the operation of the authority, and on that basis I am not prepared to agree to it.

Mr OLSEN: The Premier's explanation does not allay my fears in relation to the operation of this clause, taking into account the set of circumstances that we indicated in the second reading debate and in subsequent discussions before the House. Because of that, I certainly do not accept the explanation given and wish to proceed with the amendment.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (22)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, Ashenden, Baker, Becker, Blacker, D.C. Brown, Chapman,

Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Lewis, Mathwin, Meier, Olsen (teller), Oswald, Rodda, Tonkin, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (24)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon (teller), Crafter, Duncan, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs McRae, Mayes, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Majority of 2 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Remaining clauses (17 to 28) passed.

Clause 8—'Quorum, etc.'—reconsidered.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: There have been hurried consultations on this clause. Clause 8 should be read in conjunction with clause 7 and only by so doing can one make sense of it. In fact, clause 8 (2) refers to two persons who cannot be members of the authority at the same time; in other words, it is either the Chairman of the authority or his deputy. The Chairman, under clause 6 (a) shall be the person who, for the time being, holds the office of Under Treasurer. His deputy (that is, the deputy to the Under Treasurer) is the person provided for under clause 7 (2), so that it provides:

The Governor may appoint a suitable person to be a deputy of a member of the authority and that person, while acting in the absence of that person, shall be deemed to be a member of the authority with all the powers, rights and duties of that member.

So, while the Chairman of the authority is present at the meeting, his deputy is not present. When he is not present his nominated deputy takes over and also chairs the meeting. Only by the absence of the Chairman does he become a member of the authority under clause 7 (2). If one reads the two clauses one can understand the purpose of it. Clause 8 is correct in its format. Either the Under Treasurer or his deputy presides. A situation can arise where both are absent as they are members at different times.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SOUTH AUSTRALIA JUBILEE 150 BOARD BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 8 December. Page 32.)

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): The Opposition supports the Bill. As indicated in the second reading explanation, it is identical to the Bill introduced by the previous Government. It was necessary to bring in legislation to incorporate the board of the Jubilee 150 celebrations. As a member of that board, I have been concerned for some time that it was necessary to bring in legislation not only to formalise the structure of the board but also to protect members of the board as an incorporated body. The legislation also acts to protect the symbol or logo of the 150 board and sets out the use to which it can be put under the authorisation of the board. The 150-year celebrations in 1986 will be a major event in South Australia. It will warrant significant expenditure not only of general funds throughout South Australia contributed by various groups and organisations but also as a significant contribution by the State Government. So far the board has done an excellent job in the work that is being carried out. The fact that this Bill will formally recognise the 150 board, incorporate that board and protect its members, makes it very necessary indeed. The Opposition fully supports the legislation.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I thank the Opposition for its support of the measure. The

Jubilee 150 operations have been conducted on a splendid and bipartisan basis which I hope will continue. Certainly the support for the Bill from both sides of the House augurs well.

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

PLANNING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 8 December. Page 32.)

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Murray): The Opposition supports the amending Bill. As Minister I gave notice, when introducing the new Planning Bill into the House, that we would be introducing at a time in the future amending legislation and, in fact, had introduced that legislation into the House. It lapsed and the present Government has taken up that same legislation. The opportunity to speak in this debate also provides an opportunity for me to say a few things about the new planning system and the new Planning Act.

I have noticed with a great deal of interest the comments of the Minister in regard to monitoring the new legislation. I believe it is imperative that that monitoring take place. As I have said on a number of occasions, it is a brand new system and a complex one recognised by the Parliament when the Bill was first introduced many months ago. The period of time taken at conference indicated the complexities of this legislation.

There is certainly a need to closely monitor the legislation. I have a Question on Notice relating to the specific group of people who will monitor the legislation and a few other questions I would like to ask the Minister but I recognise that it is not proper that I do that now because questions are on notice.

I will be watching the legislation closely. It is important that we keep in direct contact with the Local Government Association, with the developers and the people in the community who will be using this legislation. We would recognise that a large proportion of the community at some stage will become involved with this legislation. I will be anxious to watch the monitoring process that has been adopted by the Government and I can assure the House that the Opposition generally will be keeping a close watch on it.

I have been made aware of a problem that relates to a supplementary development plan presently before the Mitcham council, and the concern I have is that it could be quite detrimental to the Minda organisation. I have already received representations from Minda. I understand that representatives have made an approach to the new Minister of Planning, who has agreed to see them. I think it is a pity that the legislation is having to go through before the Minister has had an opportunity to talk over the problems with Minda as a result of this legislation going through and as a result of the supplementary development plan going through the Mitcham council.

I would hope that the Minister will listen to the concern expressed by that group of people. I believe there are ways in which the Minister can help them, and we will certainly be watching that situation closely also. I intend to say much more about the new legislation later but I give notice now that the Opposition supports it.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Environment and Planning): I thank the Opposition for its support for this measure and I also thank the member for Murray for ventilating the matter of the supplementary development

plan being considered by the City of Mitcham because it gives me an opportunity to explain the Government's position in this matter. I will certainly be happy to talk to Hassells, the people representing Craighburn Farm (Minda Incorporated) in this matter, but I do not see that their concern really impinges on the passage of this legislation, except in a way that I think would be most unfortunate. I am not suggesting that anyone is requesting that anything improper be done. What we are doing here is that as a result of the proclamation made on 4 November it has been necessary for the Government to slightly alter the form of the Bill which the honourable member previously introduced in the last Parliament. This is necessary in order to pick up supplementary development plans or amendments to zoning regulations initiated during the period between the first proclamation which allowed the Planning Commission to be set up and the final proclamation of the Bill on 4 November.

The effect of not proceeding with this amendment would be, I am advised, that those particular supplementary development plans would go out of existence and it may well be that there are those people concerned about the particular supplementary development plan who would not mind that happening. My point is that one simply has to look at that particular supplementary development plan on its merits and in terms of the machinery, which the Opposition obviously approves because it introduced the legislation, and which we approve.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: You'll have the opportunity to look at that particular plan.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Right, on both sides, subject to the review that is going on. In a letter to me, Hassells have referred to section 41 (11) of the Planning Act which they believe will take away my discretion to be able to act in relation to the supplementary development plan should it be approved by the Mitcham council. I take the opportunity of pointing out that there also exists section 41 (12), which gives the Governor in Executive Council discretion. Of course, the Governor acts on the advice of the Government of the day, so it will be perfectly proper should I be less than satisfied with the supplementary development plan that finally comes forward for the Government to tender appropriate advice to His Excellency without in any way suggesting that I am supporting a certain line on a particular point of view being put forward by Hassells or, for that matter, that I am opposing it. I am in a position to say that there is still opportunity for review. In any event, I think it would be unfortunate if, whatever the merits of this supplementary development plan, it were simply to disappear because of a loophole which has occurred in the actual dating of the proclamation of the legislation.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: It doesn't handle loopholes, though, does it?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: We indeed do, and that is why we are proceeding as we are at this time. The particular merits of Craighburn's concern is something that I do not want to discuss at the moment except to make the point that I have on record a press release that was made by the then Minister of Planning, Mr Hugh Hudson, on 7 November 1978 in which he made clear that in any application for subdivision the Government would act to ensure that all land north of the Sturt River was retained as open space. He went on to say in that statement that all land north of the river would be rezoned for special uses in order to retain the existing open-space character of the land, consisting of 350 hectares, most of which is zoned rural A. That is the matter which is the subject of discussion before the City of Mitcham at the moment and, as the member for Murray would know, as Minister he had exchanged correspondence with these people but I think he would agree with me that

at no time did he commit his Government to a particular course of action except for continuing consultation to ensure that the views of all parties concerned in this matter could be properly ventilated. In any event, if the former Minister feels that other than that is the case, I shall be happy to talk to him about it.

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

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The SPEAKER: In calling on the honourable member for Brighton, I remind honourable members that this is her maiden speech, and I ask that the normal courtesies be extended. The honourable member for Brighton.

Mrs APPLEBY (Brighton): I move:

That the Address in Reply as read be adopted.

In moving this motion, and as a new member of this Parliament representing the electorate of Brighton, I would like first to formally congratulate you, Mr Speaker, and hope that we will conduct ourselves as an effective Parliament for the benefit of the electors who have given us the responsibility to represent them. To the Premier, Government Ministers, back-benchers, members of committees and Parliamentary staff, I hope this Parliament sees the fulfilment of the expectations of all South Australians for both growth and security.

The policies put forward by the new Labor Government during the election campaign will result in significant improvements to the way in which we all live. I feel that one of our major tasks is to be accessible to each and every person, regardless of age, gender, background, position, social environment, religion, or politics. Local government, schools, business, community groups and individuals must be encouraged. Every person should have reason to be proud of our State. As a goal, we must work towards the improvement and security of our lifestyle, and the growth of our community. We must have pride in the total achievement of our most valuable asset—people.

During my campaign I recognised the importance of talking to people in the community, both on an individual and on a group basis, to find out what they need and expect. The people who elect us require not just a member of Parliament, but an ear and a voice, understanding and action. They want to discuss problems and issues with their elected member in an environment in which they feel comfortable. For ease of communication discussion needs to be in terms that everyone concerned can understand. I am honoured that the electors of Brighton have given me the task of representing them for the term of this Parliament. At this point I would like to make my commitment to each and every person in the electorate to represent them with care and honesty in every situation that arises; and to work for the development of the community in areas such as education, care for the aged, economic development, transport, the environment and recreation.

However, it is unfortunate that the issue which will be of particular importance over the next few years is unemployment. His Excellency the Governor, in his Speech at the opening of Parliament, addressed us on the severe economic problems we are facing in South Australia. The situation has been made worse by the sudden collapse of employment in the manufacturing sector which greeted the Government on its assuming office, and Government Ministers have given immediate attention to dealing with this crisis.

If the Federal Government, under its present leadership, insists on maintaining its present approach to economic

management, there is little hope for a marked improvement in the new year: 1983 could be the worst year that South Australia has experienced for almost half a century. This Government and the Governments of New South Wales and Victoria, which are the two other major industrial States, have taken the initiative in formulating a plan for the revitalisation of the national economy. The Premier has a major responsibility to continue to hold discussions with the other States and the Federal Government on these matters. He must receive the support and co-operation of every South Australian if we are to lift ourselves out of the depression the State has been pushed into over the past three years.

As my first contribution to discussion in this House, I wish to address myself to the particular problems of the mature age unemployed. For some time the labour market has been undergoing significant change. The results are seen in rising unemployment, slowing employment growth, and a reduction in the labour force participation rate. The burdens associated with these changes have fallen unevenly on different groups within the work force. During the 1970s much concern was focused on young people, and deservedly so, chiefly because they accounted for the greater proportion of unemployed and are particularly vulnerable.

Resources have been provided for support, training and counselling of unemployed youth, and substantial grant and subsidy schemes have been established to help them. We cannot do too much in this area, but it should be realised that other groups, the mature unemployed in particular, have been almost totally neglected. During the period from August 1979 to August 1982, older people suffered greater job losses and more severe unemployment growth than did young people.

A glance at the newspapers shows us that the situation is deteriorating almost on a daily basis. I refer to a selection of headlines from Adelaide's daily papers since late October:

- 20 October—Workers take cut in pay and hours
- 21 October—1 000 accept four-day week
- 22 October—40 more retrenched
- 28 October—Federal bounty may save 400 jobs
Special help for Kelvinator
- 9 November—140 retrenched at Kelvinator
200 men at Bridgestone sacked
- 10 November—Clarks Shoes to close for five days
Another 500 lose factory jobs
Bannon will seek more Federal aid
- 18 November—29 jobs go as South Australian steel plant shuts
- 25 November—Tyre firm to lay off 136 more workers

I refer to extracts from an article dated 9 November, dealing with the Kelvinator sackings, which stated in part:

Mr Moore, 34, said 'Most workers were in a state of shock over the sackings.' 'Two women workers who had been sacked [one of whom had worked at Kelvinators for 26 years] were in tears' ... 'They didn't even call me into the office. I was told I had the sack where I stood.'

'Workers who received notice face many headaches ranging from how to pay off mortgages to trying for a job during a period of record post-war unemployment.'

Mr Victor Cannella, 46, a welder who worked in the refrigerator doors section for 18 years and is married with three children said, 'There's little chance of me getting another job at my age.'

Mr Ken Peplow, 34, worked for Kelvinator for 12 years. 'I'm virtually out on the street from Thursday', he said. 'I'm paying off a unit at West Lakes which I bought six months ago.'

'The initial shock is the hardest. You come to work one morning and you leave at night with no job—it's a lovely feeling.'

I hope members took notice of the ages of the people to whom I have been referring. It is mature people, aged 35 years and over, who are now carrying the biggest burden of the economic down-turn in South Australia. This is disturbing, as the majority of these people would be the sole or main breadwinner in their families under better economic circumstances. What they do for their families and at the same time for the economy cannot be under-estimated:

providing food and clothing, buying washing machines and cars, supporting the entertainment industry, taking holidays, replacing home furnishings, and supporting their children's education.

It is certainly time to direct more attention to the plight of the mature worker and to devise means of alleviating the problems they face before circumstances worsen further. In my area a public meeting was held to bring together the older unemployed, and over 90 people attended. The group identified five priorities:

1. The need for employment; however, as full-time employment is becoming more difficult to secure, the need for part-time or casual work is also important.
2. The need to maintain skills of the unemployed person's trade or profession.
3. The need for information about community services and facilities.
4. The need for concessions to assist people forced to live for long periods on unemployment benefits.
5. The need for appropriate support and retraining groups for unemployed mature workers.

Much of the poor labour market experience of this group in recent years appears to be connected with cuts in State Government employment, the down-turn in the housing sector, and the continuation of the decline of the manufacturing sector. Thus, mature employment would be boosted by larger expenditure on public works, policies which stimulate the housing sector, and other measures which promote and sustain viability of existing and new enterprises, particularly in the manufacturing industry. It may be considered necessary, in the period before such changes can be initiated and take effect, to establish a direct job generation programme for the mature unemployed.

The social consequences among this group are most severe where there are families and children. A constituent visited me recently to explain his family's situation. He had worked in a manufacturing plant for 27 years until he was retrenched four months ago. He is still trying to pay off the family home and car. His wife has a part-time job in the retail industry. They have two children. The eldest will be seeking employment at the end of this year, and the second child has two years schooling left to complete.

Because of 'work pride' the man has been passing himself off as retired. He has been living on his pay-out from work, the family's savings and his wife's pay for her 30 hours a week in retail, which has now been reduced to 19. Until he came to see me he had felt too ashamed to collect unemployment benefits. They had sought no help from the community, as they said they were unsure about where they fitted in. Incidentally, the oldest child wants an apprenticeship as a plumber or electrician, and after 67 applications has as yet no prospects for the new year.

There is an urgent need to reverse the present trend of increasing unemployment amongst people who are over the age of 35. In the three years between August 1979 and August 1982 it had risen by 5 100 or 21 per cent. The situation of this mature group has deteriorated relative to young people. In the same three years the participation of teenage males aged between 15 and 19 years increased by 0.4 per cent and the participation of the 35-plus age group fell by 4.5 per cent. This is a large change in a three-year span and probably reflects a reaction to worsening labour market conditions for the group. This is the so-called discouraged worker effect.

People know that they will not be able to find a job, so they withdraw from the labour market and live on whatever resources they have available. Of course, not everyone is in a situation where they can afford 'early retirement', or whatever emphasis we want to give to someone resigning

himself to the fact, both in thought and action, that he will not be able to find employment for the rest of his life.

The term 'discouraged worker' is unsatisfactory, because it implies that unemployment exists only where it fits in with the narrow definition prescribed by the Commonwealth Statistician. The actual situation is that the Statistician's estimate of unemployment is lower than is the real level of unemployment. An economist would refer to the people who want work but who do not come within the Statistician's definition as 'hidden unemployed'. What is unusual and disturbing about the present situation is that we know that both the Statistician's estimate of unemployment and the number of hidden unemployed are increasing at the same time.

The majority of mature unemployed are likely to be the sole or main breadwinner in their families. Families where the wife has paid employment are more fortunate than are those who depend solely on social security benefits. The growth in the labour force participation of women is now higher than one would expect, simply from the long-run trend for more women to participate continuously in the work force during the major child-bearing and rearing years. It appears that many women are entering the labour market to seek employment because their husbands are in danger of becoming, or are, unemployed. I see this as a further pressure placed upon families, because it is not providing the pleasure of a career for women, but rather is placing them in the position of taking on additional responsibility to make ends meet.

At the same time it creates a new problem for their families, because often it has a devastating effect on the traditional breadwinner, who may see himself as a failure, not only because he is not working, but also because his role as head of the household is diminishing. How people cope with this total situation depends to a large extent on what services are provided for them. As I see it, the first step is to openly identify this group as mature unemployed and to work at all levels to ensure that services are tailored to their needs. There should also be a campaign to raise the awareness of people who are at present in work to the services that are available should they become unemployed.

Last Thursday the Federal Government announced a new scheme which gives belated recognition to the needs of the mature unemployed. The new measures include big subsidies for employers who offer jobs to adults who have been unemployed for a long time. Apparently, employers taking on adults who are over the age of 25 years and who have been unemployed for eight of the past 12 months would get a subsidy of \$100 a week for each employee for 17 weeks, followed by \$75 a week for another 17 weeks. A larger subsidy of \$125 a week would be paid for those over 45 years who have been continuously unemployed for 12 months. Does this mean that those who obtain employment under this scheme will have only 34 weeks job security and then be thrown back on to the scrap heap, or will some onus be placed on employers not to abuse the arrangement, as has happened in other schemes where the employee knew that, when the subsidy finished, so was the job?

I would like to conclude by reminding members here today and the electors of this State that the Government and the people have a responsibility to ensure that South Australia is again recognised as the most innovative of all the States, as we were in the not too distant past.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before calling upon the member for Mawson to speak I would remind the House, as with the previous speaker, that this will be the honourable member's maiden speech, and I hope that the same decorum will be afforded to her as to the previous speaker.

Ms LENEHAN (Mawson): In seconding the motion, I wish to formally congratulate the Speaker on his election to the most honoured position in this House. I also offer my congratulations to other newly elected members. Election to this House is a great honour which I believe carries with it an enormous responsibility to represent the hopes and aspirations of ordinary Australians. To the electors of Mawson, I publicly offer my sincere thanks for the support and trust placed in me as their Australian Labor Party representative. In particular, I say 'Thank you' to the 11 968 people who gave me their first preference vote. My family, my campaign director, my committee, and my personal friends must also share in the success of winning Mawson for the Labor Party. Their continued support and hard work throughout the two-year campaign have been greatly appreciated. I also wish to thank the Australian Labor Party for the confidence and faith it expressed in preselecting me as its candidate for Mawson.

Having completed the first part of my Party's mandate, namely, to win Mawson, I now intend to put my energies and skills into being a strong, approachable and caring member who will continue to hold the seat of Mawson for Labor. My final thanks must go to two people who have driven more than 3 000 kilometres to be with me today. My parents are not only responsible for my physical presence in this Chamber, but through their example and positive support they have encouraged me to achieve the goals that I have set myself. Before discussing some of these goals with respect to my district, I believe it is appropriate that, as a new member of this House, I outline something of my background and personal and political philosophies.

I was born and educated in Queensland, and I lived in New South Wales for 12 years before coming to South Australia six years ago. While living in Sydney and as a parent of three children under the age of six years, I shared the experiences of so many of my constituents, namely, poverty, loneliness, and a sense of powerlessness and frustration at the traditional inequalities which so rigidly confine people within classes and sex roles. It was during this period that the first seeds of my political consciousness began to grow. This gradual and at times painful growth was precipitated by two factors: the Vietnam war and, closer to home, the realisation of my domestic dependency and powerlessness to participate in the world around me.

During this period there was little or no affordable child care, and unless one had family living close by there were few opportunities to participate in work and in interests or activities outside the home. However, during this period I was accepted at MacQuarie University as a mature-age, part-time student. So began the long challenging experience of combining practical, day-to-day realities and experiences with academic theory and analysis to form a personal and political philosophy. For me, that philosophy is one of democratic socialism and feminism.

I would like briefly to explain what I mean by 'democratic socialism'. It is not only the working towards a much more equal society by the redistribution of wealth and power, but it is also reorganising our priorities, with the main priority being to take care of those people in our society who are least able to stand up for themselves. Real equality of opportunity is something that I believe must exist for every member of our society. Therefore, my personal feelings about feminism are totally in accord with my feelings about democratic socialism.

We must redirect our priorities, I believe, to take care of those people who need to be looked after in our society and who are, as I said earlier, the most powerless within the community. Therefore, I bring to this Parliament and to my district not only a range of life experiences, but also a commitment to fight for real equality and justice and a

society in which the wealth and power are shared between all and not just amongst the privileged.

As members will be aware, the seat of Mawson is the fastest growing and largest electoral district in South Australia. Mawson typifies the problems, aspirations and hopes of many Australians. My constituents are experiencing not only the effects of the economic recession, but the economic policies of both the Fraser and Tonkin Governments. The general effects of those policies include massive unemployment. For example, in South Australia in the period from September 1979 to October 1982, there were 3 100 fewer people in full-time employment. The increase in the numbers of unemployed during this same period has risen correspondingly by 8 200 to a record 54 100 unemployed people.

In my district it is estimated that 30 per cent of young women aged between 15 and 19 years are seeking full-time employment, almost one in three. While it can be claimed that there has been an increase in the total number of jobs available during the three-year period, a closer examination of this statistic reveals that the increase is due entirely to an increase in part-time employment.

In October 1982 there were 113 100 people in part-time employment. Many of these jobs are marginal, poorly paid, low status positions with little or no career structure. In many cases part-time workers receive marginally more than the unemployed benefits. Therefore, we have not only a situation of rising unemployment, but rapidly rising under-employment. Two other aspects of the previous Government's mismanagement of the economy which are affecting the constituents of Mawson are the housing crisis and the effects on small businesses.

The housing crisis is known to all. As recently as this morning on the front page of the *Adelaide Advertiser* there was an article about a young person living in a charity bin. That type of situation is not new to me. As a candidate I have experienced people living this way over the past two years. The housing crisis in the south must concern every member of this Parliament. We have reached a stage in the southern area where it is now impossible to find emergency housing, where young people have no accommodation and are living on beaches and in clothing bins. Such a situation is disgraceful, and cannot be tolerated.

The housing crisis does not extend only to the very poor in our society, because it extends to many of my constituents who are actually paying off mortgages. In the District of Mawson more people are paying mortgages than in probably any other district in South Australia; it is much higher than the average. These people had been greatly affected by the increase in interest rates, coupled with the increases in electricity charges, water rates and other State taxes and charges which increased rapidly under the previous Government.

The housing crisis has not happened in isolation, nor is it the only result of the previous Government's economic policies. The effects on small business were brought home to me during the recent election campaign. I sent out 1 000 letters to small business people in that part of my district covered by the Noarlunga council, and 160 of those letters were returned. It has been estimated that those businesses have actually gone out of business. They no longer employ people in my district, but they were employing people 18 months ago. That is a figure of 16 per cent within one council area of the District of Mawson.

Therefore, I wish to commend the Government on the initiatives that it is taking to do something positive and constructive about small business and about job creation. To that end, I have already initiated a seminar to be held early in the new year with the local community, service providers, small business people, the local councils and other interested parties, to sit down and talk about the sort

of job creation programmes that we wish to see for the southern community. I am also presently involved in organising a meeting of young people in the area to establish some recreation and sporting facilities which, in certain parts of my electorate, do not exist at all.

I wish to conclude my maiden speech by saying that I give my unequivocal assurance to both this Parliament and to my electors that I will continue to work as hard as I have in the past to represent them with the strength, vigour and skills that I have, and I want to thank them once again for electing me.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to His Excellency's Speech opening this first session of the forty-fifth Parliament.

Although I did not know the former members of Parliament personally, namely, the Hon. Cyril Douglas Hutchens, C.B.E., who represented the electorate of Hindmarsh from 1950 to 1970, and the Hon. Gordon James Gilfillan, who served as a member of the Legislative Council, representing the Northern District from 1962 to 1975, I wish to join with His Excellency in expressing my condolences to their families and friends.

I extend my congratulations to you, Mr Speaker, on your elevation to the high office you hold in this House. Thanks must also go to those members from both sides of the House who have made me welcome in this institution.

To the electors of Goyder, who have again clearly shown their confidence in the Liberal Party, I say, 'Thank you'. I will endeavour to be a worthy representative of the people of Goyder. My campaign committee and workers have worked tirelessly for many months, and I am very indebted to them for their continual support and help.

Most members here today know the former member for Goyder, Mr Edwin Keith Russack. Keith has been an excellent representative of Goyder, and before that, Gouger. Previously, he was a member for Midland in the Legislative Council from 1970 to 1973. His honesty and integrity were beyond reproach, and I know that he is well respected by all members who were privileged to know him. Keith had a profound knowledge of the electorate and of the electors. He gave clear evidence of his Christian beliefs, and is a true family man. Just as his personal actions showed the ethical beliefs he held for society, so, I believe, the words of Abraham Lincoln, the United States of America's sixteenth President, provided the basis for much of Keith's political thinking. I heard Keith quote these words on several occasions, and they certainly are central to the Liberal Party philosophy. Abraham Lincoln said:

You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift.
You cannot help the wage-earner by pulling down the wage-payer.

You cannot further the brotherhood of man by encouraging class hatred.

You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich.

You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than you earn.

You cannot build character and courage by taking away a man's initiative.

You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves.

Keith will be missed in this House.

There is another former member of this House to whom I would also like to refer. It is only recently that I have been informed that the seat I now occupy in this House was that which a former member for Mitcham, Mr Robin Millhouse, now Justice Millhouse, used to occupy. I make mention of Justice Millhouse because, had it not been for a conversation we had many years ago, it is unlikely that I would be speaking in this Address in Reply debate here today. It was with the then Lt.-Col. Millhouse, in the Adelaide University Regiment in the early 1970s, that I first discussed

the possibility of joining the then L.C.L., now the Liberal Party. Time passed and events took their course. Strangely enough, the day that Mr Millhouse was appointed to the position of Justice, 7 April this year, coincided with my preselection as the Liberal candidate for Goyder. I congratulate Justice Millhouse on attaining his present high office, and I look forward to addressing this House from the seat he occupied for many years.

The electorate of Goyder is a large and diverse electorate and in the time available it would not be possible to consider all the facts which are especially relevant to the electors. Consequently, I will simply consider certain historical factors which are applicable to much of the electorate and relate these to the present and future concerns of Goyder. I believe that we can learn much from history.

South Australia's settlement in 1836 was based on the Wakefield theory of settlement and, therefore, land settlement was more controlled and less chaotic than in New South Wales and Victoria. Nevertheless, with the push by people for new land and with surveying lagging behind, South Australia, as had occurred in other colonies, experienced the settlement of squatters or pastoralists. Much of Goyder became available to pastoralists through the purchase of an occupation licence.

Yorke Peninsula, being a relatively homogeneous unit, provided classic examples of the early squatting days. During 1846-47, there were more than 20 applications for occupational licences on Yorke Peninsula. Invariably these early pastoralists brought their flocks with them from some other part of South Australia. Reports indicate that the scrubland on the peninsula was so dense that sheep, to get through, often had to be driven along the beach. Certainly this is a far cry from today, when so much of the peninsula is devoid of vegetation. In fact, the 1980 edition of the map 'Vegetation Clearance—Agricultural Regions of S.A.' indicates that Goyder (with the exception of the southern tip of Yorke Peninsula) has possibly been cleared more than any other region.

Some form of reforestation is therefore necessary, because of the effect that this total clearing has had. Thus, the lack of protection from wind is often a worry to barley growers. Many salt lakes have formed because the dissolved salts now run to the lowest ground level, since there is no vegetation to impede their movement, and soil erosion is difficult to prevent in some areas, especially during a drought such as we are now experiencing. In this respect, the planting of trees along roads or other carriageways, on properties where they are not unduly limiting the land available for cropping, and along coastal land belonging to the Crown, are all realistic options available. The tax concessions announced recently by the former Minister of Environment (Hon. David Wotton) for South Australian landholders engaged in primary production to plant native trees and vegetation as soon as conditions are right can only help in the reforestation programmes. I do not suggest the requisitioning of uncleared areas as national parks or reserved areas to restore the vegetation. Experience has shown that such moves create more problems for many farmers. A classic example is the national parkland at the foot of the peninsula. As if times are not bad enough with the drought, farmers are being raided by hundreds of kangaroos from the national park. Where common sense would dictate that any pest should be either controlled or eliminated, farmers are continuing to have their fodder crops eaten, whilst the limited quota killing of kangaroos seems to be a higher priority than considering the plight of drought-devastated farmers.

The passing of the Waste Lands Act in 1869, enabling the purchase of land on credit in selected agricultural areas, heralded the end of the pastoralists holding occupation

licences in South Australia. The selectors or farmers brought a new era into Goyder. Just as the farmers began to displace the pastoralists, so we must not forget that the pastoralists had commenced the displacement of the original inhabitants, namely, the Aborigines, in many areas. The early association between the two cultures varied from satisfactory to bad. So often the relationship was determined by the personalities and attitudes of particular individuals. In fact, one of the earliest police stations was set up in 1849 at Moorowie near Warooka, because of racial conflict.

Place names today on southern Yorke Peninsula bear testimony to the variation in attitudes towards the Aborigines. Thus in the eastern section, where a negative attitude was prevalent, one finds predominantly European names such as Edithburgh, Wool Bay, Troubridge Hill, Penton Vale and Diamond Lake. In contrast, on the western side, where relations were much more cordial, predominantly Aboriginal names occur, namely, Moorowie, Orrie Cowie, Minlacowie and Warooka.

Point Pearce is an important settlement today. Relations between the Aboriginal descendants and the European descendants are probably on a firmer footing today than they have been in the past. Here credit must go to the Central Yorke Peninsula Liaison Committee for the way it is operating to help sort out and overcome difficulties that arise. The role of the former member for Goyder, Mr Rusack, in the establishment and continued interest in this area needs to be acknowledged. I trust as the new member for Goyder that I will be able to continue to assist and help further the work which this committee is doing.

Many of the early selectors displayed what could only be referred to as a gambling spirit. Instead of people viewing the land personally, it was sometimes selected by looking at a map. One could imagine the disappointment of a selector who found that his land was covered with lakes or was excessively stony. There is certainly a lesson for all people in this regard, namely, to be fully familiar with all the facts and personally to see an item for sale that could be concealing many unknowns. It is not surprising that many of these early selectors or farmers, therefore, did not make a success of their new venture. At least by selecting south of Goyder's line (named, as is the case with the Goyder electorate, after the then South Australian Surveyor-General), which approximates to the 350 mm rainfall isohyet, the farmers in most of the electorate could usually expect satisfactory rainfall.

Whereas the pastoralists were concerned with the grazing of animals, especially sheep, the selectors or farmers concentrated on grain growing. In this connection, the advent of superphosphate and the contribution of Roseworthy Agricultural College proved vital to the development of Goyder. Technological advancement in seed varieties, mineral deficiencies, animal husbandry and the mechanical machinery available have heralded vast changes in the agricultural undertakings in Goyder. I suggest that changes in agricultural methods in the future in Goyder will be no less significant.

Surveys of the land enabled the farmers to settle, and townships were recognised as part of the regular pattern of survey for settlement. Goyder today is little changed, in that it consists of the large expanses of rural land used predominantly for agricultural purposes, together with the many small and medium-size settlements providing the essential services for the electorate.

It is an unfortunate thing that technology, although helpful to Goyder in many areas, has also had a detrimental effect on many of the small communities. Thus, motorised transport has meant that services previously offered in hamlet-size settlements have often disappeared. Typical sufferers in this respect are the local stores, the local school and possibly the hotel or garage. At times it would seem that

people in the rural towns want every service possible but at no cost to themselves. It is in relation to this factor that a supermarket proprietor to whom I spoke in the electorate recently saw a positive feature of the current drought. Whereas in normal times many families went to Adelaide to supposedly get groceries at cheaper prices, the drought situation has meant that they are limiting the amount of travelling they are doing and, therefore, they shop locally.

The District Councils Act of 1858 had opened the way for local government to become established, and with the establishment of new towns many new district councils and corporations were proclaimed. So much has been done in Goyder over the years through the agency of local government. Although massive changes in boundaries and many amalgamations have occurred over the years, nevertheless, the remarks in July 1886 by the Commissioner of Crown Lands, that 'local governing bodies were better able to look after local affairs' is still applicable today. There are some 14 district councils within or serving part of Goyder today. The need for these local governing bodies to be effective administrative units without being strangled by bureaucratic red tape and regulations is an important consideration for the future.

Less formally organised in the early years was the health factor. Strong and healthy bodies were a definite advantage in the pioneering days. Local cemeteries in Goyder bear witness to the countless deaths (especially among children) from illnesses and accidents. Before 1900, hospitals were a rarity, and the acquisition of a doctor for a particular town must have given the local people a greater sense of security. Today most of the major towns in Goyder have their own hospital. I see the continued maintenance of these hospitals as an important priority, and I would view with displeasure any attempt to decrease the services offered by these hospitals or associated health-care facilities.

Although farming and agricultural pursuits were to become the economic mainstay for Goyder, other economic pursuits made their contribution. Railways have had a significant impact on much of the electorate. Their heyday is long past but the short or longer term 'booms' that some of the towns experienced as a result of their location on the railway network is still evident. The railway stations still have an air of grandeur about them, and the cottages are readily identifiable, but, as with so many enterprises, the number of people being employed by the railways in the towns of Goyder is decreasing, as are the services being provided by the trains.

It would appear that the fixed track has disadvantages over the more flexible road transport. The question remains as to whether a rail system losing money in the long term would be more expensive than the massive bill which this State is going to face to keep both major and minor country roads up to the standard that we have come to expect.

Mining has made its contribution to the electorate over the years as well. Thus sand, gravel, salt, gypsum, dolomite and limestone have been, and in most cases are still being, mined in various parts of Goyder. For the future all eyes are on the prospects of coal mining, with large reserves of coal having been located in the Bowmans and Lochiel areas, and the possibility of a large new economic venture commencing in the future is very real. Many people in Goyder are awaiting with bated breath the announcement by the Electricity Trust of South Australia in the not too distant future on the suitability of this coal for possible power generation and, in turn, where our next power station will be located.

A major problem in parts of Goyder, especially in early years and still today in selected areas, is that of water. Besides rivers, creeks and dams, the Aboriginal waterholes often provided a major source of water. Over time, bores

were sunk, at times on the sites of those waterholes. In most areas, however, it was the piped reticulated water supply that brought certainty of supply to the people. Unfortunately, the reticulated supply still does not extend to all sections of the electorate. This in turn limits the development potential of many farms, it limits the amount of stock that can be carried and it means an uncertain water supply for many householders, especially during our current drought. Although I strongly believe that the reticulated water supply must be extended to all parts of Goyder with all haste, at the same time, because of the limited water sources to which South Australia has access, I am very concerned about the availability of water for the next generation's usage. Hopefully, priority will be given to examining alternative methods to supplement the water supply of rural areas generally.

An important factor in the everyday lives of the people throughout Goyder has been their religion. Just as the people settled new areas, so the churches followed the people into these areas. Only this year I have been privileged to attend the anniversary services commemorating 100 years of the Catholic Church in two areas of the electorate. Many churches were established during the 1870s and, although some of them had a local resident minister, there were other denominations which were served by ministers who lived hundreds of miles away. Thus the Lutheran congregation at Honiton on Southern Yorke Peninsula back in 1874 was conducted from Hahndorf in the Adelaide Hills, and even some five years later the same congregation was being served by ministers who were located at Gawler, and later on at Light Pass. Perhaps we members of Parliament who represent country districts should not complain about the excessive mileage we have to cover in 1982.

I am a Christian, and it is in this context that I look forward to representing the people of Goyder. Many of the standards accepted in Western society have derived from Christian principles. No matter what our beliefs may be, I feel we all need to be very conscious of the standards that we, as members, set. If the political leaders of this State and of this country do not maintain proper standards and set the appropriate example, then any aspirations we may have to making this State and country great become hypocritical, and the criticism levelled at politicians for disregarding the basic fundamentals inherent in the Western democratic system will increase and bring disrepute on an institution whose members should be beyond reproach.

Some people may feel it remiss of me, because of my association with education for the past 17 years, if I did not consider some aspects of education. Because of the limited time today I would hope to take the opportunity to expand on this subject at a later time. Considering the historical perspectives of education in Goyder I would simply make the following observations. First, the early education systems operating in Goyder were of three main types: often schools were established in association with a particular church; alternatively, private individuals established schools in some places; and in time the State schools were the principal providers of education throughout the electorate.

Secondly, just as many small settlements have disappeared or services decreased so, whilst there almost certainly would have been hundreds of schools operating in the electorate of Goyder in earlier years, today there are 43 schools. I look forward to a close association with these schools and appreciate that there are many different and at times complex needs among them.

I am pleased to have had the opportunity to work in both State and private schools. The option of choice in education that has existed in South Australia for much of its history is an aspect that appears to be increasing in educational planning generally. Thus in our present day and age, when there are continual demands for the inclusion of new areas

of learning within the school curriculum, schools offering special emphasis in certain areas are not restricted to the private schools. We find schools having specialist areas in music, in physical education, in computing, in technical training and in agriculture. Certainly most specialisation is occurring within the metropolitan schools, and I recognise that it is more difficult to provide specialised schools in country areas which would serve an area wider than their normal catchment area. Whatever the case, I believe that the healthy competition between many State schools and between the State and private schools is a positive feature of our education system. Parents are able to 'shop around' for the 'best deal' for their child's education.

I note with interest that the recently published results of the Central Northern Region Working Party, which examined what factors parents took into account as they made their choices of secondary schools for 1982, indicated the top three choices (from 25 choices), as follows: first (with a 91.8 per cent response), the school's approach to behaviour; secondly (with a 90.8 per cent response), the school's approach to discipline; and thirdly (with an 83.1 per cent response), the school's approach to homework. Just as we have seen the pendulum swing from private to State schools and back to private schools, so I believe that the way parents perceive the running of the various schools will continue to change from time to time.

An advantage that many secondary schools in Goyder have had over city schools has been the smaller class sizes in various subjects. We are well aware of the intensive campaign for smaller class sizes waged prior to the last State election. One could be forgiven for thinking that schools in Goyder which have small class sizes would have no trouble in attracting their clientele. As if to contradict the concept of small classes, I have found that some parents would prefer not to send their students to secondary schools whose classes are too small because they are not experiencing sufficient competition from their peers, and they question the degree to which students can be fully extended in a small class situation. It would appear that we may be faced with a 'Catch 22' situation.

We sometimes fail to appreciate that tourism is not a new concept but in fact was already encouraged and developed in the 1800s. Apparently the invigorating, health-giving air of Edithburgh was well advertised to Adelaideans in the 1880s. In fact, a ferry commuted regularly between Adelaide and Edithburgh bringing tourists to Southern Yorke Peninsula, with accommodation being provided at a large resort called Sultana House. Today tourism affects most of Goyder—from Port Parham's crabs to Riverton's blacksmith museum, from the Auburn-Watervale wineries to the rugged coastal topography at Cape Spencer, the electorate has much to offer the tourist. It is becoming an increasingly significant economic mainstay for many businesses in the electorate. Unfortunately, a negative aspect of tourism in rural areas such as Goyder is on the increase—this is the increase in crime and vandalism that is accompanying the tourism boom.

A few years ago a friend of mine living in one of the country towns in the district of Goyder took his wife and family for a holiday in New Zealand. They were gone for three weeks, and they did not lock their house whilst away. This type of trust was even more noticeable when I was on Kangaroo Island. The thought of theft or vandalism did not seem to enter people's minds. It is a great disappointment to many rural people that the concept of trust toward one's fellow human no longer seems to apply. As the October *Farmer and Stockowner* journal noted:

Rural crime is erratic, unpredictable and usually unexpected ... house breakings and stock and property thefts come and go

in different areas. The problem is accentuated by the fear of reprisal.

A grazier recently commented that producers had to choose between reporting stolen or damaged property and perhaps getting some compensation for it, or having the same people return to ruin more property in spite. The sort of crimes include blatant stealing, especially where equipment can be lifted easily and resold, such as tools, stationary engines, c.b. radios, machinery parts, fertilisers, sprays, piping, sprinklers, seeds, and even gates! Shooting and wilful damage take their toll, domestic and wild animals are shot and their carcasses often left to rot. In one case a large number of goats were killed and the carcasses thrown into a waterhole, thereby contaminating the water and rendering it useless.

It appears that many crimes are not reported, and certainly, reporting of crimes (be they major or minor) is essential if the police are to have a chance of successfully apprehending the wrong doers. Although strict policing and harsher penalties may go some of the way towards limiting these crimes, fundamentally the problem lies in educating people to respect other people's property. It is another example which indicates that having basic standards from which to work in our society is so important.

As with the rest of Australia, the people of Goyder have had to face depressions, too. The 1890s and the 1930s depressions both took their toll. Many people had to leave the area. Farmers, whose farms were running at a loss, and others, looked for alternative work. Salt scraping on southern Yorke Peninsula helped save many farmers from economic ruin. People had to make sacrifices, and personal demands had to be put to one side. It was interesting to hear Professor Blainey expound his views on the 1930s depression recently in *The Blainey View*. In his view, to get out of a depression we need to lose some of our freedom and some of our privileges. We need to take a lower standard of living if we genuinely wish to overcome unemployment. He feels that unions, big business, and small business must submit themselves temporarily to Government control to help overcome the problems of unemployment. I feel that there is considerable wisdom in his views, and I hope that we will not be subjected to prolonged wrangling from the different State and Federal power groups but that commonsense may prevail and that people will not be too proud to take a lower standard of living in order to cure the economic ills that are with us at present.

Just over 10 years ago a Federal Labor Government under Mr Gough Whitlam came to power in Australia. He came in just before Christmas, and some people thought at first that Gough Whitlam was the real Father Christmas, and that Christmas giving was no longer confined to the season of Christmas, but that it continued all year. Money flowed forth as never before. 'Ask and ye shall receive' was the popular catchcry. Australia appeared to be a land of milk and honey, and, with the distinct possibility of money coming from pet Khemlanis, it looked as though the year-round Christmas would never end. In fact, only one question was left unanswered, namely, 'Who is paying for all the extravagance?' The answer, of course, turned out to be a sickening, 'We are paying for it.' It soon became obvious that not only could we not pay for the spending spree, as we were billions of dollars in debt, but that we would be paying off the extravaganza for years, and possibly for tens of years, to come.

If nothing else, we must learn from those catastrophic years that Australia and, in turn, South Australia, cannot sustain the spending by Governments of money that is not there, or a level of wages that employers cannot afford to pay, and cannot be so arrogant and selfish as to not be prepared to take a cut in our real living standards by accepting a wage freeze, refusing any catch up, so that at least some

of our fellow South Australians will receive employment. A councillor in Goyder indicated to me recently that a wage freeze for 12 months would mean a minimum saving of \$40 000 for the council. That is a lot of ratepayers' money; with some 14 councils in Goyder, many of them quite large corporations, that saved money can only help the people of Goyder.

In all the early undertakings in Goyder, whether related to early squatters, to the first farmers, to the railway workers or to the miners, conditions by and large were tough. Hours were long, incomes were often low or uncertain, personal sacrifice was necessary, and there were hardships aplenty. But those rough and tough conditions do not seem to have had a detrimental effect on the descendants of the early pioneers. On the contrary, I suggest that the citizens of Goyder, by and large, would have to be ranked amongst the finest, most genuine, honest, humorous and hardworking Australians in this great land of ours. They have shown clearly their separate individual endeavour to achieve according to their personal goals and abilities.

But, just as so much can be traced back more than 100 years, so there is also another area in Goyder whose current history goes back a mere 30 years. This is the area centred around Virginia and Two Wells. The predominant ethnic community in this area has shown many Australians why we should be proud to be Australians and what we should do if we do not want Australia to drift towards mediocrity and an arrogance which prevents our keeping the interests of all people first and foremost in our mind.

These migrants, predominantly from Greece, Italy, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia, have been prepared to work long hours, to take low or uncertain incomes, to make personal sacrifices, to face hardships, and to accept rough and tough conditions; in other words, they have faced the same obstacles as the first wave of migrants faced some 100 years earlier. They, too, have shown clearly what individual endeavours can achieve, and I believe we have something to learn from them. These recent ethnic communities did not come here demanding favours from the Government; on the contrary, they simply wanted the right to work and to earn a living.

The Adelaide Plains, Yorke Peninsula, and all sections of the District of Goyder are integral parts of the electorate and of South Australia. I certainly hope to do all in my power to avoid discrimination against any section of Goyder. As the elected member for Goyder, I look forward to representing the people, and as a member of the Liberal Party I will abide by the Liberal philosophy, because no other philosophy is better equipped to cater for the needs of the people. Liberalism is a philosophy based on concern for the needs and hopes of each individual. Liberalism is about people. I would draw members' attention to other aspects of the philosophy as outlined in the State platform of the Liberal Party: it is a philosophy which is concerned with the quality of life, and seeks more than material fulfilment. This philosophy looks to the individual, and not to the State, and sees the State not as an end in itself, but as a means of helping people to achieve their own goals.

Liberalism tries to create an environment in which people can be individually successful, and rejects any doctrine, including socialism, which results in levelling downwards. I feel that the classic analysis of socialism comes from a high school teacher in New York. As a teacher, he found that the socialist-communist idea of taking 'from each according to his ability' and giving 'to each according to his need' was accepted without question by most of his pupils. In an effort to explain to them the fallacy in this theory, he sometimes used the following approach: when one of the brighter or harder-working pupils made a grade of 95 on a test, he suggested that he take away 20 points and give

them to a student who had made only 55 points on his test; thus, each would contribute according to his ability, and, since both would have a passing mark, they would share equally.

After he had juggled the grades of all the other pupils in this fashion the result was usually a 'common ownership' grade of between 75 and 80—the minimum needed for passing, or for survival. Then he speculated with the pupils as to the probable results if he used this theory for grading papers. First, the highly productive pupils—and they are always a minority in school as well as in life—would soon lose all incentive. Secondly, the less productive pupils would, for a time, be relieved of the necessity of study. This system would continue until the high producers had sunk to the level of the low producers. At that point, in order for anyone to survive, the 'authority' would have no alternative but to set up a system of compulsory labour and punishment against even the low producers.

Finally, he returned the discussion to the ideas of freedom and enterprise—the market economy—where each person has freedom of choice and is responsible for his own decisions and welfare, and most of his pupils then understood what he meant when he explained that socialism—even in a democracy—will result eventually in a living death for all except the 'authorities' and a few of their favourite lackeys.

Considering further aspects of liberalism, we find that liberalism calls for self-reliance, respect for individual moral and spiritual values, and an understanding of the concept of service. The fostering and preservation of the family unit is all important. The right of an individual to hold private property is essential in a free society. Liberalism provides the opportunity for a high level of general education, available to all, with freedom of choice and with adequate incentives to attract those with ability to undertake advanced studies. Liberalism recognises the need to provide adequate social services to help those who cannot support themselves, and to maintain vital health standards. In the application of social services, it strives to maintain the dignity of the individual. Liberalism aims to create a society in which private enterprise is the major factor in achieving general economic progress. Liberalism emphasises that human satisfaction and well-deserved profit-making are vital to work and to achievement. The liberal concept of government is that ultimate authority lies with the people.

In conclusion, Sir, Goyder has a multitude of diverse characteristics which make it such an interesting electorate. The people are proud of their traditions, are energetic and hardworking, and are ready to face the changes and accept the challenges of the future. As member for Goyder, I will work hard and do my best to represent the interests of Goyder in this Parliament.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Whitten): I call on the member for Henley Beach, and in doing so I remind all members that this is the honourable member's maiden speech and I request that he be afforded the usual courtesy.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I support the motion and offer my personal congratulations to the Speaker on his elevation to high office in this House. I am sure that he will fulfil his duties with distinction. I congratulate all other new members of the House and wish them all the best in their endeavours on behalf of the Parties they represent. I also congratulate members of the Labor Party Cabinet on their election to high office. I am sure that they will perform their duties in a way that will receive plaudits of everybody concerned.

Before I turn to the substance of my speech, I take this opportunity to extend the thanks which are due to the members and helpers of the Henley Beach branch of the

Australian Labor Party. They have tackled the work of the past two years with dedication, and much of my success in the district of Henley Beach rests on the efforts of these people. They set about to put before the people of the Henley Beach electorate the principles of the A.L.P. The fact that I am here now is testimony to their hard work.

I would also like to thank my union, the Printing and Kindred Industries Union. I have received significant help from the officials and members of that organisation. Needless to say, I am a strong supporter of the trade union movement, which has had close and continuous links with the Australian Labor Party, especially in this State since 1890. It is with great pride that I stand here as a representative of the seat of Henley Beach. Two of the Australian Labor Party members for this seat will be long remembered in the history of this State. I refer, of course, to Glen Broomhill and the late Fred Walsh.

Glen Broomhill, in his capacity as Minister of the Environment, introduced into this Parliament legislation which provided for a deposit on drink cans. The legislation was not without controversy. However, eventually it was passed through this House and made law and the comparative cleanness of the beaches and parks in South Australia is an unspoken tribute to him. The late Fred Walsh was a history maker, both within and without the Parliament. His life's work for the Labor movement is a legend. I hope that I can serve the Parliament and the electorate as well as these two predecessors.

I wish to address myself to what turned out to be the biggest issue in the recent State elections. In 1982 we have witnessed an extraordinary burst of redundancies Australia wide. In South Australia, newspaper reports tell us that retrenchments and redundancies have occurred in at least 36 different companies. In addition, thousands of people are working a four-day week rather than face retrenchment. The problems of the manufacturing industry in this State (or should I term it more accurately the manufacturing drought) are large indeed. The South Australian economy is particularly vulnerable, partly due to the result of the composition of the State's industrial base. Our high level of unemployment, the second highest State level in the country, is due to this and will worsen unless Labor's alter-

native policies, both at the State and Federal levels, are introduced.

I would like to make some comments about how I see the problems that have occurred in Australia. In the past, we have been mainly a primary commodity producing country, depending heavily on the exports of wool, wheat, sugar, and so on. On the import side we have tended mainly to import manufactured goods, both as consumables and as inputs into the productive process. Even the growth of mineral and energy exports throughout the 1960s and 1970s did not significantly alter this. With this pattern of development, Australia has managed to retain its high standard of living thus far. However, with the instability of world trade in primary commodities, including minerals and energy, the cost has been great. We are now facing record current account deficits of more than \$9 000 000 000. This deficit has a serious implication for currency stability, domestic interest rates policy and budgetary policies. In South Australia, our concentration on the manufacture and export of normally low-value added commodities has involved us in a declining share of world trade. One estimate is that 75 per cent of Australia's exports is concentrated in sectors which, over the past 30 years, have grown at below the average rate for world exports as a whole.

We still depend far too heavily on imports for most of our machinery and equipment supplies and we still depend much too heavily on the export of primary commodities to pay for them. Almost 40 per cent of our 1981-82 import bill was accounted for by imports of machinery, transport equipment, and iron and steel. We spent more than \$536 000 000 on imports of commodities last year. Thus, while imports into Australia generally grew (24.7 per cent last year) imports of machinery and transport equipment grew by 55 per cent and 46 per cent respectively.

Exports fell overall by 8.5 per cent, but exports of wheat, wool and barley—accounting for almost 45 per cent of total exports—fell by 30 per cent, 16 per cent and 30 per cent respectively. Our economy has moved into deficit and we can no longer pay for our imports without borrowing. I seek leave to insert in *Hansard* a purely statistical table of exports and imports, sourced by the Bureau of Statistics.

Leave granted.

EXPORTS (a) (b)
(\$'000)

Principal commodities exported

Period	Total exports	Meat (c)	Wheat	Barley	Wool (d)	Lead (e)	Iron and steel (f)
1979-80	1 599 199	98 632	375 695	191 806	183 746	180 458	26 899
1980-81	1 400 028	99 814	303 919	156 812	225 004	99 717	14 903
1981-82	1 280 871	89 712	211 362	109 550	213 084	101 671	r 33 874
1980-81—							
May	109 992	4 610	19 257	16 641	18 940	5 764	2 446
June	105 137	10 561	7 543	14 824	15 160	8 620	—
1981-82—							
July	62 376	2 272	833	5 593	11 799	3 557	4 989
August	105 770	9 018	7 199	13 231	10 710	12 745	1 700
September	94 609	6 165	8 177	11 198	11 110	6 544	4 263
October	87 941	4 694	4 456	699	14 760	6 742	2 577
November	93 945	5 890	6 827	4 498	19 887	10 220	2 907
December	72 441	5 654	2 553	1 812	16 323	2 184	3 934
January	127 074	8 688	29 533	12 971	36 393	3 899	1 656
February	101 883	7 972	11 319	12 864	17 207	10 636	4 510
March	126 988	7 948	39 079	3 048	22 289	16 504	1 039
April	160 989	12 912	65 095	11 018	23 092	r 8 705	—
May	138 959	7 235	34 060	12 932	16 193	6 582	6 297
June	92 449	8 933	3 508	19 687	12 378	4 021	—

For footnotes see page 19.

IMPORTS (a) (\$'000)							
Principal commodity groups imported (b)							
Period	Total imports	Transport equipment	Machinery	Petroleum and petroleum products	Iron and steel	Textiles	Chemicals and related products (c)
1979-80	882 457	112 502	145 244	310 346	20 678	40 442	34 220
1980-81	1 072 425	130 302	177 896	401 246	33 418	36 166	37 427
1981-82	1 337 311	190 738	274 852	431 823	69 955	34 752	48 344
1980-81—							
May	139 974	10 566	19 793	72 269	8 289	2 237	3 354
June	46 575	9 062	11 603	71	2 117	2 304	2 585
1981-82—							
July	101 327	9 458	22 460	40 948	2 481	1 795	2 275
August	89 856	11 268	17 957	22 124	3 032	2 409	5 008
September	87 946	7 677	23 452	22 061	3 075	1 704	3 321
October	103 456	10 595	19 763	41 405	5 244	2 650	4 277
November	72 070	11 430	17 737	574	5 629	3 522	5 606
December	(d) 150 267	(d) 57 473	14 447	43 326	5 792	2 398	2 942
January	128 973	17 407	40 504	36 187	10 167	2 766	4 017
February	113 626	9 885	19 647	48 235	4 060	3 912	5 873
March	123 250	12 374	34 362	36 502	6 920	3 605	2 908
April	96 147	13 642	21 075	26 594	9 028	3 214	3 599
May	142 143	16 508	19 483	68 798	6 942	3 139	4 840
June	128 220	13 016	23 395	51 361	7 584	3 638	3 677

For footnotes see page 19.

Source: Australian Bureau of Statistics.

Mr FERGUSON: We are also vulnerable to these trends in another way. The Tonkin Government and the present Fraser Government, in their pursuit of high interest rates and recessionary policies, have caused a serious down-turn in consumer spending and home building activity which has had extremely serious consequences for South Australia's consumer durables and construction industry, on which we are heavily dependent. During its term of office, the Tonkin Government, with its total preoccupation with natural resource development, has escalated the present economic drought in our manufacturing industry. In my Government's policy document, entitled 'South Australia's Economic Future—Stage 1', we stated:

The manufacturing sector is the key component of the State's export base. Manufacturing industry development, therefore, is vital to the future of the State. It will remain a key sector of our regional economy and, therefore, warrants special attention and an adequate level of support from the State Government. South Australia could possibly fare better with a more diversified manufacturing industry structure. A structure comprising a greater number of industries less subject to the effect of local fluctuations, would contribute to greater stability in production and employment, particularly under difficult economic conditions. Ideally, diversification would occur as a result of positive and off-setting growth in previously under-representative sections.

I would like to discuss here some aspects of industry protection. Over the past few years, pressure for reduction in industry protection has intensified. This has been partly due to the relative expansion of such States as Queensland and Western Australia, which have only low proportions of manufacturing industry employment. The Tonkin Government was influenced by these ideas. Its argument was that industry protection got in the way of business. Unfortunately, that Government overlooked the fact that South Australia has an above-average dependence on tariff protection. The Industries Assistance Commission (I.A.C.) has demonstrated that South Australia would be adversely affected by any national reduction in industry protection. At the Federal level, the Fraser Government stated on 19 July that it would not proceed with a programme for further reductions in protection. That Government's policy stated:

On the matter of protection, the Government has decided that now is not the time to implement a programme of further reductions. In a period of severe recession in the world economy, and climbing industrial activity in Australia, a unilateral

programme of protection reductions would only serve to worsen the deteriorating employment prospects in manufacturing industry.

It should be noted that over the past decade a wide range of industries have experienced very significant reductions in protection, and further reductions are in the pipeline as a consequence of decisions on I.A.C. reports, including those arriving from recently completed tariff review programmes. Furthermore, the Government has recently determined, after careful and detailed review, sectorial programmes for the textiles, clothing and footwear industries and the passenger motor vehicle industry. These programmes contain built-in pressures for structural change including gradual reductions in protection and increase market access for imports. Both arrangements are judged to represent the maximum rate of adjustment that those industries could sustain, given their employment and social significance.

The Government is standing by its commitment to maintain these assistance programmes. The Government continues to adhere to the view that there are long-term benefits to the community from investment shifting towards activities requiring lower levels of protection and, therefore, into areas of comparatively greater economic efficiency, thus promoting a faster rate of economic growth.

It is apparent that the Federal Government has no long-term commitment to maintain general levels of tariff protection for the manufacturing industry, with severe consequences for South Australia.

Comparisons have been made between the levels of assistance to manufacturing industries and that of the rural sector. However, the problems of identifying rural assistance in a readily observable way are compounded by the fact that the assistance mechanism relies on a host of subtle non-tariff barriers, concessional provision of public services, and concessions through the sales tax and income tax systems. Assistance through commodity specific schemes identified and quantified by the Industries Assistance Commission is over-shadowed by the magnitude of assistance available through tax concessions, broad-based assistance schemes such as petrol freight subsidies, uniform pricing subsidies and rural finance subsidies.

These subsidies exist and are costly but the problem for those working with effective rates of protection calculations is to allocate the cost of those broad-based schemes to specific commodities. Although proponents of higher protection for the rural industry would argue that assistance overall has shrunk into insignificance there is, I believe, evidence that this is not the case. Studies done by the Metal

Trades Industries Association of Australia attempt to identify the real level of assistance to the rural industry, but even these studies have not been able to clearly identify the cost of taxation concessions available to farmers. Therefore, I reject the I.A.C. report which stated that the rate of specific Government assistance afforded the rural industries during the 1970s was significantly below that accorded to manufacturing and only about one-fifth of the rate applying to rural industries at the start of the decade. I seek leave to incorporate in *Hansard* three tables which are purely statistical in nature.

Leave granted.

Assistance in Australia: Metal Trades Industry Association of Australia.

Source: A Study of Rural Assistance in Australia—Metal Trades Industry Association of Australia

RURAL ASSISTANCE MEASURES: A SUMMARY OF COSTED ITEMS

Measure	Total Cost in (a) 1980-81 dollars	Cost Allocated to rural com- mercial pro- ducers (\$m)
Industry specific measures (b) measures operating through costs	128.9	128.9
measures operating through sales value	296.0	296.0
measures operating through income	13.1	13.1
Sales tax concessions	65.0	65.0
Income tax concessions concessions introduced in the last three years (c)	51.0	51.0
averaging provisions	140.0	140.0
depreciation allowances (d)	260.0	260.0

Measure	Total Cost in (a) 1980-81 dollars	Cost Allocated to rural com- mercial pro- ducers (\$m)
Broad based assistance schemes		
petroleum freight subsidy	123.0	40.0
implicit subsidy from uniform pricing	68.0	23.0
LPG subsidy	33.0	5.5
Provision of services by the public sector		
rural air services	0.3	(e)
subsidy to general aviation	93.7	(e)
loss on rural telephone network (f)	239.8	(e)
loss on rural mail deliveries ...	16.4	(e)
Rural research (g)	41.4	41.4
Rural Finance	5.3	5.3
Total	1 574.9 (h)	1 069.2

(a) estimates of assistance measures are made for the last year available but all costs are then brought to 1980-81 dollars using the GNP implicit deflator.

(b) these costs make up the IAC estimates of rural assistance set out in Table 1. The estimates in Table 1 are re-estimated in 1980-81 dollars.

(c) concessions set out in Table 2 brought to 1980-81 dollars.

(d) the latest estimate was \$200m in 1977-78.

(e) unable to estimate the proportion accruing to commercial rural producers.

(f) the latest estimate was \$220m in 1979-80 for telephones and \$15m for postal services.

(g) this is the implicit subsidy for rural research carried out by CSIRO not funded by industry levy. The subsidy was \$38m in 1979-80.

(h) the State Assistance Schemes identified in section (g) are not included in this Table.

APPENDIX A

Table 1.6.3. Effective rates of assistance afforded selected rural activities, Australia: 1969-70 to 1978-79

Commodity/Activity	Gross value of rural production in 1978-79 (a)	1969-70 \$m	1970-71 %	1971-72 %	1972-73 %	1973-74 %	1974-75 8%	1975-76 %	1976-77 %	1977-78 %	1978-79 %	Average (b) %
Cereal												
Wheat	2 296	21	25	35	21	-15	-13	-5	3	5	-3	-2
Barley	339	5	2	3	8	1	-2	-2	0	3	1	1
Oats	100	13	6	10	9	4	-1	-1	0	2	0	2
Fruit												
Apples and pears (c)	132	1	3	2	0	12	12	8	10	0	-2	4
Dried vine fruit	66	35	69	58	2	9	49	70	-1	4	-4	13
Other Crops												
Sugar (d)	396	74	40	14	-1	-17	-30	-21	-13	-9	-8	-11
Cotton	76	42	50	-2	-7	-5	-6	-7	-6	-6	-6	-3
Tobacco (e)	55	91	*	*	99	*	*	77	24	6	-4	57
Livestock												
Beef and veal	2 155	-3	-4	-2	-2	-1	2	-2	-2	14	-1	0
Mutton and lamb	472	-2	-2	-2	-2	0	0	-2	-1	-2	-2	-1
Pigmeat	254	-8	-8	-8	-7	-4	-4	-4	-5	-5	-4	-5
Livestock Products												
Wool	1 374	2	15	24	3	2	2	1	1	2	1	4
Dairying (e)	631	*	*	33	63	72	78	*	*	*	n.a.	*
Export parity		*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Manufacturing milk sector (e)	297	*	*	8	21	19	19	18	9	14	n.a.	26
Export parity		*	*	*	*	76	49	32	62	52	51	88
Fluid milk sector (e) ...	334	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	n.a.	*
Export parity		*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Eggs	134	*	*	95	*	*	60	70	25	40	*	90
Average (b)		21	25	16	10	1	-2	4	6	10	4	

See over page for explanation of footnotes.

* Estimated to be greater than 100 per cent.

n.a. Not available.

— Not calculated; the unassisted value added was estimated to be negative thereby implying a meaningless effective rate of assistance.

(a) Industries included accounted for approximately 90 per cent of the gross value of rural production in 1978-79.

(b) Weighted by estimated unassisted value added.

(c) Transfers from consumers to producers estimated on the assumption that the removal of the stabilisation and supplementary assistance arrangements would result in 10 per cent of 'at risk' export sales being redirected to the domestic market. A price elasticity of domestic demand for fresh apples and pears of 1.8 was assumed. For further details see IAC, Apple and Pears, No. 239, 1980.

(d) Assumes that transfers between producers and consumers are distributed between sugar cane growers and millers on the basis of two-thirds and one-third, respectively. See IAC, The Sugar Industry, No. 209, 1979.

(e) Estimated using import parity prices (landed duty free price of imports) to calculate transfers between producers and consumers. For other industries, only export parity prices were used.

APPENDIX B

Table 1.5.2.: Average Effective Rates of Assistance (a) and Disparities (b) in Effective Rates for Broad Groups of Manufacturing Industries, Australia: 1968-69 to 1978-79 (c)

Industry ASIC Code	Description	Average effective rate					Standard deviation of effective rates				
		1968-69	1973-74	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79 (d)	1968-69	1973-74	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79 (d)
		%	%	%	%	%	percentage points				
21-22	Food, beverages and tobacco	16	18	16	13	15	26	29	26	23	21
23	Textiles (e)	43	35	51	57	(61) (f)	25	25	44	45	(42) (f)
24	Clothing and footwear (e)	97	64	141	149	(151) (f)	36	26	46	44	(47) (f)
25	Wood, wood products and furniture	26	16	18	18	16	15	10	13	13	11
26	Paper and paper products, printing	52	38	30	29	28	33	24	15	14	13
27	Chemical, petroleum and coal products	31	25	21	18	17	24	14	14	13	12
28	Non-metallic mineral products	15	11	7	5	5	20	13	11	8	9
29	Basic metal products	31	22	15	14	12	20	18	9	8	9
31	Fabricated metal products	61	44	34	32	32	23	18	16	12	12
32	Transport equipment (g)	50	39	54	61	(59) (f)	14	13	40	49	(48) (f)
33	Other machinery and equipment	43	29	22	21	22	17	10	9	11	13
34	Miscellaneous manufacturing	34	24	25	27	31	14	10	9	9	11
Total Manufacturing		36	27	27	26	(26) (f)	30	23	32	34	(34) (f)

(a) 'Net' assistance provided to an activity, industry, etc., after making allowance for the effects of tariffs and other forms of protection which increase the costs of the activities concerned. A fuller explanation of effective rates of assistance is in IAC, Trends in the Structure of Assistance to Manufacturing. The forms of assistance covered by this table are the same as those covered by Table 1.5.1 (see footnote (a) of that table).

(b) Standard deviation of the effective rates calculated for each of the 4 digit ASIC industries within broad ASIC Groups.

(c) Figures for 1976-77 to 1978-79 are based on the pattern of production in 1974-75 and are not strictly comparable with figures for earlier years which are based on production in 1971-72.

(d) Preliminary, subject to revision.

(e) Estimates of assistance for these industries are not strictly comparable with estimates published in the commission's recent reports on these industries because of differences in industry definitions and methodology.

(f) Estimates of assistance afforded by quantitative restrictions which contribute significantly to total assistance for these industries were not available for 1978-79. The figures in brackets are estimates made on the assumption that nominal rates of assistance for tariff items subject to quantitative restrictions in 1977-78 remain unchanged in 1978-79.

(g) Takes no account of the effects of the local content scheme for motor vehicles.

Source: Commission estimates.

IAC, Assistance to Manufacturing Industries in Australia: 1968-69 to 1973-74, 1976.

Trends in the Structure of Assistance to Manufacturing: (Approaches to General Reductions in Protection Information Paper No. 1) 1980.

Mr FERGUSON: Clearly, then, the argument about levels of protection for the rural and manufacturing industry is not one which will go away in a hurry. My Government will be looking at ways in which we can ensure that the manufacturing industry, South Australia's vital and job-intensive industry, is not further eroded and is, in fact, vastly improved. I believe that, if we are to protect and increase our manufacturing industry here in South Australia, we must look at ways of taking a broad overview of the situation, both at the State and Federal levels. We are already in the process of simplifying and revamping the current mechanisms to provide for greater communication between the private sector and the Government, and we have established a Cabinet economic subcommittee under the supervision of the Premier to examine major proposals having economic implications and to recommend priorities to Cabinet.

The subcommittee is chaired by the Premier and includes Ministers concerned with aspects of economic development. We are in the process of establishing a single department to co-ordinate Government assistance for economic development in South Australia. The department will be responsible to the Premier and the Treasury. An economic development body is to be established to provide independent advice to the Government.

It is to be a representative body drawn from the community to advise the Government on development, to provide a forum for community views, and act generally as a sounding board for development proposals. The existing State Development Council is the basis for such a body with extended representation of the trade union movement.

I believe that expansionary, monetary, and fiscal policies will give rise to faster productivity growth and a corresponding decline in unit cost which could in turn absorb much

of the increases in labour costs. We also need to reduce South Australia's dependence on manufactured—often high technology—imports as well as increasing the share of manufacture in our exports. There are many opportunities in the fields of mineral investment and processing, manufacture itself, and exports. I am conscience of the need to implement anti-dumping policies designed to mitigate the present crisis in industry.

I quote from correspondence that I have received from Mr G.R. Madder, Treasurer, I.C.I. Australian Operations Pty Limited, one of South Australia's more significant companies, as follows:

The Australian chemical industry is painfully aware of the effect of dump imports from low-cost producers who often have the benefit of subsidised feed stocks. The threat is highlighted by the present excess capacity in recessed overseas economies. Such imports of the common plastic materials, poly-vinyl chloride (P.V.C.) and polythene, as well as synthetic fibres and other chemical products, have caused serious disruption to the Australian industry. Some anti-dumping measures have been in force and these have given limited relief.

One of the major chemical operations in South Australia is the Osborne alkali works, the major product of which is soda-ash. Natural occurring materials of this type are available in the U.S.A. but not in Australia. A number of countries have to compete with imports of this natural material on their markets and it could pose a danger to this important South Australian industry. This means that the local producer, I.C.I. Australia Operations Pty Limited, has to contain its costs through continued attention to productivity and other means. The Osborne works currently employs about 600 and total capital invested is \$60 000 000.

It is my wish, and I am sure the wish of the Parliament, that the present manufacturing sector becomes more internationally competitive. However, we must protect jobs in South Australia.

I must support the Australian Confederation of Industry in its statement that unilaterally lowering tariffs in Australia, or the removal of other assistance, would be an act of economic as well as social lunacy. It is my hope that all members in this House will use their utmost influence to hold back the manufacturing drought that is now occurring in this State and convince Federal authorities that manufacturing industry should not die in this State.

Mr BAKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

[Sitting suspended from 5.50 to 7.30 p.m.]

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

Section 22 of the Licensing Act presently permits the Licensing Court to authorise the holder of a retail storekeepers licence to keep his premises open for business until 9 p.m. on one night in each week. Such an authorisation must relate to an evening on which other retail premises in the same locality are open for late trading. Under the Shop Trading Hours Act, late trading has been authorised on two nights in the week immediately preceding Christmas and on a further two nights in the week immediately preceding the new year. As section 22 is currently framed, it is not possible for the Licensing Court to authorise bottle shops

to be open on both nights, notwithstanding that such an authorisation would clearly be desirable in the public interest. The present Bill is designed to enable the Licensing Court to authorise late opening of bottle shops on much the same basis as late trading is permitted under the Shop Trading Hours Act.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 strikes out the provision that currently deals with late trading by bottle shops and substitutes new provisions. New subsection (5) provides that the Licensing Court may, on the application of an applicant for or the holder of a retail storekeepers licence, extend trading hours to 9 p.m. on the days fixed by or under subsection (6). This latter subsection declares that the extension shall operate, in the case of licensed premises situated in a shopping district, on the days on which late trading is permitted in the shopping district and, in the case of premises situated outside shopping districts, on a particular day in each week fixed by the court. New subsection (7) contains definitions required for the purposes of the new provisions.

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

MINING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 8 December. Page 34.)

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition supports this Bill. It is identical to a Bill that was drafted when I was the Minister. It is designed to remedy a defect in the original legislation whereby an inequity existed in relation to compensation payable when mining operations occur on exempt land or in the vicinity of exempt land. The Bill is identical, the explanation is identical, and the Opposition supports it.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE (Minister of Mines and Energy): I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

The Hon. D.O. TONKIN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not believe that the motion was seconded.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order. I point out to the honourable member for Bragg that the honourable member for Unley seconded the motion, and I accepted that.

The Hon. D.O. TONKIN: I rise on a further point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. If the honourable member seconded the motion, he was out of his chair when he did so.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I uphold that point of order. The position has been rectified.

Bill read a third time and passed.

RACING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 8 December. Page 34.)

Mr EVANS (Fisher): I state from the outset that this matter is considered by my Party to be a conscience vote. Therefore, whatever I have to say is a personal opinion, not necessarily that of my Party. I am amazed that such a Bill has come before the House, in view of the experience I gained during the time that I had the responsibility of keenly

following the different sporting and recreation events throughout this State. I wish to state quite clearly that I oppose this measure, which I consider to be unnecessary and which has been requested by very few people. Due to the way in which it is drafted, it will benefit only one group of athletes within the State, namely, a professional elitist group.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:

Mr EVANS: If the Premier checks with his Minister, he will find that the money paid into the fund will go to the professional group and that none of it whatsoever will go to the amateur group. If the Premier finds that he has been misled by his Minister and that what he thought would be the case is not in fact the case, he has the opportunity to amend the Bill at a later stage.

The proposal involves giving for the first time the opportunity for the gambling industry to be interested in foot racing. It is a departure from the traditional trends that we have known within this State. The Minister would know that at times people associated with homing pigeon clubs have suggested that gambling on that sport sometimes takes place in Europe, as it does with cycling. Now that we have opened up this area one can foresee that professional cyclists would have just as much right to ask for gambling facilities as would those involved with homing pigeon clubs. The Minister used as an example the fact that there are gambling facilities available at other professional races, such as the Stawell Gift, although in those cases the area of competition is clearly defined, where it is on an oval or a showground, and an admittance fee is charged, so that the people who wish to use the recreational facilities, say, at Glenelg, do not have the impingement of gambling facilities near normal family activities.

The Bay Sheffield carnival is more of a family outing to which many people go for other interests. However, they would suddenly find that there is gambling activity with no clearly defined area of operation. The area in which bookmakers may operate can be defined, for example. However, to my knowledge there is no charge for entry into the competition, and people just drift in and watch the event. In fact, the events are not all professional; there are some amateur events. According to the Bill, gambling would not be allowed on those events. So, for the first time, there will be the opportunity for direct human participation in the sport of foot running and individuals can decide whether to compete to increase the odds and get better odds, to bet against themselves, or to bet against others. At least within the horse and dog racing industries the human element is not the sole dictate of the result of the event.

If it is a case of pulling a horse back or doping dogs or horses, there is an opportunity to detect it. Where it comes back to an individual person, whether the individual competes and, in essence, attempts to win every event coming up to the Bay Sheffield or the Stawell Gift, or whether they intend to just increase the odds—

Members interjecting:

Mr EVANS: I notice that some members are laughing. I have taken a keen interest in this area, and I know that the type of activities I have suggested are not uncommon in professional foot racing. I have never entered a professional foot race, but I have some knowledge of this area. It would be fair to say that operators of larger bookmaking practices are unlikely to be interested in this type of event. I know that it could be argued that it is only one event a year, but I point out that it cannot be said that it will stop at that if this event proves to be of benefit to those who wish to gamble.

In saying that only major bookmakers would be interested, I point out that they would have to be members of the bookmakers league or persons approved by the board to

carry out gambling at this event. I predict that those persons will be affiliated with the South Australian Bookmakers League. The House should know that the Bookmakers League objected strongly to the increase in the turnover tax, which went from 2 per cent to 2.3 per cent in the latter part of 1980. In fact, it was very hostile about it. At the same time, the duty on the tickets used by bookmakers was abolished. Even though that was of some benefit, the Bookmakers League was so hostile about the turnover tax increase it set out at its meeting in 1981 to put a levy on its members, with the agreement of bookmakers belonging to the league, to build up a campaign fund.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: That is those who attended.

Mr EVANS: I do not know that all bookmakers finally paid that levy. As my colleague said, those who attended the meeting in 1981 agreed to a levy being applied. All members would know that many meetings take place and that the vast majority of members do not attend those meetings. Maybe those members of the Bookmakers League who wanted to have a levy struck for a particular purpose organised it by letting the right members know that it was supported that a levy be applied to members.

The purpose of the levy was to build up a campaign fund to fight the 2.3 per cent turnover tax, as it then applied, and have it reduced back to 2 per cent. It is true that in April 1982 a letter was sent to the Minister of Recreation and Sport and to the shadow Minister. The Minister (then the shadow Minister) read that letter to this House last week. The Minister of the day replied to the letter and said that after he had considered the matter he would contact the league.

Of course, the then Minister had not reached a conclusion that suited the league by August, but it did not go back to the then Minister and ask when it should expect an answer. By that time the fund had built up to something in excess of \$40 000. So, a cheque was paid to the A.L.P. for \$20 000, with a second cheque being paid in August 1982. In fact, the Minister admits that representations were made to him and that he and his colleagues communicated with the Bookmakers League in relation to this matter.

It would be a big gamble by the Bookmakers League to pay \$40 000 to the A.L.P. for its campaign fund. One can assume that it was a guarantee that, if the Labor Party was elected, whatever could be done would be done to help the bookmakers. That alone convinces me that the proposition before us should not be supported, because it is of some small benefit to the bookmakers. It is an inroad for the gambling industry to move into the human participation sport area. I doubt whether anyone would deny that \$40 000 was paid by the Bookmakers League to the South Australian Labor Party for its campaign funds.

It was paid over in two cheques of \$20 000 and many of the Bookmakers League members are angry that the money, which they thought was paid into a fund to fight a campaign through publicity and other members pointing out the problem that the extra 3 per cent was causing to their industry as bookmakers, was not used for that purpose at all: it was used for the purpose of supporting a Party. Anybody involved in that sort of proposition to help the bookmakers during this Parliamentary term, of course, is condoning that sort of action through the Parliamentary process, and I believe that any of us who do that should be ashamed.

There are Parliamentary members on the A.L.P. side who knew that that occurred before this Bill was introduced. They may not have known before the election, although I doubt that. However, they knew before this Bill was introduced, and they knew that there was a storm in the Bookmakers League about it before the Bill was introduced. I go so far as to say that the Minister knew that that storm was brewing before the Bill was introduced. I do not want to

read copies of the letters. The evidence is quite clear that there is something about the game now that does not ring true.

Let us go back to the people who have asked for betting at the Bay Sheffield. I have been involved in the sporting area for a long while. I have been to professional foot races and been involved in fun races, if you like, on the same day as professionals have competed. I have competed in veteran athletics when the professionals have competed in at least one race on the same day, and only on one occasion until this Bill was introduced had I ever had a request, even as shadow Minister for three years, for betting on the Bay Sheffield.

I believe that the members who represent the Glenelg area would have had some representation from the organisers of the carnival. That would be logical, because anybody who can see a benefit to be derived from another section of society, something that they think will help their organisation, will fight for and seek that benefit. But how many people have had letters or telephone calls, even since this measure has been made public, stating that it was coming before the House, and that it was desirable? One constituent in my electorate telephoned me and said that he was interested in this because he was involved with a particular group, and I told him why I would not support it. He understood my position and said that he was disappointed, but he accepted that that was the way I would go.

The gambling industry is a very profitable industry for those involved; that I do not deny. There are always some at the bottom of the rung, but it is an industry which has been allowed to conduct horse-racing and dog-racing operations for some time. A precedent was set allowing bookmakers to operate with respect to dog-racing. In 1970, at about the time of the Chowilla dam dispute, I had a telephone call, as Parliamentary Under Secretary to the Premier, asking whether we would be interested in \$350 as a guarantee that if we won Government we would allow betting on dogs. I knew the person concerned, because he identified himself and I had known him previously. I asked whether he had already paid the same sum to the other group, and he said, 'Yes'. I said, 'What's the good of backing two bodies? Those sorts of guarantee will not work, and I do not think we would be interested.' Subsequently, of course, I was informed by my Leader at the time (Mr Hall, the then Premier) to tell the people in question to 'get lost'. That is the second time it has happened, and I want people to really think about their conscience when they are considering this measure and what real benefit it will be to the Bay Sheffield, and the carnival overall.

I also ask the Minister to take up with the Premier the point as to where the 1.4 per cent is going. It is going to the professional body. When it comes to the racing and trotting industry, the 1.4 per cent just does not go to one of the groups. The 1.4 per cent from this event goes directly to the professional group—the South Australian Athletic League. It sounds impressive. When the people read that they believe that it is an amateur group and that this percentage is going to a group of athletes who are struggling in the amateur class. I thought that the group we were trying to help in community were the younger athletes, the amateurs, who are struggling to get to the top, trying to compete in the Olympics as our amateur athletes and to improve the overall standard in Australia. I am disappointed that the Minister of Recreation and Sport is setting out to give this benefit when a charge is being made to operate the gambling industry at the professional foot racing and the money is going back not to the amateurs but to the professionals.

I oppose the Bill quite strongly on several grounds. First, I believe that the area in question is not a clearly defined

area to which people can be charged to go: it is an area of recreation for many people. I do not know how long the Bay Sheffield has been going; it has been going for possibly close to a century, but it is a long while.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: I will tell you directly.

Mr EVANS: I will appreciate it if the Minister does tell me, but I know that it is a long while. I know that in the other events, such as the Stawell Gift and the Bendigo Two Thousand (I think it has gone to more than that) people have a defined area. So, I oppose it on those grounds and on that of the family involvement but, more particularly, I believe that it is not a good practice to start moving the gambling industry into those areas in which people themselves are direct participants and in which it is so easy to rig the system. I do not think that it will help athletics, sport or recreation in any way. Seeing that the A.L.P. has gained support amounting to \$40 000, I believe with some form of guarantee to help the South Australian Bookmakers' League, A.L.P. members can put their own consciences to the test (and I recall that today, in her maiden speech, the member for Brighton said that she wanted to be fair and honest in the decisions she makes in representing her constituents).

So, I oppose the Bill, and I will oppose it through all stages. I hope that there are enough members in the Parliament, if not in this House, who see the disgraceful things that have occurred leading up to this point illustrating how a bookmakers' meeting was rigged, in my view, to guarantee funds for the A.L.P. in the hope that the bookmakers would get some help from the A.L.P. in Government.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): It is interesting that this Bill has seen the light of day so early in the life of the new Government. As I think we pointed out last week, the only Bills that should really be seeing the light of day early in a session before the Address in Reply debate is completed are those which are urgent. It certainly does not appear to me that this Bill is urgent. However, as an Opposition we certainly do not want to obstruct the Government in its wishes, but if it is going to jump every time a pressure group comes to it and wants something done by a certain time, it will be a pretty weak Government.

Requests were made every year to the Government of which I was a member, and they were made before that, I understand. This is simply a renewal of a request by a group of people who have been making this request for a number of years. Here we have a brand new Government jumping because it says that someone wants it. To my mind, it is not particularly urgent. The Bay Sheffield occurs annually, and this request has come annually. If the Government believes that this is a matter of pressing urgency, it wants to examine its priorities.

If it is going to jump when some pressure group asks it to do so, then this will be a pretty weak Government. It is not clear to us whether or not this is a Government Bill. The fact that the Minister has introduced it would indicate that there is an appearance that it is a Government measure, or that the Minister must have given some undertaking to the people wanting this facility that he would introduce it early in the life of the new Government. I would have thought that some of the Labor Party's election promises which raised the hopes of a significant number of people in the community would have been of more pressing urgency and significance than would a measure such as this.

I think it is true to say that the Minister (it is not clear how strongly he is supported by the Government, although the Minister is the normal spokesman of the Government) is opening up a new area in two ways. No gambling is permitted on foot races in South Australia at present, so

this breaks new ground in that regard. I understand that, even if one concedes that, the Government will be opening up an area which is significantly different—as pointed out by the member for Fisher—from the gambling which occurs on foot races elsewhere in Australia.

In this case, gambling will be permitted in public, in an area freely accessible to all and sundry, particularly people who go to the beach with their families for an enjoyable day. If one is talking about the Stawell Gift, or other professional races where gambling is permitted, one is talking about a function which people attend and pay money to enter; in other words, they go to an arena and they pay to get in. They know where they are going, just as if a person goes to the trots, then that person would know what the environment is like and would be happy to pay for admission. A person who goes to the races knows the situation and is willing to pay to go.

I understand that that is how professional foot races are carried out elsewhere where gambling facilities are made available; in other words, they are made available at a venue where people make the conscious decision to go along, pay money, and be a part of it. But that is not the scene at the Bay Sheffield. I know from personal experience that the Bay Sheffield has been going for many years. I lived at the Bay for a period, and one of the first—

The Hon. J.W. Slater: Did you have a start in the Bay Sheffield?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: No, I used to run in the opposite direction. One of my first jobs as a schoolboy was an annual job at the Bay Sheffield, returning the colours from the finishing point at the bandstand to the start of the next race. It was one of the first paid jobs I had. I think I was still in primary school, so it was a few years ago. It was a public occasion, and people would come along and enjoy it.

The Minister is seeking to bring in a new dimension. Some people may welcome it; other people will not. I simply make the point that this is a different occasion, a different type of occasion, from the professional races which occur elsewhere where gambling facilities are made available. Perhaps the Minister thinks that is not significant. I think it is a significant point that should be borne in mind.

The other significant point is that this measure is selecting a small group to receive the benefits of the percentage drawn off from those gambling facilities. It would seem a far sounder principle, even if one accepts the basic proposition, for those funds to be channelled, say, to the Department of Sport and Recreation, because a number of sports, particularly amateur sports, are crying out for funding, and everybody should know, and the Government certainly knows now, as a result of its scrutiny of the Budget, that we are in straitened financial times. If there is to be equity in the dispensing of funds, there must be a more general application of funds across the sporting fraternity; that is what happens to the proceeds of other Government imposts in the racing industry generally. So, I think the Minister should bear that point in mind.

My final point is in relation to my attitude to the Bill, and is one that I have made on a number of occasions in debates where we have a so-called conscience vote on social issues. I repeat, as I have said in this House previously, that members of the Liberal Party are in the happy position of not having to sign a pledge and coming into this place and doing what they are told. Labor Party members are occasionally free from the shackles of the pledge that they have to sign to toe the Party line when they come into Parliament, but fortunately, Liberal Party members are not subjected to that iron-clad, mail-fist discipline and have a degree of freedom of choice. Our only obligation is to

represent and reflect the wishes of the people who put us here, the constituents we represent.

I think that those who have followed the *Hansard* debates over the years will realise that Liberal Party members do not get into awkward situations, such as the one I recall involving the former member for Todd (previously the member for Tea Tree Gully) and the member for Playford, and relating to shopping hours. The Party line was that they had to vote against an extension of shop trading hours when constituents in their districts wanted that extension. Those members were in a state of extreme discomfiture because they did not know where to jump.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I doubt that the Deputy Leader's remarks can be linked to the Bill being debated.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am making the general point about the attitude of Liberal Party members to where our obligations lie and pointing out that the obligation of A.L.P. members is to the Party line; if they do not toe that line they will have not only their toes but their arms broken and, if the worst comes to the worst, they will be drummed out of the Party. Woe betide the A.L.P. member who votes against his Party. For example, look at their friend on the cross-benches, the member for Semaphore. He is poison in the A.L.P. because he dared stand against an endorsed candidate.

Mr Gunn: Brother Apap.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes. Brother Apap would give him a dose of poison tomorrow if he could. The responsibility of Liberal Party members is to the people who put us here and that is why one sees Liberal Party members voting in different ways on significant matters. I have no idea how my colleagues will vote on this measure, but I intend to oppose it for the very sound reason that the majority of people in my district have no taste for it at all. Whenever I have made inquiries relating to measures such as this the electorate has expressed firm opposition. Time has been a bit short to make inquiries on this occasion, because of the Government's sense of urgency.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The honourable member may interject. I contacted many people in my district about the casino legislation, but I did not meet one person in favour of it; in fact, people were uniformly opposed to it. Having represented my district for 12 years, I think I can speak with some degree of authority about what my constituents would want me to do. When the honourable member who interjected has been here that long he might consult his electorate about such matters.

Mr Gunn interjecting:

Mr Hamilton: A 10 per cent swing wasn't bad.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the honourable member for Eyre that he, of all people, should know what comprises the decorum of this House. I ask him to refrain from interjecting.

Mr GUNN: On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, I am fully aware of Standing Orders and I ask why you called me to order for interjecting rather than the member for Albert Park, who was making more noise than I was.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The honourable member for Eyre was out of order, and I ask him to respect the Chair's ruling and cease interjecting.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Notwithstanding all the other arguments I have advanced which impel me to oppose the Bill, there would be precious little support for the Bill in my electorate. It is sad that the Government sees this as a matter of urgency and jumps as soon as a little pressure group comes to it and asks a favour. If the Government is not prepared to get on with the business of implementing the substantial promises it made to the public, there is precious little hope for it. We even had the spectacle

today of the Government and the Premier backing off from the unequivocal promises made during the election campaign that taxes on the public of South Australia would not be increased. An interesting thing about the behaviour of the Premier since the election was that the night he knew he had won he began to back pedal and he has not stopped since. It is a sorry indication of the priorities of the Government that it is introducing this Bill with such a degree of urgency and haste. I hope it gets its priorities right in what ought to come before this House. There is no way that I intend to support the Bill.

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): The member for Fisher said that the legislation was not clearly defined. I would have thought that that is not right, as I believe that it is clearly defined. It is a matter of allowing betting on the Bay Sheffield at Glenelg at a certain time of the year. He also talked about family involvement at the carnival at the Bay. I am not sure what difference a few bets would make to that. I am not a gambling man so I am not talking from personal involvement. I do not bet on horses very often except occasionally on the Melbourne Cup.

Mr Mathwin: Have you ever laid any bets on boxing?

Mr PETERSON: The honourable member always extends my speeches. I have had an occasional wager. The member for Fisher also said that it is not a good practice. It has always been my belief that one can go to the races (the gallopers, trotters or dogs) with the family. In fact, they are advertised as family outings. I doubt that many people go to the dogs, trots or races without some investment with their families. I do not know whether that is a good thing or a bad thing but I do not think it corrupts the evening or the outing. It was mentioned as being a sport where the involvement of gambling would corrupt it. I do not know whether that is so, but I will expand on that point later. A \$40 000 donation has been mentioned as being allegedly paid to a political Party. I have no knowledge of that—it may or may not be right. It was quoted as being through two separate cheques.

Mr Becker interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: That was the point I was going to make. If \$40 000 was donated to a political Party—

Mr Mathwin: No-one has denied it.

Mr PETERSON: That is another point: no-one has denied it. I have no knowledge of such a donation. It may be right. However, I do not believe that the bookmakers at the Bay Sheffield would make \$40 000 in a year or even two years. I cannot see that \$40 000 would suddenly swing any individual or Party to support gambling on professional foot racing, which, by any definition, must be considered a minor sport. As a matter of fact, to my knowledge, it is the only professional foot race in the State, although there may be others.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: What about the Whyalla Gift?

Mr PETERSON: The Deputy Speaker is the Whyalla gift.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing in the Bill about the Whyalla Gift.

Mr PETERSON: You are right, Sir, and I apologise for the remark. The Deputy Leader stated at some length that we should represent our constituents, and I support that principle. The member for Morphet, within whose district the race is run every year, is not even in the House.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: He is busy with other work.

Mr PETERSON: He may be busy but, if one is to protect his constituents, this is the place in which to do it, not somewhere else. The Deputy Leader stated that this is not particularly important legislation, and I agree, but let us not forget that the Bill is before the House, we are debating it, and a decision will be made this evening one way or another.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Why do you think the Bill was introduced during this short session?

Mr PETERSON: I do not know why the Bill was brought forward. It has been implied that \$40 000 is involved, but I cannot see that any one would make \$40 000 from the Bay Sheffield. It has also been stated that groups have put pressure on the Government, the Minister, or an individual to bring forward this Bill, and that may be so, but in my opinion the professional runners in this State do not make up a group large enough to lean on anyone. In Victoria, which until very recently was a Liberal-controlled State, two professional foot races are held, the Stawell Gift and the Bendigo Thousand. Those races were run in Victoria when a Liberal State for many years.

Philosophically, there is no opposition to the principle. The member for Fisher stated that, where there is human involvement in sports or where there is profit to be made, there can be fixing of an event. Surely that is absolutely true: wherever there is human involvement, there is a possibility that an event can be fixed. I heard no mention of any other sport being fixed in this State, perhaps amateur boxing, wrestling, rugby, Australian rules football, or bike racing. I understand that gambling on bicycle racing was allowed at one stage.

Mr Mathwin: You could have a bet on tiddlywinks, if you wanted to.

Mr PETERSON: That is a very good point, for which I commend the honourable member. It is human nature for people to have a financial involvement in a contest. I believe there would be no member of this House who at some stage has not succumbed to the temptation to make an outlay in some contest, whether on tiddlywinks or in professional foot racing, swimming, or wrestling. I will bet now—

The Hon. J.W. Slater: They even bet on elections at times.

Mr PETERSON: It is funny that the Minister should mention that. I am aware of some people who did that and of someone who was not paid. However, I believe that there would not be a person in this House who would not have some opinion of the outcome of, say, a professional boxing match, and a majority of members would, I believe, have a small bet, not necessarily \$100 or \$1 000, on the outcome, because the people involved are professionals. Let us be honest. In a race such as the Bay Sheffield, it is very unlikely, considering the sort of money that would be invested, that a runner could be bought off, so the suggestion about corruption in foot racing at the Bay Sheffield does not really ring true.

Mr Evans: There is more money in gambling than in winning the race.

Mr PETERSON: That may be right, but professional men in any sphere, whether politicians or sportsmen, do not sell their reputations lightly. I do not consider that the amount of money placed on the Bay Sheffield would be enough to induce a runner to throw the race.

Mr Evans interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: I have been involved in sport all my life in an amateur capacity. I might mention that a lot of money is thrown around at amateur sports also. I do not know of anyone in that area who has ever sold his reputation for a few pieces of gold. I doubt whether a professional runner would do so, because if it ever got out he would have sold his reputation. If there is any evidence about this matter, let it be brought forward to prove the point that has been suggested, although I have no knowledge of it.

The member for Fisher said that an approved person would take the bets: I assume that that would be done through the Betting Control Board and that the person would be an approved bookmaker whose profession and

livelihood would also be dependent on the outcome of any action of this type. Let us be honest: any bookmaker in this State would pay out much more money on any other form of racing than would be the case with a single foot race held once a year. I think that any member would agree with that.

Mr Evans: If they'll buy a political Party, they'll buy an individual.

Mr PETERSON: The point has been made that if someone buys a political Party, which I understand from what has been said, is a single payment of \$40 000, that person would buy a runner. It has been suggested that every person, whether he is a politician, sportsman or whatever, has his price. Possibly that is right, although I do not know as I have not struck mine yet. Some people may have found that level. However, I cannot in any way envisage circumstances whereby a bookmaker would put his entire career and livelihood on the line for a single foot race for the amount likely to be invested. Further, I do not think that any runner would become involved in such activities because if he was found out he would be unable to be involved in any other race.

The honourable member asked where the 1.4 per cent tax would go. According to the second reading explanation it will go to the South Australian Athletic League, which I understand is an organisation of professional footrunners. I understand that there is only one professional foot race a year. Such an organisation would not be subject to corruption or abuse, and it is not likely that it could be bought off. I cannot see that a substantial amount is likely to be invested. The real benefit of any betting capacity on such a race would be to the carnival itself and to the people who go to the area where it is held.

I still do not see the member representing the district involved present in the House. I appreciate the benefit of allowing a small bet on the race, although if the amount of the investment worries members surely we could consider some sort of tote. I am not a gambler to that degree, and I do not really understand gambling intricacies, but I am sure that some sort of restriction could be put on it. However, I do not think that that is the worry. I think it is the standard operation of the Opposition in this House to oppose any legislation put forward by the Government or a Government member. I do not think that it has been demonstrated that there is any risk to the State or to individuals with this legislation. I would be surprised if this legislation did not pass. I think that several Opposition members will support it, as they can see that it will help the carnival, the promotion of the area, and the event itself. I support the bill.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I support the Bill but do not understand why, at this stage, the Government has rushed to put this measure through in this very short session for which we were called together for matters of financial urgency. Commitments made by the Government during the lead-up to the election campaign, required the Government to call the House together for those purposes. Whether this was a commitment to an organisation before the election or during the campaign, I have yet to find out.

I hope that the Minister explains his position clearly on behalf of the Government, not only as to what the commitment was, if any, but also precisely from whom that commitment came—whether it was the organisers of the Bay Sheffield carnival that made the request of his Government to provide in the Act for this facility, whether it was the sportsman's league, which has been referred to several times by previous speakers, or whether the request came from the licensed bookmakers of the State, as we are debating whether or not betting will take place at this carnival site.

It is important that the Minister makes that clear to the House and, to enable him to do that effectively, he may be prepared to table in the House the request which was made to his Government and which initiated the move and subsequently brought before the House the Bill that is now under discussion.

When the Minister responds I would like to know whether he has ascertained from the authorities who will run the betting operation. Will it be under the control of the Betting Control Board? Will the responsibilities be transferred to some other authority for this special purpose? Are there appropriate facilities on site where bookmakers may participate? How many bookmakers is it anticipated will operate? From which section of the betting fraternity will those bookmakers come? Will they be rails bookmakers, grandstand bookmakers, derby stand bookmakers or country licensees practising at dog meetings, trotting meetings or other meetings throughout the various regions of the State?

There is an absolute minimum of information in the second reading explanation, which is designed specifically for the purpose of explaining the background of the matter. The Minister has a fair amount to answer for when the time comes, either at the conclusion of the second reading debate or in Committee.

I would also like to know what the Minister has to say about the various comments made by my colleagues, in particular, to remarks made by the member for Fisher, who touched on what is obviously a very delicate issue, namely, the Bookmakers League donation to the A.L.P. All members were in the Chamber on the first sitting day of this Parliament when the question was asked of the Deputy Premier. He went as white as a sheet, staggered to his feet, did not know what to say and clumsily unloaded the invitation, if not a challenge, and said that I should go to the A.L.P. headquarters and ask the Secretary. Indeed, I did that. I went straight out of the Chamber and rang A.L.P. headquarters. I spoke to one of the officers and raised the matter with him. I explained what the Deputy Premier had suggested in answer to the question and, indeed, that officer backed away from the question, which was to be expected. When I asked whether Mr Chris Schacht was there, he said that he was not about, that he had just shot off somewhere to do some work for the Party. The man on the phone undertook to get to Mr Schacht my message that I wanted to speak to him, and I was assured that I would receive a call within minutes. That was a week ago and I have not heard from Mr Schacht.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: Frankly, I did not expect to hear from him either but, irrespective of all that, the situation as outlined by the member for Fisher I believe to be near the truth. I have had sufficient information to believe myself that indeed the donation referred to, the sum of \$40 000, was given to the A.L.P. by the Bookmakers League, and other matters referred to by the member for Fisher have been confirmed by senior members of the bookmaking fraternity. But I really think that that is their business. I do not know that that is really relevant to this Bill, except that it has been raised and it has been consistently accepted by you, Mr Deputy Speaker. If I might just expand a little on it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The chair has in fact allowed the debate to go on a little wider than the actual Bill, but I point out to the honourable member that his remarks at present have nothing to do with the Bill whatsoever.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I have noted several times your acceptance of the debate along that track and, therefore, I took licence to proceed without expanding too far, but simply to clarify

one or two points. It is true, as I understand it, that the bookmakers were irate when our Party, in Government during 1981, increased bookmakers turnover tax by 0.3 per cent, making it at that time higher than turnover tax applying in any other State. I can understand their concern and their position, when they called their members together at the 1981 annual general meeting and gave what I believe to be overwhelming support for striking a levy to campaign against the Government's decision. In fact, it happened in New South Wales prior to the Wran Government's coming into office when the Liberal Party in that State increased the turnover tax, and the Bookmakers Association in N.S.W. struck a levy on its members and, by significant donation, accrued a massive fund and paid it to the Australian Labor Party in that State.

Subsequently, Mr Wran got into office and he has been there ever since. Whether that was the turning point or not, I do not know. It was certainly the example put forward by senior members of the bookmaking fraternity as sufficient to give them licence to do the same, thereby, from their remarks, confirming the allegations that have been floating around the place, at least to that extent. They have subsequently further confirmed that the two cheques referred to have been paid into the Labor Party's fund from the league's account quite openly as described by the member for Fisher. The interesting thing about that, of course, is that either the bookmakers of South Australia hopped into bed with the A.L.P. for the purpose of convenience or whatever other connotation one might want to put on it; or, if the \$40 000 or any other part of it was paid—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I pointed out previously to the honourable member that I had allowed the debate to stray from the Bill. I have pleaded with him to bring the debate back to the Bill that is before us, and the honourable member has carried on literally defying my plea. I ask the honourable member to come back to the Bill.

The Hon W.E. CHAPMAN: I recognise your ruling, Mr Deputy Speaker, and, indeed, I will link up my remarks very specifically with the Bill. As I was saying, and without seeking to provoke anyone in the House at all, either first, the league hopped into bed with the A.L.P. for the purposes of convenience or, secondly, if the payment or any part of it was made to the A.L.P. before 29 April 1982 when the Minister himself wrote to the league giving a certain undertaking in relation to the turnover tax (and if indeed the league made a payment of any part of that donation before), it is fair to suggest, as is alleged all over the racing fraternity, that it was a bribe.

Thirdly, if it was not in that category, and all the money was paid after the undertaking was given by the Minister, fairly it could be described as a pay-off. Members can take their pick. The Government either hopped into bed with them politically or was involved in what could fairly be described as a bribe, or it involved itself in what could fairly be described as a pay-out after the undertaking had been given. I can understand the concern that there is amongst the membership of the bookmakers in this State about the whole stigma surrounding that issue. It is from those directions that the remarks have been made to me. Hence my question to the Deputy Premier a few days ago.

The interesting thing is that the Minister of Recreation and Sport, who was not mentioned or identified in any way in my question or in his colleague's answer, had his conscience pricked and, on the following day, jumped to his feet to make a personal explanation in this place. At no stage, on the racecourse, in the street, with the bookmakers, with the punters, with members of the S.A.J.C., in the company of any person in this Parliament or elsewhere in the last seven days, have I had anyone deny the material and the information that has been drawn to the attention

of this Parliament in relation to this deal, pay-off, bribe, donation (if that is what they want to call it), or whatever. So, one can only presume that what has been picked up from the various areas in the community is true. That is the Government's problem: it is not our problem on this side of the House. We are not involved. Our Minister, while we were in Government, gave no undertaking of the kind and, therefore, was not vulnerable to such involvement, as the present Government has been and is now. We are not a party to this dilemma surrounding the organisations involved.

That is their problem, yet in that time, when under pressure after giving an undertaking, the Government has brought a Bill into the House to amend the Racing Act, the very Act that controls the turnover tax; yet there is no mention in this Bill about turnover tax. I wonder why. If it was an undertaking made in accordance with the letter written on 29 April by this member, why has he not the guts to stand up in this House and introduce as part of his amendment to the Racing Act those undertakings to amend the turnover tax provisions? The only reference to it is that sometime later it is the intention of the Government to do this. They have the money; they have the box; they are in the box seat to proceed and fix up the legislation in accordance with the requirements of the bookmakers, yet it is absent. We finish up with an opportunity for the bookmakers to participate in the Bay Sheffield.

The Hon. M.M. Wilson: Do you really think that the Government has the money?

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: I know damn well that it has not got the money to carry out some of the undertakings that it gave before it came into office, but I believe that it got the money as a political Party, as has been referred several times. There is no question in my mind about that, and the best of British luck to it. It is not the fact that it has the money, or the amount, but the stigma and the connotations that accompany the transactions that is causing concern to many people. A senior bookmaker who spoke to me a few days ago about this subject said, 'It is causing an enormous amount of soul-searching amongst my book-making colleagues.' Be that as it may, as the member for Hanson says, it has very little to do with the subject, unfortunately, because this subject ought to embrace the opportunity to debate the turnover tax issue.

I would be the first to acknowledge that many bookmakers in this State are in a financially desperate position. It could be that there are too many of them; it could be that they were a party to requesting this opportunity to be involved. I do not know; those answers are yet to come from the Minister. I would hope that there is absolutely no connection with the bookmaking fraternity as it relates to this particular Bill, that it is a genuine request from the organisation running the carnival in the hope that it will enhance the attendance and the involvement on that day.

The suggestion that there is anything wrong with an opportunity for punters to gamble is a suggestion that I do not agree with. I have never been to a Bay Sheffield carnival, but I may well do so (with or without the presence of bookmakers). I understand, from making limited inquiries about the subject, that gambling has been taking place in and around the carnival for many years. Therefore, the Minister is simply setting out to make legal what is currently an illegal practice in and around the carnival. Whether allowing a handful of bookmakers to attend the carnival and legally take investments from punters will eliminate the S.P. operations that allegedly occur already, I do not know. It could well be that we will have a choice this year; we could have both.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: They bet on the hurdy gurdy.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: That does not concern me at all. The opportunity for people to have a punt on the carnival obviously exists illegally. If this practice can be tidied up in the form proposed in this Bill, then I support its being tidied up, policed, governed and controlled in a respectable way, particularly if it is controlled by the Betting Control Board.

The Hon. M.M. Wilson: I understand that they bet on quarterhorse races in your electorate.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: I am not involved in this debate to answer interjections, to become involved, or to commit myself or my constituents to whether or not they bet in the District of Alexandra. It is a great district, and we do have gambling at Victor Harbor, at Kingscote, and undoubtedly at a number of other places which are well controlled, well managed and well received within the community. Therefore, I have no hang ups about that aspect of the subject whatsoever.

I am grateful for the opportunity to participate in this debate, to stand up and make my position clear in relation to the principle and the concept as outlined in the Minister's brief explanation and in the brief Bill itself. The members representing districts in and around the Glenelg area will undoubtedly have something to say about this subject, and I will be very interested to hear what they have to say. Whether they reflect the views held by their electors or whether they come straight from the shoulder and express their own views will be of interest to me and no doubt to other members. I support the measure.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I thought I would never get an opportunity to express my opinion. I have been sitting here patiently listening to previous speakers and, quite frankly, I became a little bit concerned and a little bit worried. I am pleased that this is a conscience vote because I will speak my mind, and I will be a bit frank.

I think members have overdone the issue in relation to the \$40 000, because that has nothing to do with the Bill and it is spoiling an issue that is of concern to a large number of people. I do not agree with previous speakers who said that any Government should not react to the requests of a group of people within the community. Any good Government, and any political party will listen to the representations of the people within the electorate and they will react if they believe that those representations are fair and reasonable.

The request made by the South Australian Athletic League and the Glenelg council, which supports this request, is fair and reasonable. I have it on good authority that the Glenelg council supports this legislation. I have not had time to check *Hansard* to ascertain whether I have made speeches about this matter during the five or six years that I have been making representations to the Government and asking questions in the House about this matter. However, five years ago, at a Commemoration sports day at Glenelg, I certainly said that I would assist the league to legalise betting on the Bay Sheffield.

I will record in *Hansard* a little of the history of this event, because it is a significant day in the history of this State. I refer to 'Jeanes—History of Glenelg', which was printed in about 1956, the heading 'Commemoration Day Sports':

On 8 December 1886, a meeting convened by then Mayor of Glenelg, Mr W. F. Stock, was held in the Glenelg Institute for the purpose of forming a committee to conduct a sports meeting to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the State, and from this meeting sprang the Glenelg Commemoration Day Sports Association, which has conducted athletic and aquatic sports on each succeeding Commemoration Day. Mr J. P. Bickford was appointed Hon. secretary at the 1886 meeting. Prior to this, however, there

had been some sports of a less organised character than those which followed the establishment of the G.C.D.S.A.

As a matter of fact, during the early history of the State, there were race meetings on the beach at Glenelg. There was sufficient length of beach and hard sand to conduct horse-race meetings there. The article continues:

What appeared to be the first approach made to the council for financial assistance in conducting sports on the 28th—

that would be December—

is referred to in a council minute which records that a deputation waited on the council for such assistance but that a motion that 5 guineas be granted for the purpose was defeated. Later on the G.C.D.S.A. was permitted to collect and retain the Commemoration week's beach site fees, and this apparently continued until 1902, when the council decided to collect the fees itself and to pay to the Sports Committee 75 per cent, of the sum received. This was unacceptable to the Sports Committee, it being recorded that a deputation waited on the council and protested against any deduction, although the council's levy in the meantime had been reduced to 12½ per cent. The council stood firm on this amount. Later the council retained the whole of its beach site fees, which subsequently grew to a fairly considerable amount, and made a fixed contribution to the Sports Association to assist it in the conduct of its Commemoration Day meetings. For many years the normal contribution of the council stood at £100 (\$200) per annum, but in 1911 the amount was increased to £150 (\$300) for that year to meet the association's additional costs in staging a programme to celebrate the 75th anniversary of the State. Since then the council's contribution has varied between £75 (\$150) and the £300 (\$600) at the present time—

bearing in mind this article was written in about 1956—

In each year of the Sports Association's existence sailing races, swimming and athletic events have been included in the programme, the pedestrian events being held on the northern portion of Colley Reserve. At the 1882 sports meeting, the main athletic event was a 100 yards race, the prizemoney offering being the very modest amount of £2 (\$4). Apparently the first organised athletic fixture was successful for, in the following year, the prizemoney for the Sheffield Handicap was raised to £30 (\$60).

The Commemoration Day Sports have been held continuously each year since 1886, and during that time many outstanding runners have competed at Glenelg. The stakemoney offered for the Sheffield has fluctuated somewhat over the years, the highest prizemoney given being £250 for the 1936 State Centenary year, but in the main the race has been worth £100 or more for many years. To have won the Bay Sheffield is looked upon by S.A. runners as having proved oneself an outstanding athlete. Aquatic events are also well catered for each year, although the absence of a jetty in recent years has considerably detracted from the facilities available for this branch of the Association's activities. The Association is always well served by an energetic committee, and each Mayor of Glenelg in turn accepts the office of President. Besides the committee, there is a band of workers who attend the sports each year to assist in various ways, and their valuable aid is greatly appreciated. The Glenelg events are unique in at least one respect—a feast of athletics is given to the public without charge. This remarkable considering the value of the prizemoney. A conservative estimate sets the total amount distributed over the years as well over £8,000. The standard of competition is high, this contention being supported by the outstanding successes of South Australian athletes at Stawell, Maryborough, Bendigo, and other big athletic gatherings in other States. Mr. George King, as honourable secretary, has been in charge of the sports for the last 11 years. Besides being a topnotch sprinter in his younger days, Mr. King was the secretary of the S.A. Amateur Athletic League for over 20 years, and is therefore in a position to tender sound advice on both the athletic and administrative sides. Previous secretaries in Messrs. C. H. Scrutton, J. R. Crocker, W. Buttrose, L. Frearson and M. R. Pickup also rendered meritorious service.

The principal officers of the Association are:

Patron: His Excellency the Governor.

President: The Mayor of Glenelg.

Hon. Treasurer: Mr J. Gould.

Hon. Secretary: Mr. G. F. King.

I have read that article to record it in *Hansard* and to let members know some of the history of this matter. Even though that article was written 26 years ago, it covers the principle behind the request and the principle facing the Government at the moment. One option is to legalise betting on the Bay Sheffield. This year the Bay Sheffield will carry prize money worth \$11 000. The winner of the Bay Sheffield

can expect to receive a first prize in the vicinity of \$8 000. It is the second highest professional foot race in Australia. At one stage during the last three years, I believe the first prize money was the highest of any professional foot race in Australia.

The people behind the initiative to boost the Commemoration Day sports day and to highlight the Proclamation Day (held on 28 December) wished to highlight the need for the people of South Australia to return to Glenelg to express their loyalty to and pride in their State. So, about five years ago more business people in Glenelg were seconded to the Commemoration Day Sports Day Committee to raise finances and obtain sponsors to boost the carnival. We bear in mind that there is a swim through Glenelg down the Patawalonga. I believe one needs a special prize to even compete in that race although a great amount of money is spent trying to clean it up prior to that week.

A sailing event is also conducted by the Glenelg Sailing Club. It attracts a high number of entries and commands a high standard of sailing. Until a few years ago a surfing carnival was conducted also by the Glenelg Life Saving Club. The whole spirit of the Commemoration Day sports day is to perpetuate the foundation of South Australia, and that is what has been behind the move. That was behind the success in obtaining sponsors who have put up thousands of dollars in the last few years (we can now measure it in terms of tens of thousands of dollars.) This year the Co-operative Building Society is the main sponsor of the Bay Sheffield.

As I said, the society has put up \$11 000. No-one puts up that sort of money unless he has some pride in his State and is determined to do something for South Australia. The society should be commended for putting forward money to encourage what we believe will be the biggest professional athletic carnival in South Australia.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: It could become the biggest in Australia.

Mr BECKER: I have no doubt that that can happen and there are sufficient people within the business community who have the pride and the expertise to ensure that occurs, irrespective of the difficulties we are experiencing at present in regard to the economy. It is anticipated between 120 and 130 entrants will take in the carnival, which will include amateur athletics and events for women.

The main race, the Bay Sheffield, will be over 120 metres. At present there are about 70 entrants, at least 30 of whom are from interstate. This year there will be an overseas entrant, so the race will be of international note. The international competitor is the Scottish champion, who will come to South Australia specifically to compete in this event. With that run up, and with the 30 interstate entrants, there is no doubt the carnival will achieve further status and will have the opportunity, with the help of media coverage, to highlight South Australia on Tuesday 28 December. The number of entrants who take part in the carnival is sufficiently high at this stage to hold a twilight meeting on Monday 27 December for elimination heats to reduce the number of entrants on Proclamation Day.

It has been estimated that between 30 000 and 50 000 people come to Glenelg on Proclamation Day. The Proclamation Day ceremony attracts no more than 3 000 to 5 000 people and it is a tragedy that it is not telecast and more people do not attend to pay homage to the foundation of the State, the swim through the Patawalonga at Glenelg, the sailing events, and the Commemoration Day sports carnival. Last year the 'It's our State, mate' committee organised a concert in the evening, which was attended by in excess of 50 000 people. The concert will be held again this year.

The week preceding Proclamation Day and the day itself benefit the local interests, increase State pride and help boost tourism. If we take a serious look at our consciences and consider legalising betting on this event (and I can see no harm in that), I believe the event will benefit. It will add colour and eliminate the opportunity for S.P. betting (if it goes on). S.P. betting has been very hard to detect, but there is no doubt that it is carried on. Let us legalise it.

We have a responsible organisation in the Betting Control Board, which will call for applications from three bookmakers to attend the meeting. There are no worries in regard to the Betting Control Board, because it has proved over the years that it is astute in managing the affairs of licensed bookmakers in South Australia. On occasions there have been disputes involving personality clashes, but in the main this House has nothing to fear by handing to the Betting Control Board the responsibility to select three bookmakers to operate on this event.

The bookmakers will be located on the eastern side of Colley Reserve, near the finishing line, and I understand that the location will be protected by trees. The South Australian Jockey Club will provide barricades so bookmakers will be isolated and so that young people under 18 years of age will be easily detected if they try to enter that area. I give full credit to the organisers for their taking steps to not encourage under age people to place bets. Bookmakers will not take it.

The Hon. M.M. Wilson: It would be illegal, wouldn't it?

Mr BECKER: I know it is, but it can be difficult to establish whether a person is 16 or 17 these days. The publicans have those problems. The point is that the people concerned in the organisation are taking all possible steps to ensure that only people of 18 years of age and over will be able to enter the betting area.

The Glenelg council contributes about \$6 000 to the carnival and the Proclamation Day ceremony. If a council is spending that amount of ratepayers' money on something for the State, and if it is the wish of the council that this House support the legislation, I would expect everyone to support such a request. As I stated earlier, many years ago there was always a debate about how much the Glenelg council would put in; currently that cost is about \$6 000. If I remember correctly, two years ago the State Government gave the Glenelg council \$1 000 or \$1 500 when the Government changed the Proclamation Day holiday. It was a sore point with those at Glenelg that the Proclamation Day holiday was done away with. Those in the area had always prided themselves on the fact that at least the Parliament of the day recognised the significance and importance of Proclamation Day.

We look forward to the people of South Australia coming down to Glenelg not only on Monday 27 December to the twilight meeting, but most importantly on Tuesday 28 December. This will be a very significant event on the sporting calendar of South Australia. The Government must bring in this legislation now and get it through both houses of Parliament before we adjourn for the Christmas recess, because it is important that betting facilities be available for this year's carnival. I cannot understand the cynical attitude adopted by some of my colleagues in regard to this proposition. The Minister responsible has done what I would expect any Minister to do, namely, to bring in such legislation straight away so that it can be in operation on 28 December 1982, and from then on. I support the Bill.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I oppose the Bill. I have listened to the various comments made throughout the evening. It is not a matter of whether we support Glenelg on this issue, but of whether we accept that there is a need and a place for gambling on foot races. If we accept that there is a need,

then I believe that the only event for which that form of betting could be applied would be on the Bay Sheffield. However, I do not accept the proposition that there should be gambling or betting on foot racing in this State.

I believe that one can draw a distinction between established gambling on horse, dog and other forms of races and races involving humans. It has been said that one can fix a race more easily where humans are involved than where animals are involved. All members would accept that, if the stakes were high enough, then the opportunity to fix a race would be there.

The member for Semaphore mentioned betting, albeit illegal, on boxing and other forms of sport. Whilst I recognise that that is the case, I do not think that members of this Parliament or the Parliament itself should condone such action. I believe that gambling on humans is degrading and I fear that it will turn what is a family day into a gambling arena. From that point of view I oppose the measure.

I opposed the introduction of soccer pools when it was before this House because I did not believe that this State Government, or the previous State Government, should have had to resort to gambling in order to finance sporting activities. In many ways that is what is happening in this case, where the South Australian Amateur Athletic League will be the beneficiary from the gambling. I believe that it is a sorry day when one has to use gambling to finance sporting activities and facilities. That is what is really happening.

I would be more at ease if we were considering extending gambling to sleepy lizard races because, at least, there is an element of chance involved if one happens to pick the right sleepy lizard going in the right direction. Where humans are involved it is a different ball game. It might sound as though it is making a mockery of it; I think that it is. I cannot come to terms that this is the right thing. The member for Hanson mentioned that, if we are to accept the principle of gambling on human races, the first and probably the only place where we could readily condone such actions would be the Bay Sheffield. I accept that point wholeheartedly, but I cannot come to terms with extending gambling facilities to human races. I oppose the Bill.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): The member for Hanson said that the Bay Sheffield initially came about as a way of perpetuating the proclamation of our State and the carnival that goes with it. Members will acknowledge that those celebrations are important and an aspect of our history that we need to uphold. It appears that this is the biggest athletic carnival in South Australia, possibly in Australia. That is very good. Between 30 000 to 50 000 people come to the Bay at that time of year when the Bay is perhaps one of the most appropriate places to cool off.

The status of the Bay Sheffield is beyond question. One can only compliment the organisers and all people associated with it. However, I think that there are too many unknowns concerning betting on the Bay Sheffield. The members for Fisher, Kavel, Alexandra and Flinders have put forward certain points, and I find myself sympathetic to their arguments. I have yet to be convinced that betting is required on the Bay Sheffield. It seems to me that there is ample opportunity for gambling in South Australia in other areas, as mentioned, including horse and dog racing, and trotting.

I question whether or not this Bill to amend the Racing Act would eliminate the illegal betting which is apparently of some concern, and which has been conducted on the Bay Sheffield. I think that the answer there is, 'No, it would not.' Certainly, there would be legal betting at the site, but what about the people who are not at the Bay on that day? I am also concerned that, because it is an open area, there is no charge made to the public. Families come to the event

and there is no restriction on who wishes to come, and whether one wants to be there for the purpose of seeing the Bay Sheffield or any other purpose. This contrasts, as we have heard earlier speakers say, with the Stawell Gift, I believe with the Bendigo Two Thousand, and certainly with the normal horse racing, trotting and dog racing in this State, and that is a major point of difference from the proposals for betting on the Bay Sheffield. Together with the member for Flinders and other members, I question the betting on human beings. Surely it must be easy to rig a race if the people who are running can work out a plan before hand, and it would be easy to hypothesise on this but I would have to be convinced that it does not occur.

Although I question to what extent this has relevance to the point at issue, I was disturbed to hear the accusation that \$40 000 was going to the A.L.P. from the South Australian Bookmakers' League. So there are many questions in my mind that are not fully answered and I therefore would not be able to support the amendments here. In fact I feel that the success of the Bay Sheffield race is assured, and betting or no betting will not change this situation.

The Hon. M.M. WILSON (Torrens): I oppose the measure. I suppose it is incumbent on most politicians to try and at least be consistent. That is something which is not always achieved by members in this place and, as the former Minister of Recreation and Sport, I had this matter brought to my attention three times in the three years that I was Minister. Each time I was opposed to the measure or I consulted with my colleagues on the matter, and in the interests of consistency if nothing else, I will certainly oppose the measure. I do not intend to canvass all the reasons why I was opposed to the measure before and still am, because my colleagues from Fisher and Goyder have done it better than I could, but I think that it is very important to achieve consistency. I do not believe that it is the greatest social issue that has ever been before this House.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: I have not said that.

The Hon. M.M. WILSON: I did not say that the Minister did. I do not believe that it is the greatest social issue we have ever had to face in this place, and I do not really believe that if legal betting on the Bay Sheffield is allowed, it will contribute to a breakdown in our society. But I believe that a stand has to be taken, and I do not really believe, whether it is a large matter or a small matter that the morality should differ. Members opposite may have different views and they are entitled to them; it is a conscience matter. It simply is that my conscience is such that I wish to oppose the measure.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER (Minister of Recreation and Sport): I never cease to be amazed. The comments that have been made by some Opposition members are certainly amazing, because I noted in the press only a week ago that the Leader of the Opposition, at a Liberal Party annual general meeting, was reported as saying that in the next three years the Liberal Party had to reverse its quite absurd predictions and communicate with the electorate and take off its Liberal coloured glasses to get the real view of the electorate. The attitude that some members of the Opposition have given tonight certainly is the reason why they are in Opposition at the present time and is the reason why they will be in Opposition for a long time to come. I have never heard anything so absurd.

I will deal first with the former Minister of Recreation and Sport. About 18 months ago, he approached me on a personal basis, asking me whether I would support the introduction of legal betting on the Bay Sheffield. As Opposition spokesman, I said, 'Yes, I certainly would. I believe it is a step in the right direction.' I do not know what happened after that, but I would guess.

The Hon. M.M. Wilson: You remember that I asked for your opinion.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The honourable member asked my opinion. I expressed very strongly that I was in favour of betting on the Bay Sheffield. As I say, I am not sure what happened after that, but I assume that the Minister put that proposition to his Party in Cabinet and got rolled on it. I am introducing this legislation at this time, not because of any pressure from any organisation, or from anybody at all - whether it be the bookmakers, the South Australian Athletic League or anybody else—

Mr Rodda: How do you know that he got rolled?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I am only assuming; I would say that that is what happened.

The Hon. M.M. Wilson: You look back at all the Cabinet submissions and you will not find it.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I am assuming. I am only guessing that that is what happened, because I thought at that time that the Minister would introduce the legislation. I picked it up, and I made public statements which appeared in the press over the last 18 months. So, I certainly was not influenced by any pressures, or any donations or anything at all in regard to this legislation. In the first couple of weeks of Government I have had the bloody courage to bring this in, whereas none of the other Ministers of Recreation and Sport have ever tried it before. They did not have the courage to do it, and I believe that it is the right thing to do. The points made by the member for Hanson this evening are perfectly true. The history that he has given is absolutely correct. The events certainly are a very important part of the Commemoration Day celebrations at Glenelg. The member for Fisher made the point that families will be exposed to gambling, since an area is not defined at Colley Reserve. I point out that an area will be defined, will be separate, and will be controlled by the Betting Control Board; further, there will be a betting supervisor there at all times. So, it will be supervised. It certainly will be under the Board's jurisdiction.

I point out, also, that until the flat was closed at Victoria Park the same situation applied there. There was no charge for admission. Any person could enter there without payment, but certainly, here again, there was a defined area for betting by the bookmakers. This situation will pertain at the Bay Sheffield. For the information of the House, interstate experience shows that this Bill and the introduction of bookmakers will not have a significant increase in gambling expenditure by the general public.

It is anticipated that the turnover from these events on the 27th and 28th will be about \$30 000 to \$40 000. An arrangement has been made for only three bookmakers. There will be no cross code betting. Betting will be on the Bay Sheffield events only and I do not contemplate now or at any future time any cross code betting. As I said, it will have no adverse effects on a family or on the community and I do not think that one will be induced to wager on the events unless one has a special interest in them. Nobody is compelled to wager on the events, but it certainly will add to the day. That is why I have now introduced this Bill: because I want it to come into effect for this coming Proclamation Day.

A history is associated with this matter, which has been going on for the past 10 years. A number of members of this House have made representations to successive Ministers over the past 10 years. I refer to the former member for Morphet who is now the member for Hartley, and the present member for Morphet.

Mr Groom: Where is he?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I do not know where he is. He has made representations to Ministers in regard to this

matter. The member for Hanson has said this evening that on two or three occasions that he made representations to his own Party when it was in Government, but he was rebuffed. This matter is in the public interest, and the events associated with the carnival should certainly receive attention now. I do not think I ought to try to rebut some of the arguments in relation to influences in this regard by some donation that was made for political purposes. Every political Party receives donations for various reasons.

Mr Peterson: Mine doesn't.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I do not know about it, and I am not interested. I have already said that, but it certainly has not influenced my decision in either this matter or in any other matter. I believe that this measure is in the interests of the State. The Glenelg council supports it, the Glenelg Commemoration Day Committee supports it, and the South Australian Athletic League supports it. On a number of occasions over the past 18 months, I have made public statements to that effect. I supported it in Opposition; it has been in the press; and I have not had one letter or telephone call from any person opposing this measure. It surprises me that when legislation of this nature is introduced, members of the Liberal Party always see evil in everything. It is amazing! I believe that this measure is in the public interest and in the interest of the events on Commemoration Day.

For the interest of members, I point out that the Commemoration Day Committee conducted its first meeting at the Bay in 1886. The race was over 100 yards and the prize was two pounds. Following public acceptance of that event, the Commemoration Day Committee decided to hold each year a similar race which would be known as the Commemoration Day Bay Sheffield. In 1887, the first Bay Sheffield was then held over 100 yards with a total prize pool of £26, the first prize being £14, the second prize £6, the third prize £4, and fourth prize £2. This event has been staged continuously since that date and is the only event of its kind to be continually staged since then, so a significant history is associated with this race.

The Hon. M.M. Wilson: We are not stopping the race.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The Opposition is not stopping the race, but it is inhibiting its further growth. As I have said before, representations have been made about this matter over the past 10 years. It is strongly felt by the South Australian Athletic League that this will eventually be the richest foot race in Australia. It presently offers the second highest prize money for a foot race in Australia, the only race offering a higher prize money being the Stawell Gift. Although this is a possibility, it certainly will not happen unless bookmakers are allowed to field on this event.

I wish now to rebut some of the comments made by the member for Fisher and the Deputy Leader. The proposal before the House is not made to assist bookmakers. The turnover involved is expected to be in the vicinity of \$30 000 or \$40 000.

Mr Evans: In the beginning.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The amount involved may increase, but that is the expected turnover this year. This proposal is designed to assist the Proclamation Day celebrations and, to some degree (and I do not deny this), the South Australian Athletic League. The point has been made that the league is a professional organisation. So what? So are a lot of organisations. I do not think that that makes a great deal of difference, because they are still involved in sport. I do not believe that the athletic league has any ulterior motive regarding the matter.

I believe that the office bearers of that organisation are responsible and upright citizens and that some of the comments that have been made reflect on their integrity. I do not believe that those have been fair comments, because

these people are beyond reproach. If I thought that any ulterior motive existed on the part of the athletic league, I would not be supporting its representations. It made those representations not only to me as Minister but also to Ministers of both political Parties over the past ten years, so this matter is nothing new. However, nobody was prepared to grasp the nettle before. I had made a commitment when a person I met at a social function about 18 months ago asked me what was my view on the matter. I said then, without equivocation, that I would support this proposal. I have stuck to that undertaking and introduced this legislation, which I hope the House will support.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Interpretation.'

Mr EVANS: The definitions define the race on which we are seeking to legalise gambling, the ground, the meeting and the body which will conduct the meeting. The Minister has been heard to say in recent times that I suggested that children and families would be near the betting area. If the Minister looks at the speech I made he would find that I said that the Betting Control Board might control the area where the gambling takes place but the overall area where the competition is held would not have defined boundaries such as would be the case with an oval used for the Bendigo race or the Stawell race. That was the point I was making. So, for the Minister's enlightenment, I suggest he reads what I said before he gives it another interpretation.

I am also concerned that in a recent speech made by the Minister he implied that I was suggesting that people organising through the South Australian Athletic League had improper motives. At no time did I say that, nor did the Deputy Leader say that. I said that, when we are defining a foot race where human beings are competing, we are giving the opportunity to individuals competing or their trainers of the future to rig the race. I am talking about the human element which we are likely to encourage into the competition once we allow gambling into the scene. In this clause we are defining the race by a meeting, defining the body that will organise it, defining the name of the event and defining the type of competition. That is the part that concerns me. I wanted to clarify one or two points. I will ask no questions of the Minister at this stage although I have an amendment that I wish to move later on the clause.

Mr PETERSON: I refer to clause 2 (b), which provides that the meeting will be conducted by the South Australian Athletics League Incorporated. Will the Minister inform the Committee of the structure of the league and who comprises it? How will participants in the race be qualified? Are they all professional runners, do they have to be members of the league before they can run or do they run by invitation? What restrictions are put on people who run in the race?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: In reply to the member's first question, the South Australian Athletic League has been formed for many years. Formerly it was called the South Australian Professional Athletic League but that was changed. It is an incorporated body. The office bearers are as follows: the Chairman, Mr Les Brown; Vice-Presidents, Mr Les Daly, and Mr Les O'Donohue; Secretary, Mrs M. Karutz; and the Treasurer is Mr B. Fletcher. The league has been formed for a number of years.

Mr Becker: It goes back to the 1970s.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: We can go back many years. It is a recognised body and I am confident that it is able to conduct the event. It has been doing it without bookmakers for many years and it is able to make arrangements to assist in those events. In answer to the other question of nominations, I understand that all participants are professional runners. No doubt there is a nomination fee. I am not aware of all the details, but if the member is interested I could supply those details to him.

Mr BAKER: Following the statement made by the member for Fisher, is the Minister aware that this measure (I refer to the definition of 'racecourse') is being proposed for an area which is not defined and which is totally different to the normal racecourses where the boundaries are defined and where the responsibility of the management is well defined (for example, the S.A.J.C.) and that, as such, it cannot be controlled in the same terms as can other prescribed meetings, and it encompasses the provision of gambling services for a section of the community that has been drawn to the area for purposes other than gambling?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The Bill provides the definition of a foot race, as in Part VI, which will include a foot race that forms part of the foot race meeting known as the Bay Sheffield carnival, which is conducted by the South Australian Athletic League Incorporated. Even though the Bill does not define a particular area, the carnival is well known and it is run at Colley Reserve every year as part of the Proclamation Day celebration.

Mr Becker: The flexibility of the ground is involved.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: There is no flexibility. That is the area where the Bay Sheffield is conducted and it is defined. Clause 2 states that the race is to be run as the Bay Sheffield carnival, and is to be conducted by the league, and that is the venue where the race is conducted.

Mr BAKER: The area set aside for bookmaking purposes is not contested, but the area of the grounds that is associated with the foot race is at question. Every ground has its own controlling body and, as far as I am aware, no one body controls the Colley Reserve, as is the case in regard to horse racing, trotting and dog racing.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The Glenelg council is the primary controlling body and the Glenelg Commemoration Day Celebration Committee is the controlling body under the auspices of the council. Consequently, the council, in conjunction with the South Australian Athletic League, conducts the carnival.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: In the second reading stage I foreshadowed a couple of questions, one of which referred to the request that was made to the Minister or his Government to proceed with this Bill. During his concluding remarks, the Minister stated that at a social function he met a person who was connected with the organisation and who requested to know the Minister's attitude on gambling on the site. In response, I believe that the Minister gave an undertaking to support that facility, I presume, if and when he was in Government. I ask the Minister again whether that is the only basis on which the Government has decided to bring forward this Bill. Is it purely on a remark that the Minister made some 18 months ago, in a conversation with a person at a social function, that the Government has chosen to introduce this Bill? Indeed, is it on the basis of an organisation officially asking the Government to proceed and, if so, will the Minister table the correspondence associated with that request?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: There has been no correspondence to me in regard to a request. The former Minister of Recreation and Sport approached me seeking my opinion in regard to betting on the Bay Sheffield. Without equivocation I indicated that I would support it. It so happened that a few weeks later, by coincidence, I met a person associated with the South Australian Athletic League at a function. He told me that he was concerned about the fact that after having made representations to the former Government (in which the member for Torrens was a Minister) a request from bookmakers was refused. The person sought my opinion on that matter and without equivocation I said that I would support the proposal if the Labor Party came to Government, and I gave an undertaking that I would introduce appropriate legislation if I was the Minister of Recreation and Sport.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: You knew that your Cabinet colleagues would support you.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: No, I did not. The undertaking I made was a personal one. All I said was that, as a future Minister of Recreation and Sport, I would introduce legislation and I have done exactly that.

Mr RODDA: I apologise for not having been here for all of the debate. I do not think that the Minister discriminates against South Australia, but to my untrained mind the Bill seems to suggest that he is doing so. I refer to the definition in Clause 2 (b), as follows:

'the prescribed foot race meeting' means the foot race meeting known as the 'Bay Sheffield Carnival' conducted by the South Australian Athletic League Incorporated.

In regard to the broad aspect of South Australia, for example, in your distinguished city, Mr Chairman, there is a very famous and prominent foot race, the Whyalla Gift.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have previously ruled in this debate that the Whyalla Gift has nothing to do with this Bill. For the information of members of the Committee, I point out that the Whyalla Gift has not been run for many years.

Mr RODDA: It was only out of deference to you, Sir, that I mentioned the Whyalla Gift. If it is no longer run, that indicates that I have not been to Whyalla for a good many years. However, the Bay Sheffield is still run, as is a prominent race at Mount Gambier as well as the Riverland Flying 135. It would appear that the Minister is either pussyfooting or just trying the water. I intend to support the Bill, but I want to know from the Minister why we are tying up the canoe to this hallowed ground that my colleague is worried about, the Colley Reserve. I can assure the Minister and his colleagues that plenty of other betting is going on at these other races. The Government is missing out on that valuable revenue and it would not have to worry about the \$40 000 if it became macroscopic in its outlook. I know the Minister is not without some ability in this matter, because I have seen him talking to padres and other distinguished people across Australia concerning this hallowed area of getting cash together. This is what we must do. The Minister probably has very good reasons for his stance, as I know he is a man of deep and studied consequence. I am sure that he will have an answer for members of the House, but to me it appears that he is pussyfooting at Glenelg.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: If I interpret the member for Victoria's question correctly, the reason that we are confining it only to the Bay Sheffield is fairly obvious: that is where the request has come for many years for the operation of bookmakers. To my knowledge there has been no request or demand from other sources. I certainly do not intend that this will proliferate betting on foot racing. This event is run under the auspices of this particular body. I do not know anything about the Riverland Flying 135, the Mt Gambier Sheffield or any other race. It is not intended to extend betting on foot races to any other event.

Mr RODDA: I take it then that the Minister would be responsive if he received a request from the Riverland Flying 135, the Mount Gambier Sheffield or the Whyalla Gift. I am sure that, now that the member for Whyalla holds such an illustrious position, his constituents will want to be part of this South Australian scene. I take it that the Minister would be favourable to similar requests in relation to other foot races.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: If requests come to the Government, they will certainly be considered, but there is no guarantee that any action will be taken.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: At no stage has the Minister indicated whether or not, if this legislation passes both Houses and is ultimately proclaimed, registered bookmakers in South Australia will take the opportunity of running a

book for the purposes outlined in the Bill. Does the Minister know of any bookmakers who intend to participate and, if so, from which section of the licensed bookmaking fraternity does he anticipate that they will emerge. How many bookmakers are likely to participate at the Bay Sheffield Carnival.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: I am informed by the Betting Control Board that it will be able to arrange three bookmakers. I do not know who those bookmakers will be, but I am advised that there will be three, and that is all that is required at this time.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: Was that advice made available to the Minister at a social function by chance or accident, or is it a written undertaking? It appears that the whole scheme of events leading up to the introduction of this Bill is fairly casual. The Minister has already said that there are no documented requests from any person or authority seeking the Government's support for this measure. Is this undertaking by the Betting Control Board a matter of conversation or is it a written undertaking? Is there any correspondence associated with it that the Minister, his colleagues or the Government have at this time?

The Hon. J.W. Slater: The position should be made clear. The member for Alexandra should understand that when one is the Opposition spokesman on recreation and sport, one does not have documentation. But, as the Minister, I certainly have documentation regarding three bookmakers. The Betting Control Board has assured the Government and has supplied written advice that there will be three bookmakers involved in the Bay Sheffield Carnival if the legislation passes the House.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Alexandra has spoken on three occasions to this clause and, therefore, is out of order.

The Hon. M.M. Wilson: I want to take the opportunity of adding a little bit to the knowledge of members concerning the South Australian Athletic League. The South Australian Athletic League is a very old organisation in South Australian athletic terms and I had negotiations with the league on several occasions, not necessarily to do with this matter but to do with matters of encouraging athletics, especially amongst younger people. The league is very keen to assist amateurs. Indeed, the Mort Daly Foundation, of which members may have heard, is connected with the South Australian Athletic League. Although I disagree with the intent of this clause, which has the effect of paying moneys to the South Australian Athletic League, because under this particular clause the league is set up as a racing club and therefore, it will receive 1.4 per cent of the bookmakers' turnover (it is certainly not a large amount); and it is the principle that I am against. Although I am opposed to a body such as the league receiving a special consideration in the legislation, I want to put on record that it is a fine body of people and it does have—

The Hon. R.G. Payne: Why did you not help the league when you had the chance?

The Hon. M.M. Wilson: I was talking about the league and being in a specialised position *vis-a-vis* other athletic clubs. The point I am trying to make even for the Minister (and I am sure he will understand it) is that the league is connected with the Mort Daly Foundation and it assists and goes a long way to assisting even amateur athletes.

Clause passed.

Clause 3 passed.

New clause 4—'Payment to board of percentage of moneys bet with bookmakers.'

Mr EVANS: I move to insert the following new clause:

Page 2, after clause 3—Insert new clause as follows:

4. Section 114 of the principal Act is amended—

(a) by striking out from subsection (3) the word "The" and substituting the passage "Subject to subsection (4), the";

and

(b) by inserting after subsection (3) the following subsections:

(4) The board shall, out of the amount paid to it pursuant to subsection (1) in respect of the prescribed foot race meeting, pay to the credit of the Recreation and Sport Fund established under the Soccer Football Pools Act, 1981, an amount equal to 1.4 per centum of the amount paid or payable to bookmakers in respect of bets made on the foot races held at that meeting.

(5) The moneys paid to the credit of the Recreation and Sport Fund pursuant to this section may be applied in accordance with section 17 (4) of the Soccer Football Pools Act, 1981.

Section 17(3) of the Soccer Pools Act provides:

The moneys paid to the Recreation and Sport Fund pursuant to subsection (2) shall be used to support and develop such recreational and sporting facilities and services within the State as are approved by the Minister.

I am not taking away the right of the Minister, whoever the Minister may be, of passing the money over at any time to the South Australian Athletic League, if that is what the Minister so wishes at the time, but the money should be put into that fund so that the Minister of the day can decide to which group of athletes, sporting or recreational people the moneys can be made available.

I also admit that the sum involved is not great at this stage, but if, as the Minister and particularly the member for Hanson (who has some interest in that area, in addition to some knowledge of the carnival and years of experience) have explained, it is believed that by providing gambling facilities at this race meeting there will be an increase in attendance and in turnover as the years go by, the amount of money we are talking about could be considerably more than \$420 in the future. Surely the intention of the people asking for this facility is to promote the event and have bigger prize money, more people attending and more of them gambling. Nor can we be sure that, in the future, Governments of the day will not increase the amount of money which needs to be paid from any particular form of the gambling industry into Government revenue. The Minister would know that a considerable number of sporting and athletic groups in the community are still looking for money. They have great difficulty and do not have the opportunity of getting sponsorship (as professional groups do at times), especially in the area involving juniors. If we are saying to the Athletic League that it should make the decision on whether or not it gives this money to the foundation it supports, we should not take that risk. The Minister of the day should have the power through his department to decide where the money goes. If the present Minister wants to give it all to the Athletic League, that is his decision. He can stand by the criticism that comes from other sporting or athletic groups that are short of money if he continually does that. Surely, that is a fair and reasonable thing to do. So, I am asking the Minister to accept a fair and reasonable amendment to ensure that the money goes into a fund from which it can be distributed to those in most need (whichever groups they may be at the time) of money to support their particular sport or recreation. I ask the Committee to support the new clause.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I oppose the new clause for a number of reasons. First, it has been the normal practice for the controlling body, or the body that conducts the events, under the Racing Act to be the beneficiary of the 1.4 per cent. I see no difference in this area between the South Australian Athletic League and the South Australian Jockey Club, the trotting people or the dog-racing people, where the controlling bodies' expenses are covered in some way by this 1.4 per cent. The point has been made by the member for Fisher that although it is only a minimal amount (and that may be true) it may accelerate as years go by, but I doubt it very much. The same principle prevails, as far as I am concerned in regard to other codes, although I am

not putting this in the same category as that of horse-racing, trotting or dog-racing. There are expenses involved in conducting such events, and no doubt expenses will be incurred in some way by the South Australian Athletic League in assisting the bookmakers in connection with this event.

I do not know what may be involved, but nevertheless the point has been made by the former Minister, the member for Torrens, that these professional groups do support part of a foundation, know as the Mort-Daly Running Foundation, which in turn assists juniors and in some cases amateur sports any way. On those basic principles, I cannot support the new clause.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER (Minister of Recreation and Sport): I move:

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

Motion carried.

The Hon. M.M. WILSON: I support the amendment, and agree with the reasoning put forward so far in that it would seem logical to put the South Australian Athletic League on the same footing (and it is not meant to be a pun) as the South Australian Jockey Club, the trotting clubs, and the greyhound racing clubs. Because it is a tidy solution, it is not necessarily the best solution, because the horse-racing, dog-racing and trotting industry is the fourth largest industry in the State, and is not competing with a lot of other amateur organisations.

I suppose one could cite an instance where there is competition, but they are not competing with many other amateur organisations, whereas the South Australian Athletic League is in fact one of many sporting organisations as a result of human endeavour. We should not be singling out the Athletic League for special treatment, *vis-a-vis* the Amateur Athletic Association, the South Australian Swimming Association, the Diving Association and the Equestrian Federation, and I do not have to tell honourable members that the list is legion. I think there are 90 different sports registered with the Minister's own department. The honourable member for Fisher has moved this amendment so that the Athletic League is not singled out for special attention compared with those other organisations that I have mentioned. If the Government or the Minister wants to help the league or the Mort Daly Foundation, the Minister has the means at his disposal; he has the power to distribute moneys from the Recreation and Sport Fund; a fund that, despite the bitter criticism from members opposite of the soccer pools legislation and the Murdoch press—

The Hon. J.W. Slater: It wouldn't have got through if it had not been for me.

The Hon. M.M. WILSON: I did not refer to the Minister, but to members opposite. Despite bitter criticism of those organisations, the Minister will have at his disposal \$1 000 000 plus within 12 months.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: I will have more than that.

The Hon. M.M. WILSON: I know that the Minister will have more money than that available to him. We will find out exactly how much later; the member for Fisher will be finding that out. The Minister will have that money to disburse. Also, if he accepts the member for Fisher's amendment, that money from the conduct of the Bay Sheffield, from the turnover tax, if this legislation is successful, will go into the Recreation and Sport Fund. Then, if the Minister wished to help with the expenses of the South Australian Athletic League incurred in running this event he could issue money from the Recreation and Sport Fund to that body, just as he will to other sporting organisations during the coming 12 months. That was one reason why the Recreation and Sport Fund is set up as it is a power of Ministerial discretion as to the use of funds.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I think that the member for Torrens well knows that the practice and principles adopted

over many years, by both his Government and the previous Labor Government, were not to support professional bodies as against amateur sporting bodies.

The Hon. M.M. Wilson: But you are supporting them.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The honourable member has had his opportunity to speak, and I ask that he let me have mine. I do not think that we are giving this body special attention. One must remember that the Department of Recreation and Sport does not support the South Australian Athletic League in any other way—that is a fact. I do not think we are giving this body special treatment. I believe that this amendment is a messy arrangement, and for the reasons outlined I oppose the amendment.

Mr PETERSON: A previous speaker made the point that the betting tax from the Bay Sheffield should go into the Recreation and Sport Fund and be distributed from there.

The Hon. M.M. Wilson: Yes, 1.4 per cent.

Mr PETERSON: Yes. The professional betting codes in this State, such as racing, galloping, trotting and the dogs are paid out of betting tax returns, but none of that money goes to sports and recreation. It seems to me that the point put forward is not logical in the current situation where there is no money coming from betting to on sport in this State at the moment because it is ploughed back into the codes specifically providing that money. The tax from betting on a code goes directly back to the type of racing it comes from.

If we were to set up a situation whereby the betting tax from a foot race was put into the Recreation and Sport Fund, that would be totally at odds with existing practice and would set up a precedent whereby it could be argued that the tax from galloping, trotting and the dogs should go into the Recreation and Sport Fund and be allocated from that fund. Will the Minister clarify this point?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The turnover tax will be 2.3 per cent, to be distributed in the proportion of 1.4 per cent to the South Australian Athletic League and 0.9 per cent to the Government. That is the formula. The estimated turnover is between \$30 000 and \$40 000, which means that the South Australian Athletic League would receive 1.4 per cent (or \$560) and the Government 0.9 per cent (or \$360).

Mr EVANS: I do not accept the Minister's argument. The member for Semaphore is following the same line. In horseracing and dogs there is virtually no amateur racing at all. In the equestrian field there are some amateur operations such as in show jumping, but there is virtually no amateur horse or dog racing in the State. When it comes to athletics, the vast majority of competitions in the State are in the amateur areas. The inadequacy of facilities for amateurs in the State is known to all of us. We are a long way behind most States in providing suitable tracks for amateurs. There have been moves to correct the situation by successive Governments which have attempted to look at areas where changes can be made. That is the obvious difference between the two areas of operation.

Where human beings are competing as athletes there are very few professional foot races. I am sure the member for Semaphore and the Minister would be aware that many community groups, whether they be the little athletes right through to senior athletes, are looking for support. I would hope that the Minister would see the benefit of the Government being able to decide where the highest priorities lie. I know that the simple thing for the Minister to do is to get it into the Act so that he can say that Parliament put it in and that therefore he cannot give money because it all must go to the professional body, hoping it will help some amateur group out of the kindness of its heart, because the Minister does not want to make the tough decision on distributing money. He wants to be able to stand aside and say that Parliament accepted that the professional group

must get the money from this form of foot racing and the gambling tax that applies in relation to the 1.4 per cent.

The Hon. M.M. Wilson: He wants to single it out.

Mr EVANS: That is what is happening. The correct thing to do is to make it available to the Minister of the day to distribute it in the areas of greatest need. If the 0.3 per cent is taken off the bookmakers tax, will it come off the Government's 0.9 per cent or off the 1.4 per cent that is supposed to go to the athletic league?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The member for Fisher will probably be advised upon the second part of the question when I introduce amendments to the Racing Act at some future time. Nevertheless, at this stage, we are dealing with the turnover of tax which exists at the present time. I make the point again to the member for Fisher and to the House that, if I were to accept the amendment, I would be in an awkward position of giving money from the Recreation and Sport Fund or from the Soccer Pools fund and it would be the only money (if the money was then given to the South Australian Athletic League) to go to a professional body from this source. The former Minister shakes his head. I am advised that that is the position. I still believe that the amendment is an untidy one from an administrative viewpoint. I am not in a position to accept it.

The Hon. M.M. WILSON: I understand that money has been given to the South Australian National Football League for junior promotion. That is a professional organisation if ever there was one.

Mr Becker: The juniors aren't.

The Hon. M.M. WILSON: The South Australian Athletic League also assist juniors who are amateurs and certainly the Mort Daly Foundation does assist. So, the Minister's argument does not stand up.

The Committee divided on the new clause:

Ayes (19)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, Ashenden, Baker, Blacker, D.C. Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans (teller), Goldsworthy, Gunn, Lewis, Mathwin, Meier, Rodda, Tonkin, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (24)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon, Becker, Crafter, Duncan, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs McRae, Mayes, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater (teller), Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Majority of 5 for the Noes.

New clause thus negatived.

Title passed.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER (Minister of Recreation and Sport): I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

The House divided on the third reading:

Ayes (28)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon, Becker, D.C. Brown, M.J. Brown, Chapman, Crafter, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Gunn, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs Mathwin, Mayes, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Rodda, Slater (teller), Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (14)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, Ashenden, Baker, Blacker, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy (teller), Lewis, Meier, Tonkin, Wilson, and Wotton.

Majority of 14 for the Ayes.

Third reading thus carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.20 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 15 December at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 14 December 1982

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

FARMING DEMONSTRATION

1. **The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education representing the Minister of Agriculture:

1. Will a farming demonstration project in Libya be reintroduced?

2. Will the Minister continue the previous Government's policy of aiming to recover all costs associated with the State's overseas farming and associated projects and, if not, why not?

3. Will the Minister place greater emphasis on assistance to the underdeveloped countries than on the promotion of South Australia's farming expertise and marketing State manufactured machinery?

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

1. There are currently no negotiations with the Libyan Government for a project in that country.

2. The effectiveness of the International Division of the Department of Agriculture and SAGRIC International is being reviewed and the Government hopes that in future it will be possible to recover all costs associated with overseas farming projects and avoid the substantial loss made during the last few years on some projects.

3. The Minister of Agriculture's policy is to promote South Australian farming expertise in areas with similar climates and soils. This will generate trade for the State in farm machinery, pasture seeds and other imports to the S.A. farming system. The new South Australian Government will not be promoting the S.A. farming system in regions of the world where it is not climatically suited.

INSTITUTE OF MEDICAL AND VETERINARY SCIENCE

3. **The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Agriculture: Will the Minister maintain the level of personnel and services applicable to the new Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science and, if not, in which areas is it intended to reduce services?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The matter is under review.

MILK AUGMENTATION SCHEME

4. **The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Agriculture: Is the milk augmentation scheme between the South Australian Dairymen's Association and South Eastern Dairymen's Association working in accordance with the Dairy Industry Agreement and, if so, will it be necessary to amend the Metropolitan Milk Supply Act to ensure adequate funding is available to honour that agreement after 1984 and, if not, will the Government guarantee the South-Eastern dairymen their entitlements under the agreement in 1984 and thereafter and, if not, why not?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Legislation is being drafted in accordance with the wishes of the industry.

AGRICULTURE CORPORATE PLAN

5. **The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Agriculture: Will the Minister adopt the 1982 Corporate Plan of the Department of Agriculture in its entirety and, if not, which part or parts does he intend to amend and/or delete and why?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: No. The matter is under review.

PERPETUAL LEASE LAND

6. **The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education representing the Minister of Agriculture: Will the Minister support the Liberal Party policy of 'encouraging the freeholding of perpetual lease land in South Australia' and, if so, will he continue this policy on the same terms and conditions as have applied since 1980 and, if not, why not?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The question should be directed to the Minister of Lands, and the Minister of Agriculture suggests that the honourable member direct his question to that Minister.

COUNTRY FIRE SERVICES

8. **The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education representing the Minister of Agriculture:

1. Will the Minister insist that Country Fire Services headquarters improve its financial control in accordance with the 1982 Curtis Report?

2. Is it Government policy to encourage C.F.S. headquarters to allocate a greater share of its total funding to subsidising local councils and brigades than has been the case in recent years and, if not, why not?

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

1. Mr Curtis is holding a series of meetings with the C.F.S. board to discuss the implementation of his report.

2. The underfunding of the C.F.S. over a number of years is of great concern to the Government and the Government is currently examining a number of alternative methods of overcoming the problem.

VERTEBRATE PESTS ACT

10. **The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Agriculture: Will the recommendation of the United Farmers and Stockowners Association, Riverland Vertebrate Pest Board and Vertebrate Pest Commission of South Australia be upheld in having the Berri dingo cross dog relocated in accordance with the Vertebrate Pests Act and, if so, when and, if not, what action is proposed to uphold or change the law?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: No. Amendments to the Act are being drafted.

SLAUGHTERHOUSES

11. **The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Agriculture: Will the concept of slaughterhouses, as presently defined under the Meat Hygiene Act, be preserved and, if not, why not?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The 'concept' of slaughterhouses under the Meat Hygiene Act can only be altered by amendment to the Act.

RURAL ORGANISATIONS

12. **The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Agriculture: Will the Minister uphold the request of a South Australian rural organisation not to have his wife present during official deputations to the Minister by that organisation?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: No such request has been received.

RURAL SHOWS

14. **The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Agriculture: Will the Minister attend rural agricultural and horticultural shows when invited, and, if not, why not?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Minister of Agriculture attends functions where possible.

OVERSEAS PROJECTS TOUR

17. **The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Agriculture: Will the Minister agree to facilitating the planning of a private tour by the member for Alexandra of the State's overseas projects through the Overseas Project Unit of the Department of Agriculture and, if not, why not?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Minister of Agriculture will extend to members of the Opposition the same courtesies as extended by his predecessor.

AGRICULTURE ADVISORY BOARD

18. **The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Agriculture: Will the Minister be attending Advisory Board of Agriculture meetings and, if not, why not?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Minister of Agriculture will attend meetings of the Advisory Board when possible.

STATUTORY BOARDS

19. **The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education representing the Minister of Agriculture:

1. Is it intended to dispense with any of the current statutory boards structures associated with his portfolios and, if so, which?

2. Is it intended to introduce any new boards and, if so, for what purpose?

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

1. The matter is under review.

2. See above.

PRIMARY PRODUCERS

20. **The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education representing the Minister of Agriculture: Does the Minister agree that it is appropriate and in the interests of all primary producer organisations for them to discuss their problems with both the Government and Opposition Parties of the Parliament and, if not, why not?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Primary producer organisations may discuss their problems with whom they like.

PRESS RELEASES

21. **The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education representing the Minister of Agriculture: Will the Minister furnish the member for Alexandra with a copy of press releases on all subjects associated with agriculture and forests at the same time as they are circulated to the media and, if not, why not?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Minister of Agriculture will continue with the practice adopted by his predecessor.

POTATO GROWERS

22. **The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Agriculture: Will the Minister conduct another poll by the State Electoral Office of potato growers to ascertain whether the Potato Board should remain the managing authority of the State potato industry and, if not, why not?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The matter is under examination by the Ombudsman.