

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 30 August 1983

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

PETITION: MARIHUANA

A petition signed by 18 residents of South Australia praying that the House reject any legislation that would legalise or decriminalise the use of marihuana was presented by the Hon. B.C. Eastick.

Petition received.

PETITION: MEAT SALES

A petition signed by 36 residents of South Australia praying that the House reject any legislation to extend the existing trading hours for the retail sale of meat was presented by Mr Whitten.

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 4, 6, 7, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17 to 21, 32, 37, 41 to 43, 47, 50, 52, 58, 60, 63, 78, 85, 86, 92 to 97, and 104.

GLENSIDE HOSPITAL

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

Glenside Hospital—Organic Dementia Unit and Infirmary (Revised Proposal).

Ordered that report be printed.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Planning Act, 1982—Crown Development Report by South Australian Planning Commission on Proposed Development at Yacka.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

- Real Property Act, 1886—Regulations—
- i. Fees.
- ii. Strata Titles Fees.
- iii. Land Division Fees.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Road Traffic Act, 1961—Regulations—Traffic Prohibition, Mount Gambier.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Fisheries Act, 1971—Regulations—Dual Licences. South Australian Timber Corporation—
- ii. Report, 1980-81.
- iii. Report, 1981-82.

By the Chief Secretary (Hon. G.F. Keneally)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Police Offences Act, 1953-1981—Regulations—Traffic Infringement Notice Fees.

- ii. Abortions Notified in South Australia, Committee Appointed to Examine and Report on—Report, 1982.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

Racing Act, 1976-1983—Rules of Trotting—

- i. Cancellation of Races.
- ii. Classic Races.
- iii. Scratchings.

By the Minister of Local Government (Hon. T.H. Hemmings)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. City of Campbelltown—By-law No. 40—re Traffic.
- ii. City of Port Adelaide—By-law No. 35—Port Adelaide and Suburban Cemetery, Cheltenham.
- iii. City of Salisbury—By-law No. 7—Control of Vehicles.
- iv. City of Whyalla—By-law No. 36—Omnibuses.
- v. District Council of East Torrens—By-law No. 5—Traffic.
- vi. District Council of Kimba—By-law No. 25—Nuisances.
- vii. District Council of Tanunda—By-law No. 30—Repeal of By-laws.
- viii. District Council of Tumby Bay—By-law No. 38—Reserves and Foreshores.

ASSENT TO BILLS

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

Business Franchise (Petroleum Products) Act Amendment,

Business Franchise (Tobacco) Act Amendment.

QUESTION TIME

ROXBY DOWNS BLOCKADE

Mr OLSEN: Will the Premier ask the Victorian Premier to investigate reports that at least two schools in Victoria have been used by participants in the Roxby Downs blockade to plan and prepare for the activities this week and, if these reports are confirmed, will he also ask Mr Cain to ensure that Government funded facilities in his State are not used again to support a demonstration against a project that the South Australian Government at least now supports?

I understand that the participants in the Roxby Downs blockade include several teachers from Victoria. A report in the *Melbourne Age* last Friday stated that a meeting had been held at Princes Hill High School in Melbourne on 20 August to brief about 25 participants in the Roxby Downs blockade about demonstration techniques. The report also stated that at least one other Victorian Government school had been used for training for the blockade. The report further stated:

Maps distributed to recruits through the Friends of the Earth office in Collingwood indicate that training sessions have been held in the Strathbogie Ranges at St Albans High School Camp.

The report also referred to plans discussed at these venues to occupy company offices and the generator plant at the mine site. In other words, these reports suggest that facilities in at least two Government schools in Victoria have been used to plan for activities in South Australia that involve clear intentions to break the law. Therefore, I ask the Premier to take up this matter with Mr Cain with a view to determining whether these reports are correct and, if they are, to call for action to ensure that facilities funded by Victorian taxpayers are not again used to assist activities in South Australia that have led to law breaking.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not know what the Leader means when he says that these schools are being used with the clear intention to break the law. As I understand it, the law in this State allows for peaceful and orderly protest or demonstration, just as it does in Victoria and, I would hope, everywhere else in Australia. Of course, there have been some unfortunate restrictions on civil liberties in Queensland, particularly in Brisbane. I guess that, in his present posture as a sort of pre-shrunk Bjelke-Petersen, the Leader probably looks across there with some sort of enthusiasm.

However, peaceful and orderly demonstration is possible and permissible under our law, and so it should be. It is only when those involved in demonstrations exceed the law and promote or undertake violent activities that the Government and the community have a responsibility to ensure that it does not happen. In that respect, I believe that the Police Force in South Australia is showing an exemplary and very fine example of the way in which these difficult situations can be handled. In fact, the *Age*, the newspaper to which the Leader referred, yesterday referred in very favourable terms to the way in which our Police Force was playing its role.

I do not think that the Leader has adduced any information warranting me to make a request of my colleague in Victoria, nor do I believe that those matters would be under his control or jurisdiction. I think that the question is a lot of nonsense. It is yet another attempt to try and capitalise on the situation. Indeed, I would suggest that it is part of what comes close to being agent provocateur actions.

Therefore, I have no intention whatsoever of complying with the Leader's request. I intend, as Leader of this Government, to protect the rights of citizens and also to ensure that the operations of Roxby Downs continue in the way in which the law, the indenture, and the mining leases require, and that will be done.

TAXATION

Mr KLUNDER: Can the Premier reconcile the advice he has received regarding taxation from the Leader of the Opposition with that from the Leader's front bench spokesmen, the members for Torrens and Davenport?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I must say that I find it extremely difficult to reconcile those statements. Yesterday, an article appeared in the *News* under the bold headline 'Rethink Taxes, Liberals tell Bannon', accompanied by a picture of the member for Torrens. In that article the member asks us to remove the 1c a litre increase on petrol prices announced as part of the tax revenue package that was introduced. He was joined in this in an enthusiastic tone by the State Opposition transport spokesman, the member for Davenport, who also says that this is an outrageous impost. The honourable member then proceeds to produce some bogus figures, including figures that show that the State Government would get 2.5c a litre (it should be 1.5c, but he has added another cent—but that does not matter; that is par for the course, like the Leader's so-called estimates of cost).

No recognition whatsoever has been given to the circumstances under which those difficult revenue decisions had to be taken. What interested me more than that was that only a few months ago we saw the headline, in the *Advertiser* of 5 May, which stated, 'Some tax rises needed—Olsen'. Not only was the Leader of the Opposition conceding then (and I would suggest quite responsibly) that the financial problems caused by the natural disasters required action, but he instanced a few areas where such action might be taken: higher bus, train and tram fares was one suggestion, and another was an increase in the levy paid by fuel resellers.

This is exactly the same measure, the same levy, that is referred to in the article in which we are told that we must rethink and withdraw. I would suggest that we need a bit more of the constructive attitude that was being taken back in May, but which has long since been abandoned, I might add.

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The conflict in attitude is very interesting, and I refer to the conflict between the so-called spokesman on transport matters, the member for Torrens, and their Leader in relation to this tax. How about a little more honesty from the Opposition in this area? Perhaps the internal leadership tensions might be too much to allow for that.

ROXBY DOWNS

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Premier say whether the Government has received legal advice about the rights of Roxby Management Services to restrict entry to areas at Olympic Dam in which the company is operating and, if so, will the Premier reveal what that advice is? I hope that the Premier will exhibit some honesty in his answer.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: As always.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: He dodged the Leader's question very effectively.

The SPEAKER: Order! Plainly, that is comment, and I ask the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to proceed.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: On Sunday night it became clear that the demonstrators at Roxby Downs were disputing the rights of the company to restrict entry to the Olympic Dam area. The Opposition has received legal advice that the company is acting within its rights, and, accordingly, the Leader of the Opposition issued a public statement at 9 o'clock yesterday morning on this matter. The rights of the company derive from the fact that it is operating under certain terms and conditions of the Mining Act which give it rights of exclusive possession over such portions of the land necessary to undertake activities as authorised by that Act.

I understand that at about mid-day yesterday the Minister of Mines and Energy issued a brief statement on this matter which the demonstrators have described as 'totally inadequate'. Later yesterday, after the Leader of the Opposition issued a further statement condemning the activities of the demonstrators who had broken into the site, the Minister issued a further statement which, as I understand it, stopped short of making it clear that the company had the legal right to deny vehicles access to the area: clear advice that the Opposition had had some hours earlier. This afternoon's *News* editorial has this to say about the Government's position:

The Government should not supinely hang about waiting for the latest word and rhetorical questions from the fringe wreckers taking part in this farce. It should act positively to ensure the project proceeds with all possible speed.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I would suggest that the so-called 'fringe wreckers' involved in this also include certain members of the Opposition in their absolutely deplorable attitude to this whole question. Let me begin by answering directly the question asked: yes, the Government received legal advice. We have not received a detailed final opinion, but the preliminary advice supplied to my colleague clearly indicates that legal rights have been established. There is no question of that, and we have made that quite clear. But let me refer to the matter of this orchestrated attempt by Opposition members to further capitalise on this situation,

to try to wreak as much havoc as they can, to achieve their ultimate aim, namely, to jeopardise the project.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Indeed, I would suggest, Mr Speaker, that as well as trying to trample over people's rights (and we can hear from the reaction that we are striking a nerve), the Opposition members should realise the implications of their actions. It goes back quite some time. For instance, I need go back only to 23 March, when we had the Leader of the Opposition in effect inviting the sort of activity that has been taking place today. Headlines such as, '“Pressure will grow to stop Roxby”, says Olsen', in March 1983. The report states that that Opposition predicted that—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —the Government would now face pressure—yes, indeed it has, by the way in which it has been publicly assisted and generated by the Opposition.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: What are the Young Laborites doing up there?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: They are no doubt responding—

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to order.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Then in July there is a heading 'Dam ruling could be used to stop Roxby'. There is the Leader, wringing his hands, with his crocodile tears, saying 'Dear me, this dam ruling could be used to stop Roxby. Come on, use the ruling. That is what we want.' That is the sort of activity that has been going on. Then there is the situation with the Kokatha. How much sympathy is there for the Kokatha people or for the proper orderly identification of sacred sites and the continuation of the project? 'Olsen hits Kokatha claim', yes, good stuff! I heard him on the radio under questioning say 'Well, I'm not exactly saying we wouldn't accede to their wishes.' No, not at all; he wants to stir up, to the maximum possible, those who are opposed to this project.

Then we come to this ludicrous statement issued yesterday. The Opposition seeks to affect the position, seeks to aid the project, seeks to contain the demonstration, by issuing nonsense such as this: 'The Government should support the strong statements the Opposition has been making.' Yes, indeed; if it takes that course, it would be trampling over the lives of people, probably tripling the number of demonstrators on site, and it would be ensuring that there would be damage and destruction, because that is what the Opposition is on about. It is about time they said whether they are committed to this project going ahead—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —or whether they will continue with this sort of provocation.

In 1982 this House went through an extremely important and emotional debate over this issue, and at that time the Opposition attempted to exploit the position to the maximum possible political extent. Our attitude at that time was to oppose that indenture Bill, and we did so. At the time of the last election we undertook that, under a Labor Government, that proposal bound by the indenture of the Parliament would go ahead: we are honouring that promise. Now I suggest it is time that the Opposition shut up and allowed us to get on with that, because they claim that is in the overall interests of the State. Unfortunately—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —we have had this pattern of provocation, month after month, a virtual invitation to civil disobedience. I would suggest that much of what has happened in the past 24 hours on the Olympic Dam site can be laid fairly and squarely at the feet of the Opposition.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I would like to make one or two remarks. The level of disorder in the House this afternoon cannot be tolerated too much longer. Sometimes there is an analogy to schools drawn by people, and I was heard myself to remark on a certain occasion in this Chamber that it was a bad day at St Trinians. The current level of behaviour reminds me more of a bad night in the Milan Opera House; that is the level to which we have degenerated. It cannot be allowed to go on like this. I apply my ruling to both sides of the House, as each side is asking inflammatory questions of the other. It would appear that each group moves in in this *claque*-like performance. It cannot be tolerated. I will have to proceed further along the lines that Standing Orders direct.

SAVINGS BANK OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Mr FERGUSON: Is the Premier aware that the Savings Bank of South Australia has made two reductions in bankcard interest rates and that the rate is now down to 17 per cent? Will he inform the House whether this interest rate represents an advantage to the South Australian bankcard holders not available to any other banking customers in Australia? Recent press statements have been to the effect that the Savings Bank of South Australia has the most generous interest rates on bankcard in the Commonwealth. It would appear also that the Savings Bank of South Australia provides a better interest rate to its customers than do most other credit card organisations.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Those facts are correct. Over a long period of time the Savings Bank of South Australia has been a leader in this area. It is an institution which has served South Australia very well indeed. Its role has become even more important in recent years. As the Bank of Adelaide no longer exists, we do not have a headquarters trading bank operating in South Australia in the private sector but, with the current moves to merge the State Bank and the Savings Bank of South Australia, we will have a single bank with a very wide range of services and a reputation and record second to none.

One of the most important things about this is that the Savings Bank of South Australia is strongly supported by ordinary South Australians. It has been very much the depository of the savings of people who are not into massive investments but who generally believe that, in terms of where their money should be and what sort of services they require, their own South Australian bank is the one to go for. It is a competitive environment—there is no question of that. The private banks put up stiff competition. They have a role and a place in our banking system, but it is important that our State banks show leadership within the States, show that they are competitive, and show that they are able to deliver the services. That is the only way they will survive, and not through special privileges that may or may not be granted to them. In that respect, the Savings Bank of South Australia (and, indeed, the State bank to which the honourable member drew our attention), is preserving its record and reputation very well indeed.

ABORIGINAL SACRED SITES

Mr MATHWIN: Will the Premier seek an immediate assurance from the Prime Minister that the proposed Federal legislation to protect Aboriginal sacred sites will not override the Roxby Downs indenture? In a report in yesterday's *Advertiser*, the Federal Minister for Aboriginal Affairs (Mr Holding) stated that he had decided to introduce the legislation earlier because the Roxby Downs confrontation had

shown up the inadequacies of present laws on Aboriginal sites. The Minister is in clear conflict with the South Australian Government, which now supports the Roxby Downs indenture and which has approved an environmental impact statement for the project which spells out proposals for the protection of sites under State laws. Mr Holding's statements as they stand suggest that he intends to take actions which could override existing provisions of the indenture.

The SPEAKER: Order! That is clearly argument. I withdraw leave. The honourable the Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am not aware of any formal representations made to the Government. I understand that Mr Holding has made certain statements, but they are not being hardened into any kind of formal proposition. At such time as they are, if they are, I will certainly look at them.

FITNESS PROGRAMME

Ms APPLEBY: Can the Minister of Recreation and Sport say whether his department is involved in an experimental programme to promote corporate health and fitness in the Aberfoyle Park area? I realise that Aberfoyle Park is just on the border of my district but a number of my constituents could be involved in the programme. In this context, can the Minister give details of the programme and say what benefits it will have for the participants and how persons interested can take part?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I am happy to provide the information requested. Recently the Y.M.C.A. at The Hub, Aberfoyle Park, approached me for financial help in initiating a pilot programme, involving corporate health and fitness, which is to start next month. Under the scheme, employees of the Meadows council and business groups in the area (I think the National Bank, Woolworths and others) will enter into an exercise programme to encourage a healthier lifestyle and better productivity in the work place.

I believe that this is a praiseworthy initiative and, as a consequence, I have approved a grant under the Community Physical Fitness Network Programme. Objectives of the programme are to improve general fitness among the participants and to improve the morale and attitudes of participants within the working environment. I think it is true to say that experiments and research have shown that exercise and programmes of this nature assist considerably in reducing weight, blood pressure and cholesterol levels. Each participant, before entering into this programme, will fill in a questionnaire. At the end of three months they will report back again by means of a questionnaire. This information will be compared in regard to the benefits of the programme.

I await the results of that pilot scheme. I am sure it will be successful and that, as a consequence, my department will be encouraging other organisations and the community in general to participate in and to sponsor other programmes within the metropolitan and country areas of South Australia.

JAPANESE VISIT

Mr BAKER: During his forthcoming visit to Japan, does the Premier intend to have discussions with representatives of the Japanese Government about power utilities and about South Australia's potential to supply uranium to Japan for its expanding nuclear power programme? The question is simple and needs no fudging.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The programme has not been finalised as yet. Obviously, I am going to be involved in a wide range of discussions on all sorts of areas in which South Australia may have an interest, involving the resources

area, manufacturing industry, high technology, and so on. I am expecting those discussions to be productive and very useful. Of course, much of the trip will be involved in a promotion of South Australia as such, and many of the activities will be built around that purpose.

60 MINUTES

Mr TRAINER: Has the Minister of Community Welfare yet received any apology or retraction from the *60 Minutes* programme for its recent allegations in relation to the operations of the Department for Community Welfare? On Sunday 7 August the TV programme *60 Minutes* made extremely serious allegations about the department's professional social workers. These allegations implied that welfare officers were involved in the deliberate alienation of children from their parents on a widespread scale. I am advised that these allegations are totally unfounded, and I am also advised that they would be considered libellous.

Several constituents have expressed the view that the programme deliberately and irresponsibly distorted the facts of the matter, by both omission and commission, and the journalistic ethics of the producers of *60 Minutes* were severely criticised on the A.B.C. television programme *Nationwide* on the following night 8 August. Some less severe criticism also appeared in the *Advertiser* and, later on, in the *Australian* column of Max Harris. On Tuesday 9 August, in the course of an adjournment grievance debate, I commented on what I believed to be an irresponsible television programme, and suggested that an apology was desirable.

The SPEAKER: Order! That is clearly argument, and I withdraw leave. The honourable Minister of Community Welfare.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question, which has been of great concern to the Department for Community Welfare. I have not received any written communication from the management or from the producers of that television programme although I believe that, unfortunately, it has done untold harm to the services provided by the department and the public's attitude toward those services, especially where members of the public are tentative in coming forward and seeking the help of the department, often in the most unfortunate circumstances. However, I have viewed television programmes and read numerous press reports which I think have all come to grips with this most complex problem and presented it most fairly to the public for their consideration and enlightenment. I am especially pleased with the *Australian* and the *Advertiser* newspapers and with the Australian Broadcasting Commission and some commercial radio stations that have taken the trouble to look at this matter in its totality.

PETROL PRICES

Mr BLACKER: Will the Premier say whether the Government (through the Premier's Department, the State Development Committee, the Treasury or any other department) has undertaken an assessment of the likely impact of the considerable rise in petrol prices, which has occurred over the past two months, on each of the agricultural, transport and tourist industries and, if such an assessment has been made, will he say what is the anticipated effect of those increases? On 1 July, under the A.B.R.D. programme, a 1c a litre increase was imposed on petrol prices; on 4 August, the State Government announced a 1c a litre increase under the Business Franchise (Petroleum Products) Act; and last week, in the Commonwealth Budget a further 2c a litre

was added. My constituents believe that these imposts further add to the cost of production and the cost of transport of primary commodities, as well as increasing disproportionately the cost of living in non-metropolitan areas. The other industry that will be severely affected by these increases will be the tourist industry, and especially the caravan industry.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Much of the impost on fuel prices is related to the oil price parity policy of the previous Commonwealth Government. That is the most substantial and the largest part of the impost in the current situation. That policy has been introduced for reasons that have been fully debated. Impositions of tax in relation to the A.B.R.D. programme will provide a direct benefit for the whole road system, especially in country areas. The measures in the recent Commonwealth Budget will have an impact, but that impact will be Australia-wide, and some discriminatory aspects will be eradicated by the way the Commonwealth Government can consider the whole question of differential pricing as between rural and urban areas in terms of petrol. The State impost of 1c a litre does not mean that we have the highest level in Australia of such a levy: in New South Wales it is 50c higher; it is higher in Tasmania; and the levy in the other States is roughly the same. Our levy was much lower, so the extent that we have raised our figure has narrowed the difference between the levy in this State and that in other States.

Nevertheless, the beneficial effects of the revenue raised in terms of services (many of which go to country areas, and without which country areas would have severe problems) will more than recoup the outlay that must be made by those paying the levy, and that is worth remembering. It is one thing to concentrate on the levy imposed and to say, 'That sum is being drawn out of the economy.' On the other side of the ledger, we see what that money is being used for and where the benefits will flow. In this case, the benefits are considerable. The total revenue package is enabling the Government to continue with programmes that are providing benefits for the whole State.

URANIUM ENRICHMENT PLANT

Mr INGERSON: Will the Premier say whether the Government is still keeping its options open on the possibility of constructing a uranium enrichment plant in South Australia? In the *News* on 19 November 1982, the Minister of Mines and Energy was quoted as saying that the Government would not close all options on the construction of a uranium enrichment plant in South Australia. Is that still the Government's position?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I would not have thought that the honourable member who asked the question (having not been in this House very long) would want to make such an interjection criticising a member on this side who has been here somewhat longer. Perhaps on reflection he may wish that he had not done so.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. H. Allison: You're struggling for replies.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: There is no struggling going on. The question was whether the Government still had under consideration construction of the uranium enrichment plant in South Australia. I see that the honourable member agrees with me that I heard the question correctly. The answer is 'Yes'; an ongoing committee is still in existence. I think that the honourable member will understand me when I say that the level of activity in that area is extremely low.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The member for Todd is usually prone to jumping to conclusions, most of which turn out to be wrong, as he has demonstrated over the past few weeks in this House on more than one occasion to his very great discomfort. On this occasion, he might allow me the courtesy of completing the reply which I am endeavouring to give to the honourable member who asked the question. I will complete the reply by saying that the current low level of activity is a function and a symptom of the world market situation in relation to uranium.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: That's not true.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has become an authority on uranium markets. This is an area in which he did not appear to have any expertise at all when he was the Minister, because I well remember asking him whether, in relation to the activities of the department, he or his department had taken any interest in the actual marketing of uranium and minerals generally. I also introduced into this House the name of an international firm (NUEXCO) which has some expertise in this area.

It is interesting to note that, in the short time that remained for the former Minister to occupy office, all of a sudden NUEXCO began to be used on occasions under his auspices as an authority to be quoted. According to all the information which I have been able to research, read or assess in relation to the future uranium market scene, the question of an overall growth in the market has been put back a number of years. Members opposite remain quiet, because they know that what I am saying is true, and that is the situation which is reflected in the world price for that commodity at this time.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: That's not true, and you know it.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I do not know what the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is on about now. I have answered the question clearly, and that is the true reply which the honourable member needs. The committee is still in existence; I am expecting a report very shortly from that committee; and, if the honourable member wishes, I will make the contents of that report available to him at a later time.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Make it available to the House. We always did.

The SPEAKER: I warn the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

COAL COMBUSTION TESTING

Mr GREGORY: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy provide the House with an update on the coal combustion test facility planned by the Electricity Trust of South Australia at Osborne? It is clear that such a facility will be of considerable value to South Australia, having, as we do, large deposits of low-grade coals which appear likely to form the basis of much of our future electricity generating requirements. I am particularly interested in the possibility that the facility may attract test work from other States and overseas.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Earlier the honourable member indicated to me his interest in this matter, so I have some details prepared that I am sure will be of interest to the honourable member who asked the question as well as to other members of the House.

The Electricity Trust has informed me that it has finalised design work for the proposed \$1 500 000 coal combustion test facility, and that orders have been placed for most of the major components. The facility will be housed in an existing building at the Osborne power station, and construction work is expected to be completed by February

next year. Members would be aware that the trust has been evaluating a variety of local low-grade coals in which high levels of sodium, chloride, and sulphur have the potential to cause severe boiler operating difficulties. Standard analytical testing of these coals is inadequate for boiler design purposes and, in the past, samples have had to be sent overseas for detailed testing.

The decision by ETSA to construct its own test facility was made in the face of the increasing cost of overseas testing, coupled with the growing difficulty of gaining test time on overseas test rigs. Because the trust facility will have the capacity to test a full range of coals, from low quality brown to good quality black, an invitation has been extended to the Commonwealth Government to participate in the project. Commonwealth participation could then form the basis of a national coal test facility, saving the Commonwealth the need to establish a further facility elsewhere.

I must say that at this stage the Commonwealth has not taken up this offer, but we will persist with efforts to persuade it that it is a sensible approach to work jointly when financial resources are as tight as they are today. I stress, however, that the ETSA facility is not dependent on Commonwealth participation; it will proceed regardless of the response from Canberra.

ROXBY DOWNS

Mr RODDA: Can the Chief Secretary say what is the cost of sending police officers to Roxby Downs to prevent illegal activities by protesters at the mining site? Further, has the Police Department requested reimbursement for its costs and, if so, what response has the Government given? It is evident from public comment that tremendous support has been forthcoming from the public for the actions that are being undertaken by the Police Force in these difficult circumstances at Roxby Downs. In no way am I criticising police officers or the Chief Secretary for his actions in sending them there to maintain law and order. However, the cost of the exercise, estimated to be about \$600 000, is a matter of extreme public importance. As I am informed that this cost cannot be met by the Police Department from its allocation, does the Government intend to supplement the cost of this emergency operation at Roxby Downs? The only alternative for the Police Department would be for it to cut services and future facilities.

The SPEAKER: I ask the House to note that an extra question was included in the member for Victoria's question as a whole. I ask that the House consider ways, particularly when there are prepared questions, of avoiding the undesirable situation of the Speaker being forced to withdraw leave. I have tried to achieve some sort of balance, but I ask for co-operation from all honourable members in this regard.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Before replying to the question about the actual cost of the operation at Olympic Dam, I should respond to the honourable member's allegations that police officers are there to prevent the illegal activities of protesters. As has been pointed out to the House, South Australian legislation ensures that peaceful and orderly demonstrations are a democratic right of all citizens. Therefore, police did not go to Olympic Dam to control illegal activities: in fact, they went there for four reasons: first, to ensure that the democratic rights of citizens to demonstrate was protected; secondly, to ensure that there was no damage to property; thirdly, to ensure that there were not any breaches of the peace, and, fourthly, to ensure that people going about their normal day-to-day activities were not unnecessarily interfered with. They were the four reasons for police presence at Olympic Dam, and they would be the basic

fundamental reasons why police would ever be present at a demonstration. We should remember in South Australia that demonstrations are the democratic rights of citizens.

The total cost to the State for the police presence of the size there, about 250 police at the Olympic Dam site, for 10 days (the suggested time the demonstration will take) would be \$600 000. About \$275 000 would be spent for normal wages of the Police Department anyway, and that reduces the additional cost to about \$325 000. In addition to the normal reduction of the normal cost of the policing is the capital equipment purchased because of this venture. That equipment will remain police equipment for some years—such things as uniforms to be used in areas such as Olympic Dam, sheets, blankets, bedding etc., which run into many thousands of dollars.

Mr Ingerson: How much?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I can obtain the actual figures for the honourable member, but I do not have them here. It reduces the additional cost of this one only activity at Olympic Dam to below \$300 000. It is a very expensive and difficult logistic function that the police are involved in at Olympic Dam. However, it is the policy of this Government, and certainly the policy of the police, to ensure that peaceful and lawful demonstrations are able to take place, but where there is risk to property, where there are threats to public order, or where the normal activities of normal citizens might be interfered with, then the police will be there to ensure that those freedoms are protected: the police are doing that.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Frankly, I am proud of the way the police have acted at Olympic Dam, and I hope that the support that this Government has given the police in their endeavours has the approval of members of the Opposition. There has not been any clear indication of that as yet.

ABORIGINAL ART AND CRAFT

Mr PLUNKETT: Can the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs say whether the State Government has adopted an active policy of purchasing works of Aboriginal art and craft for official gifts that departments give from time to time to overseas visitors, or when on overseas visits by representatives of Government departments? In South Australia we have some excellent art and craft communities whose works are steeped in tradition and artistic quality. Groups such as the Amata Pitjantjatjara Community and the Aparawatatja Crafts Centre at Fregon should receive encouragement and recognition for the fine works of art, which range from the inexpensive to highest quality fine art, from our Government representatives and departments, locally and overseas.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question, which I am sure all honourable members find of interest. I do not know of a formal policy of encouragement by Government officials of Aboriginal artifacts. However, I know that the practice for some time of successive Governments has been that on appropriate occasions it purchases such artifacts. It is something I am sure the Government would wish to encourage, and if more formal arrangements are needed, I propose to advance that idea. It is an important factor in several respects, as well as for Aboriginal communities.

First, it is an economic factor in Aboriginal communities, as many of them totally rely on Government sources of funding to provide a central service, and this is one avenue where funds can be obtained from outside Government sources. Indeed, several active art and craft initiatives are underway in remote communities, and some bold marketing

initiatives have been undertaken. I believe that there will be many more. Although some receive Government support, others have been taken on solely at the risk of local communities.

I believe that a further important factor is the educational component for the white Australian community and, indeed, for those people living overseas who may receive a piece of Aboriginal art or artifact. I believe that there is a growing understanding, interest, and concern in the Australian community for the welfare and protection of the cultural environment of the Aboriginal community. One way that that understanding can be advanced is through the practise suggested by the honourable member and I will be pleased to pursue the matter.

MINERAL EXPLORATION

Mr OSWALD: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy advise how many companies have stopped or reduced their exploration activities in South Australia since the Government's decision in March not to approve a production licence for the Honeymoon uranium project? Also, for what minerals were they searching, and what was the value of their exploration?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The information that the honourable member seeks is not readily to hand, at least here today. As I understand the question, he put it in the form of what companies have stopped exploration for minerals: there was no restriction on the class of mineral. He then tried to relate it to the uranium decision, which took place in March this year relating to Honeymoon. I can give a general answer but, to my knowledge, few companies have taken the sort of decision to reduce or stop exploration, as referred to by the honourable member. However, one small company decided to discontinue searching for uranium. In order to give a more authoritative answer, I will obtain the information for the honourable member.

SPORTS MUSEUM

Mr WHITTEN: Has the Minister of Recreation and Sport considered providing a sports museum in South Australia? Such a museum could provide the opportunity to record sporting history in South Australia, as over the years this state has produced many outstanding sporting personalities. A museum portraying achievements in sport may be of value in retaining for posterity the history of sport in this State.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I am sure that the member for Hanson would have an interest in this matter: perhaps we could have him stuffed and stood in a corner although, upon reflection, he would probably be more appropriate in the Constitutional Museum. The idea of a sports museum has exciting and interesting possibilities. I understand that the South Australian National Football League and perhaps the Cricket Association were considering a museum only for their respective sports but I believe that it would be in the interests of South Australia to establish a sports museum. Recently, I received a letter from a gentleman who has visited Sydney, in which he stated that a sports museum at Sports House in Sydney contained an interesting collection of New South Wales sports memorabilia.

The member for Price is quite right when he says that over the years we have produced many top grade sports-persons. I believe that it would be in the interests of sport to retain the memory of these people for posterity. I certainly favour the idea, and I will be taking up the matter with a number of sports organisations and the Sports Advisory

Council seeking their views. I support the idea and I believe that we should be considering it seriously.

URANIUM REPORT

Mr LEWIS: Can the Premier say whether the Government has yet received a report from the Uranium Joint Venture Group that was established in June 1981; if so, what are the conclusions of the report and, if not, when does the Government expect to receive it? The Uranium Joint Venture Group, in which the State Government has a 5 per cent interest, was formed in June 1981 with a view to completing within 18 months a feasibility study on the construction of a conversion plant in the Port Pirie area. So far as my information is able to be accurate, I understand the study was estimated to cost about \$500 000. The report was not to hand at the time of the last election although I understand the study was nearing completion. In view of the fact that eight months has passed since the original deadline for the completion of the study, I simply ask the Premier whether he can report on its progress.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Premier. The honourable Minister of Mines and Energy.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I do not have the report to which the honourable member referred, but I am expecting it soon. When it is received I am sure it will be given the consideration that the honourable member requests.

WORKING CONDITIONS

Ms LENEHAN: Will the Minister of Labour investigate the methods by which the Department of Labour initiates investigations into wages records and working conditions? I am receiving a growing number of complaints from my constituents about this matter. As recently as yesterday I was approached by a parent who indicated that a daughter was and, indeed still is being underpaid by \$45 a week. When the parent approached the Department of Labour he was told that only the employee could complain. That parent was also informed of the possible ramifications of laying such a complaint and, in particular, the very real possibility of loss of employment for the daughter.

All of the constituents who have approached me have had children who they allege are being exploited. Although the parents' immediate concerns are for their own children, each parent has expressed concern that theirs are not the only children being underpaid or working in unacceptable conditions. Each of the parents who has spoken to me has asked the following two questions; (a) why cannot the Department of Labour act on the parents' complaint? and (b) why cannot the department simply make random checks if a business appears to be, or is known to be, avoiding its obligations under industrial awards?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I think the first point to make is that the department does make random checks and has done so for some time, although certainly not as many as I would like. However, this is consistent with the staff ceilings one has. One of my responsibilities when I again took over the Ministry was to tell the department that I wanted to escalate the number of random checks being made so as to prevent employers from having an opportunity to avoid paying award rates of pay.

Quite rightly, the department said that some random checks had been made over the past six to nine months and they had established that many employers were not meeting their obligations in regard to paying award rates, particularly to young employees, whether through ignorance or deliberately remains to be seen. One of the very direct respon-

sibilities I have as Minister is to try to take charge of the large amount of unemployment amongst young people. Rather than direct the labour that was available under Cabinet approval into that area, I decided to put extra staff into CITY. I do not think anyone would object to that, because CITY plays an important part in looking after the rights and welfare of young people.

The records show that 1 300 random checks were made last year throughout the metropolitan and country areas. It cannot be said, and I do not know who the officer was (I will have that checked on behalf of the honourable member), who said that no random checks were being made. That is not true. As I have indicated, 1 300 checks were made last year in country and city areas. They revealed that many employers were not paying a satisfactory rate of pay. I am not quite sure whether they were ignorant of their obligations or whether they were deliberately failing to meet them. Because of that, and because school leavers will soon be entering the work force, I have had produced a pamphlet entitled *Where Do I Stand?* I notice that Max Harris was quite critical of this pamphlet, saying that the way we treated employers in the pamphlet was quite unfair. I have written to Max explaining my side of the question, and it is important—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I do not know who is laughing. It is not a laughing matter; it is a very serious matter. If the member for Hanson thinks it is proper for employers to be robbing young people, let him get up and say so.

Mr BECKER: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The Deputy Premier has reflected on me by saying that I am not interested in this subject. The records in his department will show that 18 months to two years ago I raised with officers of his department this very issue of junior persons being underpaid in this State. I ask him to withdraw his remarks which reflect on me.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I could not catch the honourable member's first few words. Perhaps he could repeat them more slowly and clearly.

Mr BECKER: The Deputy Premier was trying to reflect on me by saying that I was not interested in the question or the answer he was giving. That was totally untrue.

The SPEAKER: I can only say that there is no expression that I have heard that is unparliamentary. On the other hand, my predecessor did often make a point of saying that, if an honourable member found that another member or Minister had said something offensive, then the opportunity should be given for the offensive remark to be withdrawn. I ask the honourable Deputy Premier whether he is prepared to withdraw the reflection which the honourable member finds made on him.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I am not prepared to do it because it is a funny way of expressing oneself by laughing if one is serious about a subject, and that is what the member for Hanson did; in fact, he was almost giggling about this question.

Mr Becker: That's not true.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: If the honourable member—

The SPEAKER: Order! I take it that there is a further point of order.

Mr BECKER: I rise on a further point of order, Mr Speaker. The statement the Deputy Premier has made is not true. I ask that it be withdrawn, because I was not giggling at him or the answer he was giving.

The SPEAKER: The situation is as simple as this: strictly there is no point of order. I have tried to expand the situation a little, in line with my predecessor, but since the

Deputy Premier has chosen not to accede to the request to withdraw there is nothing more I can do.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I do not want to pursue the matter, and I am sure that the member for Hanson does not want to, either. However, in future when the honourable member supports what I have to say he should not laugh while I express my point of view. This is a serious subject: so serious that the department, with my cognisance, published this pamphlet. I do not know whether the honourable member has seen it, although he may have seen the criticism in the *Sunday Mail* directed by the journalist to whom I have written the complaining about that, because I considered such a course proper. I released the pamphlet at Adelaide High School, to which students come from all over South Australia and not only from the metropolitan area. Indeed, that is why I chose this school: children attend from all districts. The Acting Headmaster at the time congratulated me on publishing the pamphlet and said that it was time someone tried to protect these young people. I would like the whole of this pamphlet to be reprinted in *Hansard*, but I know that that cannot be done. However, everyone, including members opposite, should have the opportunity to read the pamphlet. I do not know whether all members opposite take the attitude adopted by the member for Hanson, but I hope that they do not and that they agree with me that we should protect these young people. The member for Hanson should pick up as many copies of this pamphlet as he can and circulate them in his district.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MINISTER'S REMARKS

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr BECKER: The point I was making (and the point I wish to make in explanation in respect of the Deputy Premier's reply) was that I was not laughing at the answer he gave. Certainly, I chuckled when he said he would write to Max Harris, the *Sunday Mail* writer, because Max Harris has previously lauded the Minister as a great mate, or something similar. However, people mostly take Max Harris with a grain of salt: I certainly do not place any credence on his views.

However, during our term of office I telephoned the Minister's department to complain about the way young people were being treated in this State, especially a constituent of mine who had worked for a veterinary surgeon for 12 months and had not been paid. Certainly, I complained bitterly. Very little could be done because, unfortunately, the department was understaffed and did not have enough inspectors to check on these people.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: You admit that there was not enough staff.

Mr BECKER: Yes, I admit that in this one area additional staff should have been provided. I am willing to admit to such failings if and when necessary. The Minister's answer was very serious, because young people in this State are being exploited, and I will do my best to prevent them from being exploited. As regards the relationship between Max Harris and the Minister, that is a joke anyway.

The SPEAKER: I am glad that the honourable member did not continue on those lines.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 25 August. Page 538.)

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I do not doubt that over the past few weeks all members of Parliament, not least the Minister of Education, have received strong representations from individual teachers, from the South Australian Institute of Teachers, from staff representatives, and from the President of the institute, on the pressing question of substantial increases in rentals charged by the Teacher Housing Authority. Members will recall that two or three weeks ago the member for Goyder was perceptive enough to anticipate this trouble by asking the Minister questions as to the reasons for the rental increases and why the Minister had chosen to increase the rents without first conferring with the South Australian Institute of Teachers.

In his reply, the Minister made rather flippant remarks addressed to the member for Goyder, and tried to belittle and ridicule him. Although no doubt satisfying his colleagues and causing the hens to cackle (they were corn-fed by the Minister), and boosting his own ego by his response, nevertheless, his reply far from satisfied the Institute of Teachers and, whatever the intentions behind his responses to the member for Goyder, the Minister was still faced yesterday with a demonstration on the steps of Parliament House led by the President of the Institute of Teachers.

During the morning my Parliamentary colleagues and I received deputations on the subject. In my case, John Gregory (currently a Senior Master at Naracoorte High School and formerly President of the Institute) was joined by Ms Giles and Ms Bogumil from the South-East. They presented a rational and reasonable case. They have never before been reluctant to attack Ministers of Education, as I am well aware, but they pointed out that, irrespective of the attitude taken toward me when I was Minister two or three years ago, they considered that the present Minister had placed himself in an invidious position because, although not having to make promises, he nevertheless had made promises to the delegation from the institute on 13 April 1983, an unlucky day apparently, when that deputation met with the Minister on the subject of country teaching incentives.

Among the promises made by the Minister were, I understand, the following. The Minister said that there would be no increase in Teacher Housing Authority rentals while the wage pause remained in force. This promise obviously has been broken, as tenants were notified on 5 August 1983 of an increase effective from 7 October 1983. The Minister had no alternative, if he wished to increase rents from 7 October, but to give the notice prescribed by the regulations, so obviously he is already anticipating, rightly or wrongly, an increase from the Commonwealth wage decision on consumer price indexation, and he is assuming that that decision will be handed some time in September.

We believe that, if there is any increase at all, it will be about 3 per cent or 4 per cent, but the Minister, in anticipating that there will be some sort of increase, has completely ignored the relatively small amount of the increase and has chosen to raise rents by, he says, about 18 per cent to 20 per cent, whereas there are anomalies in the rental increases already announced, and it is evident that some increases will be as high as 28 per cent and more.

In response to the member for Goyder, the Minister has offered to investigate these complaints individually and I suggest that his department will be extremely busy judging from the spate of criticism voiced to us yesterday. The shadow Minister of Education the member for Torrens and I attended that rally on Parliament House steps briefly, and we were rather surprised to hear the current President of

the institute (Ms Leonie Ebert) say that she had declined to invite politicians to the meeting, which after all was a public meeting so anyone could attend. However, the fact that no politicians were invited on the grounds that promises had been broken seemed a rather specious excuse. I point out to members that the President of the institute has never previously had any qualms about inviting participation of political Parties in institute rallies, especially between 1979 and 1982.

Mr Lewis: From the mad fringe left.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I do not know whether it is the mad fringe left; but there is a strong left-wing element in the Teachers Institute executive, and it is still present. However, I was pleasantly surprised yesterday to hear some of those left-wing members trenchantly criticising the Minister and pointing out that he had blatantly broken promises on the subject on which he did not have to commit himself.

Mr Lewis: Did you know that Leonie Ebert has been rolled in the presidential election?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The member for Mallee points out that the President has not been re-elected as from 1 January 1984, and it may interest members to surmise that, had such an open apolitical stance been taken as that evidenced on the steps of Parliament House yesterday, she may not have been defeated by the President elect (Mr Bob Jackson, of the Riverland Community College), whose platform was that he would take a non-political attitude toward the affairs of the South Australian Institute of Teachers.

Perhaps the stable door has been closed a little too late. Nevertheless, Ms Ebert was quite happy to inform the Minister that, among those broken promises, the second one was that he said that there would be no increase in Teacher Housing Authority rents until significant progress had been made on the maintenance backlog. Of course, the Wednesday 24 August edition of the institute journal stated that there had been an announced backlog (announced by the Institute of Teachers) that some \$2 700 000 would be required to maintain teacher housing residences at acceptable standards in 1982-83; of this figure, only \$1 360 000 had been provided, but the journal also pointed out that there was an element of dishonesty even in the provision of that \$1 360 000, because \$600 000 of that provision had been milked from the Budget line that already provided funds for upgrading and modernising T.H.A. residences to acceptable standards. The amount of money is really \$1 360 000 less the \$600 000 that was already committed. Therefore, the Minister obviously has quite a lot to answer for.

The third point of criticism was the method of determining any T.H.A. rent increases. The Minister said that these were to be negotiated with the South Australian Institute of Teachers and, of course, they have not been. It is interesting also to speculate that perhaps Teacher Housing Authority rentals generally over the past several years have been fixed more on an *ad hoc* basis than on any formal basis. I say that because I was privy to a study of the Government Housing Authority Report which came into my hands towards the middle of last year. That report was not formally released by the former Government, but it has now been released in a red herring move by the present Minister. I will refer to the red herring issue in a few moments.

That release did not refer specifically to the fact that Teacher Housing Authority rentals were not formally structured, but there were any number of anomalies. When one considers that the Teacher Housing Authority in 1982 owned, I believe, about 1 983 houses, reduced by some 20 or 30 because of the sale of unwanted premises (so it would still have about 1 950 houses), there is a great deal of rent setting to do. The condition of those houses varies tremendously, some being excellent new houses provided by the Teacher Housing Authority over recent years and others being pri-

vately leased or very old (20 or 30 years old) South Australian Housing Trust dwellings. Therefore, there is certainly an urgent need to arrive at some formal method of fixing rents.

Incidentally, that was not the reason why I and my Cabinet colleagues decided to withhold that report temporarily: the main reason was that one of the propositions contained in that report was that the Teacher Housing Authority might be sublimated within a Government Housing Authority, which in turn might itself be responsible to the South Australian Housing Trust. We felt that the matter was already very contentious and, rather than release the report with the implication that we were condoning or supporting statements and recommendations made in that report, we decided that we would not release it. The present Minister has decided to make it public.

Another issue is that the Minister promised that part-time teachers would receive the same rental subsidy as full-time teachers receive. Increases for part-time teachers have, in fact, been substantially greater than those increases for full-time teachers. The rationale behind that substantially greater increase is that part-time teachers spend only part of their time with the Government; therefore, they should receive only a small Government subsidy and, for the rest of the time that they are occupying the house (I assume on a *pro rata* basis, although I do not know how one would calculate that), they would pay a rent much more on a par with the normal South Australian Housing Trust rentals.

Members will no doubt be aware, from the questions addressed to me in the preceding three years, that the Liberal Government certainly advantaged South Australian teachers (at least those who were living in teacher housing accommodation), because by the end of 1982 those teachers were paying only between approximately 55 per cent and 62 per of the market value for similar accommodation. South Australian Housing Trust tenants pay 80 per cent of the market value, excepting, of course, pensioners and others for whom special arrangements have been made and who would pay a very low rental based on their socio-economic circumstances.

Teachers, with a substantial rate of pay, are very much advantaged by comparison with other rent payers in South Australia. However, that was a decision of the Liberal Party before the 1979 election, and it was a commitment which was kept. The Teacher Housing Authority rentals were increased only once by that former Liberal Government during a period of three years. Therefore, each time a Housing Trust rent was not applied, that represented a substantial gain to occupants of Teacher Housing Authority premises. Those part-time teachers are certainly greatly disadvantaged. The less time one works for the South Australian Education Department, the greater the T.H.A. rent.

Finally, the point was made that the Minister had promised that no rent increase would be paid for those residences owned or leased from the T.H.A. which were not on the Electricity Trust grid. There are a number of those homes and, of course, these tenants are still paying rent. I believe that it is a commitment which I would have made as Minister of Education that people who were not on the Electricity Trust grid did not pay any rent at all. We also declined asking rent for a number of temporary homes in the remote Aboriginal settlements in the Far North-West of the State. Therefore, apart from not honouring that commitment, the Minister may also have cancelled instructions which were given by the previous Government.

So, what is the Minister about? He professes to be a strong Minister in Cabinet. He made those unequivocal promises on 13 April 1983 to a responsible deputation from the South Australian Institute of Teachers. They were left in no doubt at all as to the Minister's intention. What does the breaking of promises really mean then? Does it indicate

that the Minister is weak in Cabinet, that he has been rolled on in relation to all these issues? It would seem so. The Institute of Teachers is certainly in no doubt that either the Minister seems to have a total disregard for the promises he has made (he just makes them and then breaks them), or he has been unable to convince his colleagues in Cabinet that this was a major issue and that the promises that he, as a Minister of the State made, should be honoured. Either way, it does not look too good for the Minister.

It was put to me yesterday that this Government generally seems to have lost the confidence of South Australian electors, and that it has broken more promises in its first three months of office than the previous Government broke in its three years. It was pleasing to receive music like that to the ears from a group of South Australian teachers who had previously pilloried the former Government. Perhaps they are now realising that they were probably a little better off under the former Government than they were ready to admit.

Mr Mayes: You'd have to be joking.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I can assure the honourable member that I do not joke about issues like that. As to the red herring which the Minister has put out, he is obviously putting out the Government Housing Authority Report on the false pretext that this was what he intended to do all the time: that he was going to ask the Institute of Teachers to consider that report and to come back to him with its carefully considered recommendations, whereas, what really happened was that he unilaterally decided that he would increase Teacher Housing Authority rentals some two months before what he anticipates will be a Federal salary increase—an increase which he cannot safely and surely predict and, in any case, an increase which will be minimal compared with the huge impost that he has now placed on those South Australian teachers who occupy Teacher Housing Authority accommodation.

The report is simply a red herring and will achieve nothing. If the report's recommendations are acceded to by the Minister, obviously it will not mean a reduction in rents for Teacher Housing Authority premises: I believe that the recommendations will have the effect of moving closer towards equating them with the rents currently being charged by the South Australian Housing Trust. The General Manager of the South Australian Housing Trust is also the Chairman of the Teacher Housing Authority. Whilst I was Minister of Education the authority repeatedly made representations to me that we should increase Teacher Housing Authority rentals year by year. We did not do that because we had made a pre-election commitment in 1979, a commitment that we honoured for three years. However, in a matter of three months the Minister has broken five promises that the South Australian Institute of Teachers expected the Government to honour as part of, I believe, a pay-off to the institute for the massive support that it gave to the Minister and his Government colleagues prior to the last election.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I support the motion. I thank His Excellency for the manner in which he opened Parliament. I congratulate the members for Unley and Henley Beach as the mover and the seconder of the motion. As other members have done, I express my sympathy and regret at the passing of former members of this House, the late John Coumbe and the late Harry King. I did not know Mr King, so I am unable to comment on his contribution to this House. On the other hand, Mr Coumbe was a member of this Chamber when I first came here. For a number of years he sat in the seat that the member for Glenelg now occupies. He was of tremendous assistance to me, particularly in my early days here. John Coumbe was

able to give me a lot of advice that I found most helpful at that time. I want to express my sympathy to the relatives and friends of the late John Coumbe.

When opening Parliament, His Excellency made reference to the devastation that had occurred in South Australia in recent months from the bush fires, floods and the drought. We can all be very thankful that the current season has turned for the better. As mentioned in today's *Advertiser*, one could say that we are looking towards a record year in the agricultural sector. However, although we are facing a record year, and hopefully the best ever production returns from primary industry, it does not necessarily mean that rural industries will be able to prop up South Australia or totally solve the problems that exist. Nevertheless, it will mean that primary industry will be able to make a significant contribution to the State's economic recovery.

I issue a slight word of caution: whilst today's *Advertiser* mentions massive tonnages that could be harvested and massive sums that could be injected into the economy, one must also accept the fact that after having had two or three years of drought much of that money will be absorbed by primary producers in an effort to get back on their feet. This must occur first before the stage is reached where they can spend money on reviving the subsidiary agricultural industries. While we look forward with great anticipation to a good grain season and to recoveries in the stock industries, that does not necessarily mean that our problems will be solved, although it is heartening to look forward to a prospect such as that outlined in the *Advertiser*, as opposed to yet another drought which many people were predicting.

Members would appreciate that I have asked many questions in this Parliament in relation to fuel prices and the inequalities that exist throughout the State. This is a very involved and complex question. No Government in recent years has been prepared to take bold initiatives in regard to either fuel equalisation or price equality of petroleum products. Different attitudes exist within the community in relation to this matter. For many country dwellers, particularly those in the remote areas of the State, petroleum products are an essential commodity. They are not a luxury which can be done without: they are absolutely vital to any industry, communication or any form of transport within country areas.

However, the situation is vastly different in the metropolitan area where petroleum products may not be as essential as they are in country areas. At least in the metropolitan area we have a public transport system that is supported by the State taxpayer, and we have other alternative means of transport to take the place of the family car and freight transport systems, and so on. I appreciate the concerns of those in the metropolitan area about rising fuel costs, but the concern of those in country areas is even greater because they have to rely on commodities associated with petroleum products to a greater extent.

Over many years I have raised with the responsible Ministers the matter of fuel pricing and price controls. I have a considerable file of letters and replies from Ministers, but all those replies have indicated that this is a Federal responsibility and that, therefore, the matter should be approached at the Federal level. To an extent I accept that proposition, but I do not believe that Federal Governments, whether it be the present Federal Government or previous Governments, have addressed this matter, and I do not believe that that necessarily lets the State Government off the hook, because the State Government could become involved with this in an attempt to provide some equality in the system. I am the first to admit that any proposal for a fuel equalisation scheme throughout South Australia is fraught with complexities. No matter which way the matter is looked at, there are many complex issues involved and there is no

base data from which to work. Although the matter might seem involved and complicated, that should not be a reason for any Government to wipe its hands of the matter and say that, therefore, it cannot do anything about it.

The issues involved in the fuel industry are many and varied. There is the matter of divorcement, of whether in fact fuel companies should not be allowed to retail; that is a complex issue, although I do not know that it is an insurmountable problem. I do not know that there is anything wrong with fuel companies being involved. Further, there is the matter of the introduction of pricing controls, in addition to those that exist already, exercised by the Petroleum Products Pricing Authority. There is the matter of the retail pricing margin, that is, metropolitan versus country areas, and the matter of minimum margins. We have the matter of restricted trading hours, mainly in regard to restricted trading hours for service stations within the inner-metropolitan area. Also, there is the 50/50 legislation proposal that has been promulgated, involving an extension of rights of dealers to purchase up to 50 per cent of their petroleum requirements from sources other than their landlord's supply.

Then for country distributors, there is the introduction of controls over distributors reselling petroleum products. That is only a short list of many of the complexities involved. How could one compare a service station, which dispenses predominantly petrol through a bowser, to a little country store in an outback country area where the petroleum product distributed through that bowser amounts to about 4 or 5 per cent of the turnover of that country store? These are the sort of problems that arise.

In referring to that country store, without doubt, it would not be economically viable for it to sustain having a petrol bowser but, because it provides a community service to the motoring public, it is desirable it be there. If that country store or outlet had to buy petrol at the same retail margin as a large metropolitan outlet, then obviously it would go broke. This is one of the many implications involved. I support the concept of a fuel equalisation scheme throughout South Australia: it is desirable so that fuel users, irrespective of where they live, have equal access to what I believe to be an essential commodity.

In His Excellency's Speech reference was made to the State Budget. In this past week the Federal Budget has been introduced, and at this time, when we are about to face the State Budget in two days' time, one becomes money conscious as to what is happening to our funds in South Australia. I quote a small extract from the Ministerial statement made by the Premier and Treasurer on 4 August, in which reference was made to the financial position of South Australia at the time. It states:

The final result shows a deficit of \$57 100 000 on the Consolidated Account for the financial year ended 30 June 1983. It is made up of a deficit on recurrent operations of \$109 000 000 and a surplus on capital works of \$51 900 000. That deficit of \$57 100 000 has increased the accumulated deficit of \$6 100 000 as at 30 June 1982 to \$63 200 000 as at 30 June 1983.

The Premier went on to say that he would give members more detailed account of the factors that resulted in that position when he presents the 1983-84 Budget to this House, as he says, 'in a few weeks time', but we all know it will be on Thursday. The statement continues:

The seriousness of the financial position which now faces South Australia cannot be overstated. The ability of the State Government to carry a large deficit is severely limited and the recurrent deficit of \$109 000 000 is a matter of grave concern. If left unchecked, the State's cash reserves, already depleted, would be very quickly exhausted. This is a prospect that no responsible Government could contemplate.

I fully endorse the last comment. I do not believe that any reasonable Government could contemplate having an ongoing State deficit of \$109 000 000. That is not fair, not

reasonable, or indeed not practical in today's financial system. In my comments made 12 months ago in this debate, I expressed considerable concern because the Government of the day was proposing a \$47 000 000 deficit Budget, or more importantly, the transfer of \$47 000 000 from the Loans Fund to recurrent expenditure. We have now found that that \$47 000 000 was understated to some extent but, in view of the circumstances, I do not think anyone would seriously criticise that understatement and the change of Government that took place at that time.

However, what I do criticise is that in order to make that up Loan funds have been used to pay recurrent expenditure, and that situation cannot be tolerated any longer. The present Government is proposing to do much the same thing, with the transfer of \$51 900 000 into the general revenue account. Over the past two years about \$100 000 000 has gone from Loan funds into recurrent expenditure, which means \$100 000 000 of capital expenditure has been denied to this State in that time.

I believe that South Australia is suffering as a result: if \$100 000 000 was put into the capital works programme, this State would be seen to be moving and maintaining its balance of finances. The other factor that is disturbing is that that money has to be repaid, and this and future generations will be saddled not only with a capital amount that has to be repaid but also an ongoing infrastructure. If one allowed only 10 per cent on that money, it is an extra \$10 000 000 a year plus capital repayments that has to come out of next year's Budget. Therefore, it is an ongoing process, and one in which we are getting further and further behind.

I understand that a similar situation arose in America some years back where each of the States of the United States of America was using capital funds to bolster its day-to-day expenditure. It became apparent that some States were forcing themselves into bankruptcy, and one by one each of those States grasped the nettle and moved appropriate legislation, which provided that where the Treasury or a Government of the day used Loan funds to bolster its day-to-day or recurrent expenditure, it was compelled by law to have those funds returned the next financial year.

That meant that, if a Government overspent on its day-to-day expenditure, it either had to raise taxes to replace those funds or cut back on its day-to-day expenditure, so that a balanced budget could be guaranteed. In our present situation, particularly in not having the ability to use the taxing measures that our Federal colleagues have, we must consider seriously that proposal, because we cannot use Loan funds indefinitely. The capital works programme has slowed down, and the cost of maintenance on some of the capital works projects is having a serious effect.

In some schools in my district maintenance alone is reaching the stage where instead of being a few hundred dollars, as it was two or three years ago, it is running into many thousand of dollars. If a two-year maintenance programme on a school is left for five years, it does not compound by the years it is wasted, but compounds itself because of the deterioration, not only in the paint work, but wood rot and so forth. We have to be very careful. I admire the Premier's statement that no responsible Government can tolerate that position, and I believe that it is up to us all to grasp the nettle and to see it that way.

However to use Loan funds in order to maintain Government promises is not the same kettle of fish, and I condemn the Government (as I condemned the previous Government) for taking that same action. I suppose it is easy for this Government to get away with this particular argument by saying that the previous Government did it so why can't we. One finds some difficulty in summarising the overall effect of last week's Federal Budget. However, I

think that it attacks the producing sector of the community in order to assist other areas.

Whilst one does not deny that social security and community welfare programmes are important in today's socio-economic climate, one must not lose sight of the fact that an increasing part of our Budget and our taxation system revenue is being absorbed by an even larger proportion of the community, with a decreasing proportion of the community providing that revenue. In other words, our producing sector (that sector with the ability to pay taxation) is becoming smaller, and yet the demand or the user section of the Budget is becoming larger. This trend cannot continue. I have no answer to it: I do not know what the real solution to the problem might be.

Mr Baker: Cut down on expenditure.

Mr BLACKER: Yes, that is fine and we would all agree with that, but there are limits to how that can occur. Whilst the social security and community welfare programmes are being expanded, so is the cost of administration of those programmes. At the same time, the income side of the Budget is being diminished. I believe that, unless we can get back to an attitude of employment—a fair day's work for a fair day's pay—and some basic elements of employment, we will not turn the corner, and conditions will gradually get worse.

In terms of incentives to employ, most employers want responsibility: they want a fair day's work for a fair day's pay, and they also want relief from many of the Governmental requirements in which they are obligated to participate. Recently, I had shown to me a schedule of costs for workers compensation based on a percentage of fees charged within respective industries. I will not comment on the exhaustive list, but workers compensation premiums range from 1 to 2 per cent in some industries and up to 45 per cent in others.

I notice that in one industry with which I have some contact, namely, the shearing industry, workers compensation premiums for shearing contractors is 27.13 per cent. That means that for every sheep shorn, in round figures some 27c a sheep is added because of workers compensation. The going rate for shearing is about \$93 (or possibly more than that now due to a recent increase), and the owner or contractor must add another 27 per cent on top of that. Therefore, costs escalate.

In many cases where a potential employer does his homework to find out whether he can justify additional employees, he realises that, in many cases, the cost of that employment is not just the cost of wages but often is double the cost of the wages, after adding workers compensation premiums, 17.5 per cent holiday pay loading, and all other fees and charges. It becomes an exorbitant and prohibitive move to contemplate. In basic terms, a position attracting a salary of \$12 000 would mean that that employee would have to earn for the employer some \$24 000 in order to justify the creation of that additional job. As they are the facts, obviously employers say that they cannot be bothered undertaking the hassle of creating that sort of a position, if those obstacles are placed in front of them. I do not deny that every employee has the right to workers compensation.

Recently, I heard said at a United Farmers and Stock-owners conference (albeit in a rather jocular way but, nevertheless, on a public platform) that, if anyone is going to have a workers compensation claim, South Australia is the best place to have it. It became apparent that some shearers who operate in various States throughout Australia, by the time they come to the end of their run and it looks as though they may not get work for two to three months, tend to finish in South Australia. Regrettably, the percentage of workers compensation claims that occur under those circumstances is considerably higher than occurs under nor-

mal circumstances. The inference is that the system is being abused. I say that it is an inference, because that was all that was stated. It is of concern that somebody, with sufficient contact with the industry to recognise that an abuse of the system has taken place, can justify making such a statement.

Mr Ferguson: I would like to see them justify that statement.

Mr BLACKER: I appreciate that. I cannot justify the claim, but it was said on a public platform in front of 300 to 400 people. Therefore, something must have occurred for that person to make such a statement. If I can obtain any information, I will pass it on to the honourable member.

I have often thought of how the Government could assist in a meaningful way to create jobs. It has occurred to me that, if the Government could undertake a pay-roll tax exemption scheme as an incentive (and not a blanket scheme under the old pay-roll tax legislation that we now have) in which, for every new employee taken on the employer was granted 12 months exemption from pay-roll tax, employers would have a fair incentive to employ people.

I am referring to new jobs created and not people laid off and reinstated and I believe that potential exists for such a scheme. I understand that there are about 6 000 employers in South Australia now liable to pay pay-roll tax. I also accept that the Government would have budgeted for a revenue close on \$200 000 000 from pay-roll tax in the present financial year. That estimate was subject to existing companies paying the tax and being able to maintain their work force at a certain size. In the present recession, many companies are contracting or reducing their work force and, in some cases, going out of business. It therefore makes good sense to help those businesses that could expand to do so without the Government penalty of pay-roll tax. I do not believe that that would be a loss to the Government. It means that a delay in revenue would occur in the future.

The Premier has previously admitted publicly that he is opposed to pay-roll tax but that Governments could not do without it. I believe that pay-roll tax is one of the few means of taxation available to State Governments. What I am proposing amounts to a direct cash concession to every company that wants to take on more staff but is deterred from doing so because of the cost of pay-roll tax. It could affect hundreds or even thousands of employers. The exemption could apply for 1983 and 1984 or, better still, for a three-year period. The Government has already recognised the value of freeing companies from pay-roll tax by raising the payment threshold to \$160 000. This means that the companies that would engage, for example, about 10 employees with an annual wages bill of \$160 000, would pay an amount of \$8 000 or 5 per cent in pay-roll tax. What I propose would be a means of saving around \$750 for every employee earning \$15 000. In large companies that would amount to a real incentive.

I make those comments because I believe that it is a means by which Governments could encourage larger employers to at least try to expand their system, if possible. It is not something that will cost the Government in a direct pay-out, because it is not receiving that money now. If a new job is created, in 12 months or so or whatever time is prescribed, those moneys would become owing to the Government. I think it is a means by which some tangible assistance could be given to employers with a view to improving the employment situation.

Without doubt the headline news of today and the past few days is the Roxby Downs issue. It is with great concern that I note what is happening. I do not know whether it is coincidental that it happens to be the school holidays or whether it is coincidental that, the Franklin-Gordon River dam problem has finished, we now have the demonstrations at Olympic Dam. However, I wonder if we could sustain

two demonstrations at the one time in different parts of Australia. That might sound a little facetious, and I believe it is, but I have become rather cynical at the way these demonstrations are occurring at considerable cost to the South Australian and Australian taxpayers.

Roxby Downs is a mining project that every sane person realises has a tremendous potential to add millions of dollars to the State of South Australia and to create hundreds of jobs, directly and indirectly. The companies have poured millions of dollars into the project, and they are now being disrupted by one demonstration after another. I believe that Roxby Downs is one of the most exciting new industries in South Australia. It has the full support of the Opposition and, I understand, it has the full support of the Federal and State Governments. The project has been examined from every possible angle and it has been approved by Governments of every persuasion. It must be the most approved and supported new industry in South Australia, if not Australia, and the public should be allowed to benefit from it.

The silent majority of the people of South Australia, and of the people of Australia, have the right to expect that such an approved project be allowed to go to work, and I believe that it is up to the Government to support them. Earlier today the member for Victoria asked the Chief Secretary how much the demonstration is costing the Government, and I believe the sum of \$600 000 was given as the cost of the police contingent that is now at Roxby Downs.

The Hon. G.F. Kenneally: If they are up there for the full 10 days.

Mr BLACKER: I accept the explanation of the Minister, and I hope that that will not be the case, and that it will not continue for 10 days. However, that is a cost to the South Australian taxpayer. I think the average person in the street is becoming more and more alarmed, and I hear comments from individuals who are asking why the developers should not be allowed to get on with the job. The project has been examined; it has been approved by Government after Government; there has been an environmental impact statement; every normal course of action for any development has been followed; it has had the full approval of every committee that has examined it, Federal, State or any other way; and all opportunities were given to every special interest group to have its say about it and they were given that opportunity in every possible way. I do not believe that any person could point to one committee, one individual, or anyone down the line and say that a person or a special interest group was denied the opportunity of having input into that project. When all those courses of action are followed, surely that company has a right to expect that it be allowed to continue uninterrupted.

In today's *Advertiser* a correction was made by Roxby Management Services to an earlier advertisement (which I do not recall having seen) that said that in 1983 no Aboriginal sites were identified. The correction in today's *Advertiser* states that that statement was made in 1981, two years ago, in the presence of three Cabinet Ministers. That was a statement made at that time, but suddenly different viewpoints and opinions are coming forward. I believe that it is becoming an abuse of the system. For arguments sake, if I had an interest in the particular area and I wanted to express a point of view, then the normal course of committee structure, the normal course available to any individual, would be available to me.

I had an opportunity to have input to the environmental impact statement and the select committees and, in my own case, to Government debate. All of those avenues were there, as they were to every other citizen of South Australia and Australia, and for that matter anywhere else in the world. Now, some considerable time after the event, we have this pressure group activity. I believe the *News* summed

up the situation fairly well in its front page coverage today. Perhaps some of the opinions of the *News* are inflammatory, but they are being said time and time again by citizens of South Australia. The article states:

The *News* had no wish to make prominent editorial comment about the antics of the meddlesome minority at Roxby Downs. Publicity is what they crave. However, as they deliberately escalate their stupid provocations at the Olympic Dam site it is necessary to speak for the majority of South Australians. This is the majority which supports Roxby Downs because it means jobs. Jobs, Jobs, Jobs. Ten thousand permanent jobs throughout South Australia, according to the developers.

That is why Parliament ratified the agreement for Roxby Downs to go ahead. That is why it was endorsed categorically by the present Federal and State Governments. Let the school holiday protesters now posturing before the cameras—and the silly trendy politicians climbing on the bandwagon—find a replacement for those jobs. They would find an attentive audience in the suburbs around Elizabeth and Woodville where they are bearing the brunt of the latest car industry sackings.

The protesters preach the language of non-violence. Rubbish. They are hell-bent on confrontation. They invite martyrdom. The Bannon Government should not supinely hang about waiting for the latest word and rhetorical questions from the fringe wreckers taking part in this farce. It should act positively to ensure the project proceeds with all possible speed.

The article continues by describing events that took place last evening and this morning at the Roxby Downs site. As I have said, some of those comments are indeed inflammatory, but I believe that they are an accurate report of what many South Australians are saying and thinking about today's particular problems up there. I do not believe that we can tolerate that type of action.

It is fair to say that if we did not have the electronic media covering that demonstration it would disappear. In making that statement I am not suggesting for one moment that we should have censorship or anything like that, but I think it portrays the point I am trying to make, which is that they are after media attention and they are getting it.

One little issue that I now raise, and I meant to do so when I was talking about the unemployment problem, is an issue that I believe is now before the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission in relation to retrenchment and redundancy claims before the commission. I understand that the present case before the commission is asking for three months notice of termination of employment, one months full pay, four weeks full pay for every year of service, another job to be found for the employee, and the difference in pay in another job to be made up for one year if it is less. I think that, because of those conditions added to what I said about pay-roll tax, workers compensation, and holiday pay, more and more jobs will go out of the window, because of excessive claims by those who are fortunate enough to be employed.

We all appreciate that those out of work are the ones who need support. Those in work, whilst we appreciate that they want to protect their conditions, should not do so at the expense of others. More and more we are having the situation of the haves and have nots, not just in monetary terms but in the opportunity to have employment. So far I have been speaking about matters that concern me and my attitude might have appeared to be a little regressive. However, I was pleased that the Government a few weeks ago supported a massive development project to be undertaken at Port Lincoln.

Mr Baker: They'll tax it.

Mr BLACKER: Possibly so, but so will local government and so will many areas of the State, for I believe this to be real State development, not merely a local tourist operation. It is a model of financial planning involving private enterprise, local government, the State Government and, to a lesser degree, the Commonwealth Government. I commend the Government for its approach to this plan, the concept of which appeared seven years ago and in respect of which

there was input by the previous Government, although it is only in the past six months that we have seen considerable Government activity and involvement of Ministers of the day.

Most Ministers of the day have visited the site and been briefed on the project. Recently, the Minister of Tourism and the back-bench Labor Party Tourist Committee were in Port Lincoln, and they lent their support to the project. Indeed, on the evening of their visit, the Minister of Tourism, on television, promised full Government support to the project. I thank the Premier and the Minister for the way in which they have followed this project through. It is a long-term project that will not happen overnight, but will probably take 10 years to eventuate if all goes according to plan. The project has the ability to create 1 300 jobs. On present calculations, it will be a \$27 000 000 project, so it is a project of the more major developments to which this State can look forward in this field for one decade, possibly two decades.

The project will involve 350 residential allotments and will provide marina facilities to accommodate the whole of the Port Lincoln fishing fleet, except the tuna fleet. It will have 150 berths for recreational fishing, for off-shore yachtsmen and for visiting yachtsmen. It will have what is locally referred to as a community pier, involving an aquatic centre, an art centre, a sports stadium and a holiday resort, part of which will be of international standard and other parts of which will accommodate all types of tourist accommodation down to low rental shack-type accommodation. So, the whole project will provide for every facet of holiday maker and the tourist industry.

The project itself has attracted considerable news interest, especially in the local media, but it has not attracted much State-wide interest. I believe that the Government may have been unfortunate in that respect because it was entitled to a little better coverage than it got. Be that as it may, the local community is delighted about the project, and I am sure that it will proceed with every possible haste. I was pleased to learn a week ago that the first part of the project that will be proceeded with on the site will be the \$1 600 000 aquatic centre, which the Government announced on Monday last week. The work is to be undertaken under the Commonwealth Government job creation programme, which means a Commonwealth contribution of \$975 000, the rest to be made up by local government. In fact, the aquatic centre will be a confidence booster to the overall programme.

Immediately the first spade of soil is turned the project will be under way and will be an on-going commitment. It will fulfil an urgent need in the City of Port Lincoln for certain facilities that the city has hitherto lacked. It is most unfortunate that a city the size of Port Lincoln should not have a swimming pool, an art centre or a sporting stadium, because many smaller country towns throughout the State have an indoor basketball stadium, two or three squash courts, and similar facilities.

This project will act as a focal point for the people of Port Lincoln, and the announcement concerning the aquatic centre some weeks after the announcement of the marina project gives a true indication of the intention of the State Government and of the local council and of their commitment to the scheme. I pay a tribute to the local council for its commitment to the marina project, because it saw the wisdom of such a facility and was willing to commit \$360 000 toward the acquisition of property that would be required for the project. That property was known locally as 'holiday land', and its acquisition will allow the council to proceed with developing the land and its associated roadworks and if all the land is not required for the project, to resell it, recover the cost, and maybe even provide a considerable

profit on the original acquisition that can be turned back into the project.

The council has undertaken the return to the area of one-third of the rates to be received from the residential allotments associated with the project so that the community facilities may be developed. That is something about which we do not hear very much from local councils.

Having sung the praises of the Government for a few minutes, I shall now raise an issue that I had hoped would be associated with the marina: that is, the provision of a sewerage system at Porter Bay. The Minister of Water Resources will be familiar with the area as one which is now fairly heavily built up (I understand that it is over 60 per cent built up) and which is faced with tremendous drainage problems, the complexity of which is caused by the stony ground and the flowing of effluent into the street.

This problem raises many concerns for the health of the residents, especially of the children who play in the streets, and the overall hygiene of the area. The previous Government and the present Government have given undertakings that work will commence this year, and I was disappointed to learn about two months ago that the Government had abandoned the sewerage of the area. It is fair to say that, according to today's standards, most people expect to live in a residential area without having effluent running down the street. Until February, I was involved with the Public Works Committee in investigating projects where this was occurring, and I would have thought that the Port Lincoln problem was similar. One householder must pump out his septic tank every three weeks, at considerable cost, and have the sewage carted away; it is not a matter of merely using a submersible pump and pumping it into a deep drainage system. In other areas, no matter what happens, the effluent finds its way onto the street and the only answer is the provision of a sewerage system. In August 1981, the then Minister of Water Resources (Hon. Peter Arnold) replied to one of my many requests. The letter states:

The need to sewer the area is acknowledged, and in this regard the Engineering and Water Supply Department is preparing a scheme for submission to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works for inquiry and report. Subject to a favourable report by the committee, the Government will examine its financial position with respect to the Porter Bay sewerage scheme.

Later, in November 1982 (and, incidentally, there were a number of letters in between), I wrote to the new Minister of Water Resources. The Minister replied:

I refer to your letter of 12 October 1982 to the former Minister of Water Resources concerning the Porter Bay sewerage scheme. Unfortunately, no funds were allocated for this scheme during the 1982-83 financial year. However, provision has been made on the capital plan of the Engineering and Water Supply Department for the construction of the scheme during the 1983-84 and 1984-85 financial years. Provided funds are then available, construction is expected to commence in July 1983 and take approximately two years to complete. It is pointed out that final approval of the scheme will also be subject to a favourable report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works.

Yours sincerely,
Jack Slater, Minister of Water Resources

That undertaking by the Minister of Water Resources was very gratefully received by the local community, and they were looking forward to work having commenced by now. Regrettably, that was not to be the case. I followed that up with a series of other questions, and on 22 April this year, I received the following reply from the Minister:

Dear Mr Blacker,

In response to your question in the House of Assembly on 29 March 1983, the following information is provided concerning the provision of a sewerage scheme for Porter Bay. Expenditure on the Porter Bay sewerage scheme is currently being reviewed. Indications are that this project will not proceed in 1983-84 due to other priority needs. In these circumstances, construction is not likely to commence in July this year.

That was quite a blow to the community members, who have been fighting for what they believed to be reasonable health standards for the past eight years. They consider that that is particularly unfair and unjust to their area. I had hoped that that scheme would have been incorporated in the new marina. However, I understand now that the two systems can be worked independently and, whilst ultimately they will be interlocked, it does not necessarily mean that one can proceed without the other taking place.

Having said that, I think that it raises the point which I first made in my Address in Reply speech: the Government of the day is now using capital funds to bolster its day-to-day expenditure, and this is merely one of no doubt many projects throughout the State. I am not for one moment saying that I am isolated in having this project withdrawn from the construction programme. However, it is one of the many capital programmes being withdrawn by the Government because it has adopted the policy of forfeiting capital expenditure in order to maintain the day-to-day expenditure, rather than maintaining the capital works and reducing expenditure in other areas.

Mr TRAINER (Ascot Park): In rising to support His Excellency's remarks in opening the Second Session of this Parliament, I am again the last member from this side of the House to contribute to the Address in Reply debate, which commenced three weeks ago when His Excellency the Governor delivered the Opening Speech to members of both the Houses assembled in the Legislative Council Chamber on Thursday 4 August. Several months ago, during the First Session of this Parliament, I was also the last person from either side of the House to speak in the Address in Reply debate. On that occasion, the debate commenced on 8 December last year, and after the Christmas break it was concluded on 22 March this year. On that day (as recorded on page 535 of *Hansard*) I opened my speech with these remarks:

I rise on this occasion to make the final contribution to the Address in Reply debate in this current session. I hope that it will also be the last contribution made to the Address in Reply in its current format.

My remarks then are equally suitable on this occasion, although the element of prophecy proved to be sadly astray in March when I expressed my hope that my contribution on that occasion would be the last ever delivered in the traditional form. Perhaps it will be more prophetic this time.

Once again, we have subjected each other to what on this occasion has been a three-week exercise in futility. Each member has been entitled to a one-hour speech on anything and everything in reply to the Governor's address. Fortunately, the Speaker and the 10 Ministers have followed the tradition of not participating. However, that still has meant that 36 members have participated in the debate. Fortunately, not all have used their full 60 minutes allocation, although that tended to be the trend towards the end of the debate. I say 'fortunately' because potentially this House could have devoted a mind-boggling 36 hours to this time wasting ritual. Incidentally, that total of 36 hours has been approached several times in recent years. Working from the annual House of Assembly Digest, I have prepared a table listing the number of sitting days taken up by the Address in Reply in each Parliamentary session since 1967, as well as the total number of hours devoted to the Address in Reply and the percentage of each session's time taken up by this debate. With your leave, Mr Speaker, and that of the House, I wish to incorporate that table in *Hansard* without my reading it, it being purely statistical.

Leave granted.

LENGTH OF ADDRESS IN REPLY DEBATE

Parliament	No. of Sitting Days Involved	Time Spent		% of total Time
		hrs	mins	
1967	8	26	33	7.5*
1968	(Prorogued on second day)			
1968-69	6	13	47	3.7*
1969	14	38	16	10.3*
1970	(Prorogued on third day)			
1970-71	8	23	18	4.8*
1971-72	8	29	25	6.4*
1972	7	27	31	8.2*
1973	(Prorogued on fourth day)			
1973-74	8	25	21	6.2
1974-75	8	25	56	5.8
1975-76	8	20	15	6.8
1976-77	8	26	48	6.7
1977	9	26	17	47.0
(1977 Session Prorogued after 11 days sitting)				
1977-78	7	18	30	6.9
1978-79	9	25	06	7.7
1979	(Prorogued on day 11 of the session, on the fifth day of this debate after 25 Members had spoken in the Address in Reply.)			
1979-80	9	29	16	11.4
1980-81	10	35	51	9.3
1981-82	9	34	21	6.9
1982	7	27	36	17.5
1982-83	7	26	10	12.6

* Indicates that ' % of time ' includes the Governor's opening Speech, although that speech is not included in the actual ' hours ' total or in the number of sitting days involved. After 1973, that speech was included in those totals of hours taken.

Mr TRAINER: The percentage of each Parliament's time taken up by this exercise varies from year to year, according to the length of the session as well as the number of days that the Address in Reply debate has lasted. Including the Governor's Speech, its duration has stretched into a third sitting week in almost every year that is recorded in my table. On the past five occasions, the number of days taken up varied between seven and 10 sitting days, although, apparently, that includes the opening Speech by His Excellency. On this occasion, after starting on 4 August we are now winding up on the ninth day.

The number of hours taken up by this debate in the past five sessions is also evident on that table. It varied from a low of 26 hours in the last session to nearly 36 hours in the 1980-81 Parliament. At present we have taken 26 hours and 24 minutes in this session. If I were to take my full hour, we would have wound up with 27 hours and 24 minutes. The 1980 figure of 35 hours and 51 minutes suggests that almost every one of the 61 members entitled to contribute must have used the full hour entitlement on that occasion and, in retrospect, I would suggest that it was a rather regrettable waste of time.

The actual annual percentages taken up of Parliament's sitting time for the past five years are also in that table. They seem to average out at a figure very close to that of the session which concluded earlier this year, namely, around 12½ per cent. In other words, that would suggest that one-eighth of the time of this Parliament is usually taken up each year by the Address in Reply debate. One might ask, 'To what effect?' With all due respect to my colleagues of both sides of the House, few contributions in the current Address in Reply debate (just as on previous occasions) were particularly urgent or outstanding.

On four previous occasions I have commented on my adverse opinion of the Address in Reply debate whilst, of course, taking my opportunity to make my contribution to

it. In 1979, I was a new member and dutifully followed the tradition of speaking for a full hour, but without commenting on its futility. I suppose that, as a new member, I was not in a position to question the practices of this institution. However, that soon changed, and the following year I was bold enough to suggest that this debate does very little to meet the real needs of members, and that an increase in the number of grievance debates should be substituted for at least part of the Address in Reply debate. I have tabulated the amount of time given to the adjournment debates since they were instituted in the 1974-75 Parliamentary session, and I seek leave to incorporate that statistical table in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE (These grievance speeches were first introduced in 1974-75.)

	Number of Sitting Days	No. of Days Involving Adj. Debates	Time		% of total
			hours	mins	
1974-75	74	7	3	25	0.8
1975-76	45	19	9	30	3.2
1976-77	65	36	17	40	4.4
1977	11	9	4	16	7.6
1977-78	45	25	12	12	4.5
1978-79	55	22	10	50	3.3
1979	11	6	3	00	4.2
1979-80	35	15	7	29	2.9
1980-81	56	20	9	52	2.6
1981-82	68	31	15	26	3.1
1982	27	13	6	18	4.0
1982-83	26	8	3	57	1.8

Mr TRAINER: These grievance speeches, as part of the adjournment, suffer from two disadvantages at present (I will come back to that in a moment). However, they are also extremely advantageous to members and to our Parliamentary democracy. Their relative brevity means that they are usually delivered with far more style and vigour than are the one-hour Address in Reply marathons that we are currently dealing with. Unlike the more or less annual Address in Reply debates they occur far more frequently and offer opportunities for members to raise issues on behalf of constituents while they are still topical, not when they have gone stale waiting for an Address in Reply debate to come round. It is frustrating to not be able to strike on an issue while the iron is hot and to make a contribution as a member of Parliament to the public debate on some issue. It is also frustrating to not be able to help a constituent who wants an issue raised, and it is very hard to explain to a constituent, as so many constituents are not familiar with Parliamentary workings, that the opportunities of making a contribution to a grievance debate are often few and far between.

The main avenues open to a back-bencher to be more than division fodder in modern-day Parliaments tend to come most often in grievance debates and during Question Time. We do get grievance opportunities, other than those during the adjournment debate, as part of the discussions of the Budget and Supply Bills, and so on. However, the most important opportunities are those that occur during the regular adjournment debates. There are two disadvantages, however, to the regular adjournment debates: they are not regular enough to be relied on; and they are very late in the day's sitting as part of the adjournment. In explanation of that, I would like to amplify the two points. The first is that the regularity of adjournment debates cannot be relied upon, because any extension of the sitting time beyond 10 p.m. on Tuesday or Wednesday or 5 p.m. on

Thursday wipes out the adjournment debate. This can happen very readily, and does so far more often than not.

An examination of the table that I have had incorporated indicates a pattern over the past five Parliamentary sessions during which I have been a member whereby adjournment debates have been held on only 87 of the 212 sitting days: in other words, much less than half of the adjournment debates placed on the time table actually take place. That is with the exception of the past three weeks, during which time we had made a particularly outstanding effort to have adjournment debates every night, the only exception being last Thursday, when the Address in Reply had to go a little bit too long, which robbed us of the opportunity on that occasion.

As I have just pointed out, members miss out on their adjournment grievance addresses far more often than they have the opportunity to make them. From personal experience as a back-bencher, I know what it is like to be all keyed up at around 10 o'clock at night, with notes prepared on some burning issue, only to find that the adjournment debate has been cancelled. A back-bencher is left, so to speak, all dressed up with nowhere to go, and wondering what on earth he is going to tell a constituent who is relying on him to raise an issue in Parliament on that occasion. If one is fortunate one may be able to postpone one's contribution in those circumstances to another day, but often a postponement renders useless the matter that a member wanted to raise. This occurs so often that only a small proportion of the potential of those grievance debates really is actually realised, and only 2 per cent or 3 per cent of Parliamentary sitting time is allocated for this valuable opportunity for a back-bencher to contribute. This will be evidenced later by reference to *Hansard* and the table that I have sought permission to have inserted.

I mentioned two disadvantages of the current adjournment debate system. The second is that these speeches are part of the adjournment, which means that they are very late in the evening on Tuesday and Wednesday or late on Thursday afternoon. Unless the subject matter is something fairly sensational those grievances do not receive the attention from the media that they often deserve, it being too late for most deadlines. Although debates at that time may be quite often accompanied by excellent repartee from the handful of dedicated colleagues still in the Chamber, some quite interesting grievances can receive the same fate as some of the more boring Address in Reply contributions.

In effect, we can have one person speaking in almost solitary splendour, as I said on a previous occasion, perhaps with only one or two others on his side of the Chamber for company, with a similar handful on the other side of the Chamber. In those circumstances a member is, in effect, addressing an almost empty Chamber, an empty gallery, and in most cases an empty press gallery, with only *Hansard*, the Clerks and the Speaker to listen to his address. *Hansard* records our remarks for posterity, and it is possible to distribute copies of *Hansard* to a few selected persons in our electorates, but with due deference to the comment of the member for Fisher last week, that is of minimal benefit. He laid great stress on his claim that, 'People have an opportunity to read *Hansard*.' I believe that that is a rather artificial claim. It is all very well to say that members of the public have that opportunity, but it is not a real opportunity. Copies are available, a fortnight or so after speeches have been made, through libraries or to the tiny minority who are subscribers, but for 99 per cent of the population *Hansard* might just as well not exist. In fact, I would not be surprised if half the population thought that *Hansard* ran in the Melbourne Cup.

For our attempts at canvassing issues of concern to be anything more than an idle posturing, they must be part of

the public domain. This means they must receive some sort of media coverage, however minute or however superficial. For new suggestions to enter the marketplace of ideas through a Parliamentary representative, for anger to be adequately expressed, and for deficiencies in our society to be effectively highlighted, it is not enough to address a near empty Chamber and have one's words recorded in *Hansard* to be circulated to a tiny minority or to gather dust, untouched for ever more on a shelf, unless perhaps the interest of a student is aroused for his or her thesis in some future century. Somehow the media must be more closely involved with the workings of Parliament, because we rely on it for most of our communication with the electorate at large.

I firmly believe that we should restrict the Address in Reply debate (and I stress that it should be restricted—not abolished) and that the time saved be used to expand the grievance debate system, bringing a large proportion of those debates forward from the late evening adjournment and placing them in what one could call prime time, immediately following the conclusion of Question Time at about 3.15 p.m. In that time slot they would have a chance of receiving media coverage if the subject matter or style of delivery warranted it, the grievances would be less likely to be deleted from the programme in the way that they are in the adjournment time slot late at night. Perhaps we could have two 10-minute grievances in that 3.15 p.m. prime time arena (one from each side of the House), retaining another pair of grievances to be conducted later at night, which, of course, would still be subject to the disadvantage of running a risk of deletion if the time for adjournment is extended.

Mr Mathwin: There would still be fewer people to listen to it. The time for Address in Reply here used to be two hours.

Mrs Appleby: The member for Glenelg has not been listening—

Mr MATHWIN: You are out of order, because you are out of your place.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TRAINER: Last Thursday, when the member for Fisher commented on the Address in Reply debate, I suspect that I was one of the people whom he had in mind when he said:

It has become evident in recent years that more and more members who are perhaps Party oriented rather than individual oriented are saying that the Address in Reply debate is unnecessary and should be wiped out or restricted in some way.

The honourable member also said that deep down in every individual in the House perhaps there is a desire to be an Independent. I could possibly say in response to that that perhaps the honourable member had his next preselection in mind. However, in quoting the member for Fisher I am merely attempting to deny any allegation that my motives in seeking to restrict the Address in Reply are Party motivated, because they are not.

I believe that the Leader of the Opposition should be entitled to his full hour, if he wishes to use it, but so also should be the Leader of any other Party or group, such as the member for Flinders or the member for Semaphore. However, I was pleased to note that this time at least one of those members kept his contribution quite short. Members making their maiden speech might still be granted the full hour, although perhaps few would choose to use that option, and with the diminution of peer pressure the number of new members to do so in future might be even smaller than it is now.

Mr Mathwin: That is supposed to be the only time when a member is allowed to read a speech. Do you realise that?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TRAINER: It is absurd to have everyone speaking for an hour: to have the member for Glenelg speak for three hours in the early hours of the morning as he did recently

is even more absurd. I see no convincing reason why we should not reduce these speeches, except for those to which I referred, to perhaps 15 minutes or 20 minutes as a maximum time, making the time saved available for grievance debates, because those debates are ones that really allow back-benchers on both sides of the House, Independent or not, a chance to make a more worthwhile contribution and to effectively raise issues of concern to their constituents. Surely, the member for Glenelg must at least agree with the thought behind that, even if he does not agree with the details.

Mr Mathwin: I do, but I do not think that a member should have to read his speech. Perhaps it might help someone who can't speak, to be able to read for 10 or 15 minutes.

Mr TRAINER: Well, I am pleased that the other night the member for Mitcham agreed with me that a lot of time was wasted in the Address in Reply debate. But I do not support the suggestion that came from the member for Glenelg's colleague, the member for Mitcham, in his contribution on 23 August when he said: We should save time by incorporating Address in Reply speeches in *Hansard* without reading them. I quote—and I hope I will be excused for reading the quote:

I have had it suggested that we should follow the congressional system in America, where it is possible for members to record a speech that they believe is of great import, but they do not have

to actually address the House, they can have it included in the *Hansard* or the record of the day as part and parcel of their thoughts and views.

The member for Fisher was quite scathing about the idea of any moves in that direction, and I must agree with him. The member for Mitcham also went on to comment on the procedures that we follow in Question Time, as follows:

Since I have been in this House we have had the spectacle of the Government wasting time whenever the opportunity arises, and we find ourselves with very few questions able to be asked within the allotted hour.

Had he been here during the last Government, he would know what wasting time in Question Time was all about.

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

Mr TRAINER: I am interested only in the past few years, not in pre-history. Apart from grievances, Question Time is one other arena in which backbenchers have an opportunity to raise topical issues. However, the member for Mitcham is a bit off beam if he thinks there has been a deterioration in Question Time since this Government came to office, and in support of my response to that allegation I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it a third statistical table listing the numbers of questions asked over the past few years.

Leave granted.

Average Number of Questions asked on those days which incorporated a Question Time

Parliament	Sitting Days	Days Questions Asked	Questions Without Notice	Daily* Average Asked in Question Time	Questions on Notice
1967	57	57	2 011	35	82
1968	(Prorogued on second day)				
1968-69	68	67	3 099	46	34
1969	64	64	2 910	45	19
1970	(Prorogued on third day)				
1970-71	75	73	2 763	38	109
1971-72	74	73	2 949	40	92
1972	54	52	2 133	41	147
1973	(Prorogued on fourth day)				
1973-74	69	65	1 601	24.6**	202
1974-75	74	71	968	13.6	625
1975-76	45	39	634	16.3	365
1976-77	65	55	811	14.7	990
1977	11	9	91	10.1	171
1977-78	45	39	630	16.2	513
1978-79	55	49	657	13.4	1 201
1979	11	10	140	14.0	219
1979-80	35	31	399	12.9	980
1980-81	56	47	619	13.1	1 255
1981-82	68	62	672	10.8	598
1982	27	25	238	9.5	186
1982-83	26	21	331	15.8 }	239

* Total number of questions without notice divided by the number of sitting days on which a Question Time was held. (This varies from the figure used in the *House of Assembly Digest*, which is based on the total of both types of questions divided by the total number of sitting days regardless of whether Question Time takes place.)

** Transition figure for 1973-74 when Question Time was reduced and the adjournment grievances instituted.

Mr TRAINER: I understand that prior to 1974 an average of about 40 questions was asked each day during Question Time. In those days (and I can see—or rather 'hear'—the member for Glenelg nodding his head in agreement, Question Time took 1½ hours. There was a different method of asking questions, and Questions on Notice were not asked so much at that time as now. In 1974, Question Time was reduced to an hour.

Mr Mathwin: From two hours.

Mr TRAINER: Sorry, from two hours to an hour, and the time saved was used to make possible the adjournment debates; that is correct, is it not?

Mr Mathwin: That was the theory.

Mr TRAINER: Yes. If you had been listening earlier on, you would know that I pointed out what has happened to most adjournment debates.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must refer to other honourable members by the name of their electorate, and I hope that the jolly conversation being carried on across the Chamber will cease.

Mr TRAINER: Following those changes, there was a very large increase in the number of Questions on Notice asked, and, as indicated in my table, the number leaped to a record 1 255 for the 1980-81 Parliament, due mainly on that occasion to the efforts of my colleague, the member for Albert Park, and myself.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Don't leave out me.

Mr TRAINER: The member for Baudin had his hand in there as well.

Mr Mathwin: There were 7 000 one year.

Mr TRAINER: The number of Questions without Notice, in particular Question Times, was reduced to an average of 14 during the period 1974-79. With the advent of a Liberal Government in 1979, we saw the average number of questions plummet from 14 to 11.6 for the period 1979-82, and the situation deteriorated further as the position of the Government deteriorated further. The Tonkin Ministry answered an average of about 13 questions each Question Time for the first two sessions, but for 1981-82 this dropped to 10.8. For the last session of that Tonkin Government in 1982, it dropped to an appalling average of 9.5 questions in Question Time. I can see that the member for Baudin is in total agreement. He was Opposition Whip at the time, and had the frustration of trying to work out who would get these rare gems of opportunities on the Opposition benches at that time to ask questions. It meant an average of only about five questions from the Opposition and, therefore, it was mainly the front benchers who had the opportunity each day.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I still bear the scars.

Mr TRAINER: Indeed. On some days the filibustering and covering up was so bad that I can remember occasions when only three or four Opposition questions were asked on a particular day. The Bannon Labor Government set out to try to remedy that situation and, as the total will show, we have averaged close to 16 questions a day, well above that of our Liberal predecessors and exceeding even that of our Labor predecessors earlier in the decade.

The member for Mitcham has little to complain of. Indeed, earlier this month on opening day this House set a near-record of 26 or 27 questions on the one day, and even today we managed to get 18 questions in, although 10 of those were from the Opposition. Nevertheless, the member for Mitcham is quite correct in drawing attention to the value of Question Time for back-benchers who want to raise particular issues.

Recently, in an attempt to improve communications with the public, this House allowed television cameras to have access to the Chamber for news reports and specialty programmes such as *Nationwide*. We rely on the media to help us carry out our task of canvassing issues, and it seemed a progressive step to remove some of the barriers between us as representatives and the electorate at large. Certainly our attitude is somewhat different from that of the Adelaide City Council, if one looks at the scathing comments in today's *News*, as follows:

If Parliament conducted its affairs in the manner of the Adelaide City Council, there would be an uproar. Faced with a decision of the utmost concern to its electorate—and the people of Adelaide as a whole—it goes into camera.

I will not refer to the actual issues dealt with by the council, but certainly that press attitude is somewhat different from that of one commentator in the media, who surprisingly did not seem to be pleased with our television coverage. I refer to the Max Harris column in last Sunday's *Sunday Mail* where, in an article entitled 'TV Pollies? Keep them in the House!', he says:

Should the televising of proceedings in the South Australian State Parliament be banned?... Parliament brings itself into disrepute when it insists on being seen to be seen. Even the briefest news segments, extrapolated from our demure North Terrace debates, are prone to make the gorge rise.

That comment about making people vomit is a rather cruel gibe. Nevertheless, the article continues:

There's no argument but that you'd see more sustained effort at intellectual concentration during nit-picking sessions in the monkey cage at the zoo.

I can only say that I have never visited him at home, so I would not know about that last aspect. However, that would

be a cheap shot on a par with the shots that he has made. The article continues:

It is not the inelegant shambles of debating procedure the viewer finds demoralising.

I am not sure what that refers to because most television coverages are of Question Times which are not actually debates anyway. The article becomes a bit nasty further on when it states:

But the errant eye focuses its attention on the chaps having a chat about the trifecta at Morphetville, the senior front-bencher having a post-prandial snooze, the member who appears to be deeply absorbed in a copy of *Women's Weekly*. And above all, the viewer is perturbed by the appalling prostate problems endured by Parliamentarians. At any given moment at least three of them are stumbling from their seats, presumably on their way to the latrines, and three are drifting back.

That would appear to be a little close to breaching privilege, in the sense of reflecting on Parliament, but it then reflects on the Speaker, using a classroom analogy, as follows:

... Classrooms are rarely if ever like the legislative zoo. The teacher-equivalent in Parliament is Mr Speaker, and we rarely hear anything said on the floor of the House because he is constantly barking like a walrus with chronic catarrh while his pupils take not the slightest notice.

The SPEAKER: Order! I take that as a reflection on that noble animal, the walrus.

Mr TRAINER: The article continues:

In my maths class at school the presiding pedagog—

he has actually got 'pedagog'; that may be an attempted pun on his part—

had only to mutter quietly 'silence!' and there'd be instant hush—otherwise you'd be shot out of the class like the proverbial bullet. These observations are stale stuff, but they must be made again.

Why must these cheap observations be made again? Why make cruel, gratuitous insults against Parliament in that sense? Are they just cheap shots to amuse the ill-informed? I particularly resent the reference to members 'stumbling from their seats'; his reference is in the context of members leaving their seats and the Chamber. It is obvious that Mr Harris has no real idea of what is involved.

The Hon. H. Allison: Has Mr Harris ever been in this Chamber?

Mr TRAINER: I will come to that. He seems to expect 46 members to sit rigidly gazing at whoever is speaking and maintaining that fixed pose for hours on end, not moving a muscle. As Government Whip, I particularly resent his comments, because my duties require me to move around the Chamber and to dash in and out a great deal. How does Max Harris assume that speaking lists are compiled? How does he assume that it is worked out who is going to speak and in what order? How does he assume the sequence in which members ask questions is calculated? Do we do this by mental telepathy? How do we advise the Speaker of the order of speaking? How does one negotiate with the Opposition Whip over pairs and similar matters without using mental telepathy? If documents need to be brought into the Chamber from members' rooms or from the library research service, or if telephones have to be answered for an urgent message, should we use telekinesis? The article goes on further to state:

Televised Parliamentary sessions must be abolished or our politicians will have to conform to the community's expectations of high seriousness, good manners, attentiveness to the issues of the day and seemingly self-presentation.

His constant stress on 'high seriousness' suggests that he wants us to be stuffed shirts. We could react accordingly. One could refer it as a matter of privilege, or something like that but I think that that would be a stupid mistake. I would rather assume that what Max Harris has said has been written not through malice but through a lack of awareness.

Mr Mathwin: He likes the Deputy Premier, though, doesn't he?

Mr TRAINER: I did not say that he was not good in his judgment on some matters, and I will again be referring to Max Harris in another context in a few moments. If it is indeed lack of awareness, I will offer him the hand of hospitality and friendship in return for his rather cruel comments and invite him to be my guest at Parliament House one afternoon during the current session. I already had in mind the situation which the member for Mount Gambier suggested a moment ago. As there must surely be something lacking in Max Harris's Parliamentary education, I challenge him to be my guest for a hastily consumed lunch (one which, despite the splendours of the Parliamentary dining room, would probably be at odds with what I am sure his leisurely lifestyle demands) and invite him to an afternoon of close at hand examination of how we lesser mortals go about our Parliamentary duties—not, I might say, that all Parliamentary activity is praiseworthy: far from it.

In the *Australian* on 30 July, Max Harris (who, the member for Glenelg said, commented kindly on Jack Wright) was quite correct in his defence of Jack Wright, along with Mick Young, as 'an honest battler besieged', to use Harris's words. He said:

They are the last of the Henry Lawson men, and I think we will see few of their like again.

The attacks on Jack Wright by the Opposition were indeed disgraceful. They were well summarised by 'Onlooker' on 21 August in his column most aptly entitled, 'Curtain down on sorry show', in which he stated:

The final curtain seems to have been rung down in the Wright scenes in the Combe-Ivanov tragicomedy and it seems an appropriate time for the inevitable critique of the performances.

He continued:

... the show ended much as T. S. Eliot's view of life—with a whimper, not a bang... it's obvious some ghost writer handed in a ready-made scenario, promising a box-office hit for the Opposition... there was the curious casting. One of the main actors, Mr Dean Brown, fluffed his lines. Regular theatre-goers will remember Mr Brown once attempted to get out of the chorus and take over the producer's job.

I can recall the day that the leadership battle on the other side was recorded in the *News*—'Brown versus Olsen', and all the rest of it. In the same newspaper on that day we saw the large headline on the opposite page 'Power struggle in the Kremlin', and I was not sure which story was referring to what! So much for the political ineptness of the Opposition in regard to the so-called Wright affair. Let us look at the morality of it all and at the comments made by Father John Fleming in the *Advertiser* on 27 August. Talking about Parliament at large, he first stated:

Society tends to believe the worst about its elected representatives, that they are really in it only for the power, personal ambition and money. How critical it is then for Governments and Oppositions to behave in ways that lend support to their credibility and worthiness of respect.

How did the debates regarding the alleged deficiencies of the Deputy Premier line up with that? Father Fleming had this to say:

In the past couple of months in South Australia it seems to me that those fundamental principles have been obscured by the so-called Combe affair and its ramifications for the State Government. We have seen the State Opposition use what is essentially a matter for the Federal Government to embarrass the State Government and to deflect that Government away from its fundamental obligations to serve the community. A trap was set for the Deputy Premier, Mr Wright. He seemed to fall for it. In a clear invasion of personal privacy a phone call between Mr Combe and Mr Wright was made public. Mr Wright was in trouble because it could be argued that there was a discrepancy between an answer given in Parliament and certain parts of the phone call. From all accounts Jack Wright is a decent and honourable man who has served his Party and South Australia very well indeed. He is generally regarded as an honest and truthful man. A straight-shooter.

It is not at all apparent to me just what the Combe affair has to do with our State Parliament, nor what the State Opposition

thought it could achieve for the people of South Australia in making it an issue here. It is surely not naive to expect that 'anything goes' ought not to be the rationale for political behaviour.

All that has been achieved by Mr Olsen and his colleagues is the deflection of the Government's attention away from its public duty to serve the people in order to protect itself and its Deputy Leader from an attack which was really all about political point-scoring. Meanwhile, the people who mostly suffer from unemployment and poverty have had to sit on the sidelines waiting until a completely meaningless skirmish in the political 'game' plays itself out.

I have a third reference to make to Max Harris during the course of my contribution. I referred in the grievance debate on 9 August to the *60 Minutes* episode on 7 August attacking the Department for Community Welfare in the programme 'Have you seen my child?' There was some reference in the press refuting some of those allegations, but only a couple of sections of the media actively criticised the journalism of *60 Minutes* and the damage it was doing to the work of the Department for Community Welfare social workers. One was *Nationwide* on 8 August and the other was Max Harris in the *Australian* on 20 August. Quite by coincidence, and much to my pleasure, he stressed three of the very same points which I had mentioned on 9 August. The first of them, which ties in exactly with what I had to say, was as follows:

A few weeks ago he [Gerald Stone] had a programme created on the death of a child through parental violence. Somehow this tragic death could have been avoided if the Department for Community Welfare in Victoria had over-ridden the rights of the parents and taken the child out of the home environment and into care, the programme suggested. This was followed very quickly by another programme which castigated the supposed bureaucrats of community welfare—

in this case, South Australia—

because on occasion they don't reveal the whereabouts of children in emergency care to parents from whom they have been removed, or from whom the children have fled.

The second point, which also ties in exactly with what I said, was as follows:

Some time ago *60 Minutes* produced boggling revelations about the threat to privacy and confidentiality that stem from modern super-smart bugging devices. The programme issued a clarion call to the community for the outlawing of listening devices except under the most stringent legislative conditions.

A couple of weeks back *60 Minutes* sent an actress into the community welfare offices at Elizabeth, South Australia, and there, using a bugging device, to wit a bodily concealed microphone, engaged in a mock crisis case of parental incest and violence for the purpose of what the welfare department firmly insists on describing as 'entrapment'.

The third point that ties in with what I said involves the way in which certain material was not used. Max Harris stated:

When, in the event, the deception in fact revealed exemplary community welfare procedures and complete sensitivity, the deceptional material was not used in the programme. If it had been used in the programme it would have neutralised the accusatory purposes of the programme. In short, there would have been no story. Stone used censorship by omission rather than commission.

The *60 Minutes* programme perpetrated its hoax on the Elizabeth community welfare office—the office with the heaviest caseload in Adelaide—resulting in current cases there on that day being dropped, including two urgent cases of suspected child bashing. The social worker most involved with that hoax had to leave the case of a little child who had blood oozing from his ear from a suspected bashing in order to spend valuable time on this cruel hoax. To cap it all, *60 Minutes* left that part out of its story because it did not suit the line it wanted to take. It was a case of not letting the facts stand in the way of a good story. There were other distortions. Nearly three-quarters of an hour of an interview with the Director of Community Welfare, Mr Cox, was taped but the only parts to be put to air were two 30-second segments where the Director declined to yield to the arrogant expectations of *60 Minutes* that the private

case files of disturbed children should be opened up for the amusement of the viewing public.

In South Australia, as the Minister has pointed out to the House, there are about 90 000 teenagers, of whom about 900 in any one year are on the police list of missing persons, etc. Perhaps 250 to 300 approach the Department for Community Welfare for assistance or are referred to the department. Of those, only six had their address withheld from their parents, all for serious reasons. As well as children, parents often seek help from the Department for Community Welfare for their uncontrollable or disturbed children, approaching the department themselves.

There are children involved in cases of cruel or inhumane treatment, sometimes involving physical assault, and there are cases of incest and other abuses. However, it seems that the activist groups involved in promulgating these recent allegations have ideological blinkers, which blind them to the existence of parental cruelty, or it certainly seemed so for a while. The people concerned were certainly conspicuous by their relative silence last year in the case of the 'axe lady murder' when all Adelaide was horrified by the case of the distraught woman who murdered her husband because of his incestuous sexual abuse of his daughters. Remember how on that occasion Community Welfare was abused for not taking that man's children out of danger and for allegedly not properly responding to their pleas for protection? However, *60 Minutes* and some of the people who have been pushing these allegations are only interested in matters that suit their particular intentions.

At least one of the cases dealt with by that programme was very well reported on the *Advertiser* of 30 May, but for some reason or other the *60 Minutes* team did not bother to refer to that particular article that was headed 'Police defend girl's removal from parents'. I do not want to go into any details of individual cases because I think that would be unfair, but I should like to point out that at least one of the cases was investigated by the Ombudsman, the Children's Court, and the Supreme Court, all of which vindicated the action taken by the Department of Community Welfare. However, *60 Minutes* chose not to report that particular fact, either. Community welfare workers know the facts of the cases and they know what untruths appeared in that programme. However, they also know the impact on the children of having it all aired in public, and the emotional damage that can result. It is a pity that *60 Minutes* was not a little more careful.

I should like to comment briefly on some of the remarks made last Thursday by the member for Mount Gambier, the shadow Minister of Community Welfare, when he raised again the subject of the claims of *60 Minutes*. He implied that he was doing so at the instigation of petitions from a group called Parents Who Care, an organisation with some sort of Festival of Light connections. It certainly had connections of that type at one stage, but that organisation seems to have undergone some recent changes. One of the group's parents who was on the programme told Peter White of the *Advertiser*:

... the department is part of a campaign, originating 'overseas' in countries hostile to the democratic way of life, to subvert the country by 'getting at' the children and hence destroying family life.

Two of the families who were highlighted in the programme have recently parted company with the group. The article goes on to say that the present treasurer of Parents Who Care, Mrs De Cean, said this week that the approach of the two families she mentioned in the article 'had proved incompatible with the majority of the group's members who had now changed the organisation's name to the Family Rights Association'. Mrs De Cean is quoted as saying, 'Some people have proved to be very unreasonable parents.' However, she did say that she agreed that there was some sort of plot involved. The article quoted her as saying:

I believe it's all part of a Socialist move to undermine society through the family.

The article also states:

The fact that the contradictory claims of the parents and the Department of Community Welfare are so manifestly irreconcilable may indicate that one side or the other is grossly misrepresenting the facts or has failed completely to understand the issues involved.

I leave it to you to judge which of the two groups is likely to be in that category: the welfare offices or the *60 Minutes* group. The article continues:

In this regard it should be noted that the Parents Who Care group constitutes a very small minority of South Australian parents and that the department is widely supported in its actions by independent non-government social workers.

On 9 August, I expressed the hope that *60 Minutes* might retract its allegations or correct some of the errors in the programme or perhaps apologise to the department. In that hope, I asked the Minister this afternoon whether that had taken place, but unfortunately it had not.

Following my remarks in Parliament I wrote, on 15 August, a letter enclosing material rebutting the claims of *60 Minutes*, and pointing out the inadequacies of the coverage and of the logic expressed in that programme. In my letter I said that I had hoped that some sort of retraction would have been made on the previous evening (14 August) to restore the credibility of the programme, but that I had again been disappointed. I had waited until the following Sunday after the first programme to see whether, when *60 Minutes* went to air the following week, there would be some sort of apology for the distortions, the incorrect allegations and the damage to workers in the Department for Community Welfare. I was hoping for some correction of the mistakes made, but that did not happen.

When I looked at a carbon copy of that letter a couple of days later I noticed that it had been inadvertently addressed by my office to George Negus instead of Gerald Stone, who produces the programme. That was not a serious mistake because the public identifies George Negus with the *60 Minutes* programme, and it was an easy mistake to make in dashing off the letter. Being a stickler for accuracy, which is one of the reasons why I am so incensed with this programme, once I detected the error on the carbon copy and determined to be precise, I sent a letter of correction to the producer, Mr Stone, as follows:

Due to an oversight, the enclosed material was addressed to Mr George Negus. It should, of course, have been directed to you ...

The response from *60 Minutes* and Mr Stone was somewhat arrogant, petty and petulant, as follows:

Dear Mr Trainer,

The quality of your thinking in your letter to us is demonstrated by the fact that it is addressed to George Negus, one of four reporters on this programme—and not even the one who did the particular story.

I think that that point raised in response to my letter is very petty and indicates that the producer must be desperate for a point to seize on. The letter from Mr Stone continues:

Your whole argument seems to boil down to the proposition that because the Community Welfare Department does such a good job generally, it should not be criticised for failure to notify a few parents about the status or safety of their children. I can assure you that view is not likely to be shared by the great majority of Australian mothers and fathers.

Firstly, I do not think that *60 Minutes* originally implied that there was a failure to notify only a 'few' parents: I think that it created the impression that there was a widespread practice of the department alienating children from their parents. Secondly, it is not just a matter of 'failure to notify'. If parents are not notified by the department, it is not because of accident: it is because of a conscious decision by the department not to notify the parents because the welfare of the children would otherwise be at risk. Thirdly, Mr Stone made no comment about the ignorance that his programme had shown in respect of the system of protection

of children used by the D.C.W. At the very time when such thorough research was supposedly occurring in relation to the handling of children by the D.C.W., his programme chose to use a model taken from Denver, Colorado. Apparently, despite the intensive research into the South Australian story, the producer was not aware that the South Australian Department for Community Welfare had one of the best child protection systems in the world.

Fourthly, the producer apparently sees no contradiction between one week getting stuck into welfare officers for not protecting children enough and the following week getting stuck into them for protecting them too much. Finally, Mr Stone made no apology whatever for the cruel hoax perpetrated at the Elizabeth office of the D.C.W. and the destruction of the proper workings of the department on that day. The third paragraph of Mr Stone's letter states:

As for your mention of our previous story on bugging devices, we did not set out to condemn such devices but merely to point out how widespread is their use.

That is certainly not the impression that Max Harris got, and I commend the article by Mr Harris for members to read in order to see what he thought of the programme's coverage of bugging during the previous week and their actual use of it in the 7 August programme. Mr Stone's letter concludes, as follows:

Journalists, you see, unlike certain politicians, believe in presenting the pertinent facts about matters of public interest and allowing the public to make up their mind.

Cordially, Gerald Stone.

If the letter I received from Mr Stone is an example of his idea of being cordial, I would like to see his idea of an arrogant letter. In his letter, Mr Stone stated:

Journalists . . . believe in presenting the pertinent facts about matters of public interest . . .

I presume that he includes his programme's journalists in that category, yet he makes no apology for leaving out some important and pertinent facts. Mr Stone omits to mention in his letter the pertinent fact that the hoax that the programme perpetrated on the community welfare office at Elizabeth showed a caring response from the officers concerned. They immediately tried to contact the parent who, in the case depicted, turned out to be a non-existent person in the sense that he was merely a producer of the programme posing as the father. In view of the clumsy and arrogant response I received from the programme, I do not in any way retract my accusation about *60 Minutes*, that it follows the practice of not letting the facts stand in the way of a good story.

During the adjournment debate of 9 August, I mentioned an earlier example of *60 Minutes* applying sloppy journalism to a story about South Australia. I mentioned the concern that that story had caused in South Australia. Indeed, on that occasion I mentioned that the Minister of Transport replied to a question about Quest Tours on 17 March in response to allegations regarding incidents dating back to 1980 which earlier sparked off a lot of concern in the community, which hurt the business of the current owners and led to several tour cancellations.

I know of at least one school in the community which had to allay the fears of parents. In fact, the school sent home a newsletter to parents on 17 March, as follows:

There has been some anxiety expressed about the possible use of Quest Tours buses (who transported our students to and from the swimming carnival) following a highly critical segment on the *60 Minutes* programme on Channel 9. We have followed this up as carefully as possible, in fairness to the company and out of a real concern for the safety of our students. We are left with a strong impression that the report did not tell both sides of the story. We are assured by the company that the accident referred to occurred with Lewis Bros and that the ex-driver interviewed has in fact worked for Lewis Bros for three months only, 10 years ago.

The newsletter points out that Quest Tours later took over Lewis Bros. The ex-driver mentioned in the newsletter was

used as a highlight of the programme's segment about tour bus operators. I draw honourable members' attention to the concern that was expressed by the new owners of that company in the 18 March edition of the *News*, when several transport industry leaders defended the bus tour company. The article states:

South Australian Bus and Coach Association President, Mr B. J. Frazer, said he believed the company had been unfairly treated in the programme. 'That accident happened just after they took over and, since then, they have done everything possible to upgrade the fleet,' Mr Frazer said. 'They are, unfortunately, not members of our association, but we don't like to see anyone crucified and this seems unfair.'

I think that that speaks rather highly of the new owners of the company (Mr Puckridge and Mr Lewis). The President of the South Australian Bus and Coach Association leapt to the company's defence. The article further states:

Mr Puckridge and Mr Wilson claim they have worked hard and spent much money to upgrade the tour bus fleet. They said the business had received several cancellations following the *60 Minutes* programme but also calls from sympathetic customers. 'The average mum and dad who saw that programme could be excused for thinking our operation was less than perfect,' said Mr Wilson . . .

However, Mr Wilson said there was only one bus operating from the original Lewis Bros fleet they had bought, and that had been 'extensively restructured'.

Some of the remarks in that television programme have been commented on by officers of the Department of Transport. For example, Jana Wendt, when referring to safety reports, stated:

There is no mention in these documents of the extensive rust. The Department of Transport stated that it did not know what safety reports Jana Wendt was referring to, nor where she obtained them. In fact, the Department of Transport stated: there is mention of rust in reports compiled by the department on examining the vehicles and rust in window frames was detected, but the bus was not passed by the inspection authority until suitable repairs were made. Referring to rust, Jana Wendt further stated:

Inspectors here at the new South Australian Inspection Authority say they never saw it.

According to the department, the Chief Inspector said that he personally never saw it. She further states:

The Hay bus was inspected just 42 days before the smash and it was allowed to go on the road. So who were the inspectors? One of them, a man named Lonsdale, used to work for the company that built the bus. He knew first hand of the steering modification yet later as an inspector he failed to report it.

In reply to that allegation the department stated that Lonsdale did not know first hand of the modification. He worked for Lewis Brothers as a workshop foreman in the body building section and was not involved with the mechanical repairs in question. These statements were made by Lonsdale at the inquest and it was accepted at the inquest that no proof had been offered that Lonsdale should have known or had known of the modification. Whether Lonsdale knew of the modification or not is a touchy question, suffice to say that there is no legal proof that he did know or should have known, and the programme produced no further evidence that he had known or should have known. Jana Wendt further stated:

. . . and through all of those incidents, a Government inspection system that obviously just didn't work.

The department's reply to that allegation is as follows:

This is an unfair and inaccurate statement. The department's inspection system was working as well as could be expected in the majority of cases. In this particular instance a well camouflaged modification had slipped through and it would have taken an unreasonable escalation of inspection procedures to have picked it up. The *60 Minutes* team were determined to make a specific story out of the Hay accident, a presumption that Lewis Brothers Buses had been involved in a number of accidents and that Lewis Brothers were still running a bus company in exactly the same way at the

present time. Also, that Lewis Brothers' employees form part of the staff at the inspection authority.

Despite every effort made by the department to give information to the *60 Minutes* team to put these items in perspective and correct misleading ideas that the team had, *60 Minutes* tailored their story to only include original sensational material. They chose not to interview the department on any other matters associated with this question.

Once again, I believe that those comments illustrate the propensity of *60 Minutes* to not let the facts stand in the way of a good story.

In conclusion, I trust that I have given members some further food for thought regarding the concept of the Address in Reply, and the need for the media and Parliament to help raise the status of back-benchers slightly above the level of mere division fodder. Some of our Parliamentary traditions are of minimal benefit and are quite hard to alter. I recall two minor changes that I proposed in relation to the listing of Questions on Notice in the Notice Paper. I think that I have pushed for those since entering this House in 1979.

The first of these changes was for a simple alteration to separate fresh Questions on Notice from those that had been sitting on the Notice Paper for some time. My other suggestion was to mention in the Notice Paper the name of the Minister who finally answered the question, when Ministers in another place are involved. I recall questions listed on the Notice Paper addressed to the Minister of Education, for example, in the case of the previous Government. These questions involved complicated legal matters intended to be asked of the Attorney-General in another place. Ordinary members of the public reading the Notice Paper would have been quite confused to see questions calling on the then Minister of Education (who is now the member for Mount Gambier) to answer quite complicated legal matters.

After about three years both of those matters eventually came to fruition, and I am rather proud of those achievements. I can imagine my grandchildren asking me in retirement what I achieved in Parliament, to which I would reply that I had got them to draw a line across the Notice Paper between old and new questions and that I had managed to get them to drop some of the gobbledegook about Ministers representing other Ministers. Surely the pyramids themselves would crumble in comparison with such achievements as those which took place in only three years! I hope that we can be a little more speedy in relation to adjusting the Address in Reply debate and the grievance debate by way of the Standing Orders Committee, of which I am fortunate to be a member. I hope that my concluding remarks in a speech that I made on 22 March will be finally vindicated. On that occasion I said:

I am making what I hope will be the last Address in Reply contribution under the traditional format.

Motion carried.

FENCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill proposes a single amendment to the principal Act, the Fences Act, 1975. The Statutes Amendment (Jurisdiction of Courts) Act, 1981, effected alterations to the jurisdictional limits of District Courts and Local Courts. Section 13 of the Fences Act contains references to pecuniary amounts that are based upon the old jurisdictional limits. The purpose of the present Bill is to bring section 13 into line with the jurisdictional limits that presently apply to local courts. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 effects the necessary amendments to bring section 13 into line with the jurisdictional

limits prescribed by the Statutes Amendment (Jurisdiction of Courts) Act, 1981.

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

PAROLE ORDERS (TRANSFER) BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Chief Secretary): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The Standing Committee of Attorneys-General has, since 1975, been considering question relating to the supervision of parolees and the enforcement of orders against them when they are residing in a State other than that where the parole order was made. Parolees, like many others in the community, may have legitimate reasons for moving from one State to another, whether to seek reunion with their families, to obtain employment or otherwise to advance their interests. It was thought desirable therefore for a formal scheme to be developed to enable the transfer interstate of supervision and enforcement of parole orders.

A Uniform Parole Orders (Transfer) Bill was prepared and the Bill before the House is the South Australian revision of this uniform measure. The main features of the Bill are as follows:

1. Transfer of parole orders is to be on a reciprocal basis.
2. Transfer of a parole order will take place only on the agreement of Ministers of the transferring and receiving of jurisdictions.
3. Transfer will only take place where the relevant Ministers are satisfied that it will be in the best interests of the parolee and the parolee has consented to or requested the transfer or has already transferred his place of residence.
4. A transferred parole order will have effect and be enforceable as if the order had been made under the law of the receiving jurisdiction.

The uniform Bill for the Transfer of Convicted and Sentenced Prisoners was passed by the South Australian Parliament in 1982. Provision for interstate transfer of parolees is a complementary piece of legislation.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the measure. Clause 3 contains definitions of 'corresponding law' and 'designated authority' to allow for the reciprocity of interstate transfer of parole orders. 'Corresponding law' means a law of another State or a territory declared by the Minister by notice published in the *Gazette* to be a corresponding law in relation to the transfer of parole orders. 'Designated authority' refers to an authority of another State or a Territory with powers under the corresponding law similar to those to be exercised by the Minister under the measure. Another significant definition is that of 'parole order'. A parole order is an order under the law of this State or another State or a Territory for the release of a person on parole. The expression includes any authority, wherever given, for the release of a person from imprisonment or lawful detention, which is to be deemed to be or has the same effect as, an order for the release of a person on parole.

Clause 4 provides for the appointment of a Registrar of Transferred Parole Orders. Clause 5 empowers the Minister to delegate any of his powers or functions given under the measure. Clause 6 provides that the Minister may request the designated authority for another State or a Territory to register a South Australian parole order only if he is satisfied that the transfer is in the best interests of the parolee and

the parolee has consented to or requested the transfer or has already transferred his place of residence to the receiving State or territory. When the Minister requests that a designated authority in another State or a Territory agree to the transfer of a parole order from this State certain documents must accompany the request, including the parole order, the judgment by reason of which the parolee was sentenced to imprisonment, certain particulars and a report relating to the parolee. These documents form the basis for determination by the designated authority of the receiving State or Territory of the proper course to adopt in relation to the transfer of a parole order.

Clause 7 provides that an order, once transferred from South Australia, ceases to be of force in South Australia. Furthermore, each sentence of imprisonment to which the parolee was subject immediately before the transfer, ceases to have effect in South Australia. Clause 8 provides that upon the request of the designated authority for another State or a Territory the Minister may direct the Registrar to register a parole order that was in force in that State or Territory. Under subsection (2), the Minister shall not so direct unless he is satisfied that the transfer is in the best interests of the parolee, and the parolee has consented to or requested the transfer or has already transferred his place of residence to South Australia. The Minister makes his determination on the basis of the documentary evidence provided by the transferring jurisdiction.

Clause 9 provides the procedure to be adopted by the Registrar when directed by the Minister to register a parole order, and includes the maintaining of a register of transferred orders. The Registrar must—

- (a) endorse upon the parole order a memorandum recording the transfer and the date;
- (b) keep the endorsed parole order in a register together with the judgment by virtue of which the parolee became liable to imprisonment;
- (c) forward a copy of the endorsed parole order and the judgment to the Chairman of the Parole Board; and
- (d) give notice in writing to the transferring jurisdiction of the fact and date of registration.

Subsection (3) provides that a parole order is registrable notwithstanding that it was originally made in pursuance of a law of this State.

Clause 10 provides that upon a parole order being registered, the laws of South Australia apply as if each sentence of imprisonment to which the parolee was liable had been imposed in South Australia (whether or not it was in fact), as if the original parole order was made in South Australia (whether or not it was in fact) and as if any period of imprisonment served and any period spent on parole had been served or spent in South Australia. Under subsection (2), this section does not cease to operate by reason of the revocation under South Australian Law, or the registered parole order. Clause 11 is an evidentiary provision.

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

FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE ERADICATION FUND ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

In 1958 the Foot and Mouth Eradication Fund Act, 1958, was passed to provide compensation to people whose stock or property was destroyed because of, or whose stock died

of, foot and mouth disease. Since then the Act has been amended to take into account a Commonwealth/States agreement on cost-sharing in the event of an outbreak of the disease. The definition of 'foot and mouth disease' includes 10 other serious exotic animal diseases all of which have an Australian Agricultural Council approved contingency plan for eradication.

In 1982 Australian Agricultural Council, having noted that provisions for payment of compensation for exotic diseases varied from State to State, approved a set of uniform guidelines. The existing South Australian legislation satisfied most of these guidelines. However there were three aspects which could not be met without amendment to this Act. The first of these amendments is to increase the time available for lodging a claim for compensation from 60 to 90 days. It has been recognised that, with the stresses and altered circumstances which would prevail in the case of a foot and mouth disease outbreak, 90 days would provide claimants with a far more equitable time limit.

The second amendment concerns the case where animals die from an exotic disease as opposed to animals which are destroyed. The Act as it currently stands only allows compensation to be paid where an animal dies and the property is already under quarantine. When foot and mouth disease was the only proclaimed disease this did not matter as foot and mouth disease rarely kills an animal. However some of the other 10 proclaimed diseases, such as rinderpest, Newcastle disease and African swine fever, can be 'killer diseases', and the first sign of an outbreak of one of these diseases may be massive mortalities. Under current legislation an owner might find his herd decimated overnight and would not be eligible for compensation.

The Bill seeks to remedy the situation by removing the need for the property to be under quarantine at the time of death of the stock. The third amendment concerns the obligations of an owner to comply with all laws relating to eradicating the outbreak of the disease. The Australian Agricultural Council guidelines included a provision for prompt reporting to be a prerequisite for compensation. When considering current legislation it was realised that owners can be penalised for convictions for past unrelated offences under State Acts relating to exotic disease control no matter how long ago those offences may have been committed. The Bill seeks to remove this unfair aspect and instead impose a requirement for compliance with all laws relating to exotic disease control relevant to the outbreak in question.

The question of prompt reporting is thus taken into account by a requirement of the Stock Diseases Act, 1934, for an owner to report the presence or suspected presence of an exotic disease 'forthwith by the quickest practicable means'. Industry views support the amendments contained in the Bill, and its passage will provide for uniform implementation of exotic disease eradication procedures throughout Australia, as other States have made or are making comparable amendments to their legislation. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 7 of the principal Act. The Acts Interpretation Act, 1915 provides that a reference to 'this Act' in an Act includes reference to regulations made under the Act. The words removed from section 7 of the principal Act by this clause are therefore otiose words because of the phrase 'this Act' which precedes them. Clause 3 amends section 9 of the principal Act so that, in future, it will not be necessary for the land on which an animal dies to be under quarantine to give rise to an entitlement to compensation. The words removed by para-

graph (a) of this clause no longer serve a useful purpose since the amendment earlier this year of the Acts Interpretation Act, 1915. New section 14b(2) of that Act provides that a reference in an Act to a section of another Act shall be deemed to include a reference to regulations made under that section.

Clause 4 amends section 13 of the principal Act. Paragraph (a) extends the period in which an application for compensation may be made from 60 days to 90 days. Paragraph (b) replaces paragraph (b) of section 13 with a provision that empowers the Minister to refuse or reduce the amount of compensation where the applicant has caused or contributed to the loss by failing to comply with the Act, the Stock Diseases Act, 1934, or any other law providing for the control or eradication of foot and mouth disease. The existing provision gives the Minister a similar discretion only if the applicant has been convicted of an offence against those Acts. However, after such a conviction, the Minister retains his discretion to refuse compensation in relation to subsequent outbreaks of disease even though those outbreaks may be unconnected with the outbreak in relation to which the offence was committed. This seems unfair and is not repeated in the new provision. Clauses 5 and 6 amend sections 14 and 17 of the principal Act for the same reason as the amendment made by clause 2.

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

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 25 August. Page 527.)

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): This afternoon we have had another example of the manner in which the Premier is holding in complete contempt this Parliament and the people of South Australia. He has released to the media a generalised summary of the Government's capital works programme for this financial year, attempting to dress it up as a major boost to spending by the Government on capital works.

Mr Becker: You're joking.

Mr OLSEN: No, I am not joking. The increase amounts to just over 10 per cent. It does not represent any significant increase in real terms; so the Premier ought to be embarrassed about his activities.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: I will get to the licensing provisions in good time. The Premier has implied that it is an increase in funding, when in fact it is not: in fact, it could well amount to a cut, if we take into account South Australia's current inflation rate of 12.3 per cent. Unless that inflation rate falls significantly over the next 12 months there will be no increase in capital works funding: in fact, there will be a cut in real terms. The vast majority of the projects that the Premier has listed were begun by the previous Government but, of course, the Premier ignored that in his trumped up press release this afternoon.

The Premier's release of this information in advance of the Budget is another example in a series of unprecedented actions by the Government in an attempt to hide the massive increase in taxes and charges that it has imposed this financial year. In acting this way, the Premier is holding this Parliament in supreme contempt. Parliament should receive this information first. It is Parliament that must vote on these appropriations, but it seems that under the present Premier Parliament is the last to be informed. All traditions and conventions have gone out of the window, in the same way

that they have been abused by the Government's decision to introduce its major revenue raising legislation before telling Parliament how the money was to be spent. Clearly, the Premier is trying to mislead the public about his capital works programme. He has even tried to deny the Opposition an opportunity to point this out. I will recount the set of circumstances that apply to this matter for the information of members of the House. When I became aware later this afternoon of the Premier's intention to release this information in an unprecedented manner, I asked his office for a copy of the information that was being released to the media. The response that I received from a senior Ministerial officer in the Premier's Department was interesting. He said:

I dare say you've already got your copy of the press release from the media. If you haven't got a copy by 4.30 or 4.45 I dare say we can get you one. The Budget's on Thursday. You'll have to wait until then.

In addition to that the Premier has had a press conference. I put in a call personally to the Premier, which he has not had the courtesy to respond to in the meantime. It is typical of the Government's arrogant fashion that my office was informed in this way, and it is typical of the way in which this Premier continues to hold this Parliament in contempt. Why should he do so? Why is he trying to run away and hide from the issue?

Mr Mathwin: He is fudging it up.

Mr OLSEN: The Premier is pretty good at fudging. Why should he take this course of action? It is quite clear why he should take this course of action. He was a little peeved when on Budget night, last Tuesday, we happened to be able to go to a press conference before he did, with the whole Public Service behind him, to support the information, to give a detailed response to the Federal Government. He was a little slow off the mark. Having been beaten to the gun on a number of occasions he was attempting to release this information privately to the media, without telling the Parliament, without making a copy available to the Opposition, trying to thwart us in responding tonight on the media services on the Government's public works programme.

If we look at the Premier's statement released today, the school building and redevelopment programme has been slashed by 18 per cent in real terms in the State Budget. The paper states:

The Premier announced this afternoon that \$24 000 000 had been allocated for school building and redevelopment programmes, and was a cut of \$2 700 000 in money terms compared with the former Liberal Government's allocation last financial year.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Would the Leader please be seated. I think the Chair should point out from the beginning that this Bill does not open up a full scale debate, as a Supply Bill would. It is a particular Bill, and I draw this to the Leader's attention. I point out to the honourable Leader that it is the opinion of the Chair that his remarks are starting to stretch far wider than the ambit of the debate on this Bill.

Mr OLSEN: What I am attempting to do, and I can understand the Premier's embarrassment—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Chair is simply pointing out what the Bill contains and what the debate should cover.

Mr OLSEN: I take on board your comments, Sir, and I can understand the Premier's embarrassment on this position and why he would want to take a point of order on my proceeding in this manner. These tax measures and the capital works programme trotted out today to the media by this Premier create quite serious implications for the Budget, and the debate on the measure before the House has impli-

cations to the Budget. It is a taxing measure, including revenue items in this Budget, and it is a Budget item specifically to which I am referring. To repeat briefly, there is a reduction of \$2 700 000 in money allocated for the school building programme. The Premier's statement today that there had been a major increase in the funding of the Government's construction programme was deceptive and misleading.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I rise on a point of order, Sir. The Chair has made a ruling, and I suggest the Leader is transgressing it.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The matter before the House is one on which I would hope the Leader would have something specific to say. He is simply not speaking to the Bill.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. I pointed out originally, and I still point out, that this is a specific Bill dealing with the Licensing Act. The Chair has no intention of allowing the debate to become a full-scale Supply debate. I ask the honourable Leader to adhere to the Chair's ruling and come back to the Bill.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I rise on a point of order, Sir. The Premier has stated, in introducing this measure, that it is a taxing measure so that the Government may accrue additional revenue to provide services and certain capital works. I submit that this is extremely relevant to this debate, because of course this is a taxing measure and it is because of that taxing measure and the income that will accrue to the Government because of it, that the various capital works programmes will be able to be instituted by the Government.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order. I do not intend to uphold the point of order, and I intend to stick to my original ruling. It is not a Supply Bill and cannot be debated as such. It is a specific amendment to an Act, and accordingly I point out to the honourable Leader that the Chair will allow certain references to the taxation measure but does not intend to allow the debate to continue in its present vein.

Mr OLSEN: I think the point has been well and truly made to date and I do not need to canvass it. I will certainly abide by your ruling, Sir. I can understand the Premier's severe embarrassment about having the matter come back and fly in his face today.

The Opposition opposes the Licensing Act Amendment Bill, particularly when revenue covered by the Bill is being used to fund (quoting the Premier) 'an increased capital works programme'. It is a reduction in real terms of 18 per cent in the school building programme. The Government has now presented four of the five measures which will raise significant additional revenue from taxpayers this financial year. The two measures before the House today, and the two already passed by the Parliament earlier this month, will raise, according to the Premier's estimates, \$32 000 000 this financial year.

Mr Mathwin: He is not very good at guessing; he never has been.

Mr OLSEN: He is not very good at financial competence, and that has been demonstrated clearly.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Chair is not in a very good mood at the moment.

Mr OLSEN: The fifth measure the Premier has promised—a new financial institutions duty—has not yet been announced in detail. According to the Premier, the rate at which it will be applied has not even been set yet. That statement is about as credible as the Premier's promise

before the last election not to increase rates of existing taxes or introduce new taxes. Of course the rate has been set, because this new tax is the largest single component of the five measures to raise additional revenue this financial year, and the amount it will take from taxpayers, from pensioners and the unemployed as much as from those who can more easily afford it, will have a significant bearing on the end of year Budget result.

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Listen to the Premier whining! At least what is left of the Budget will be revealed to the House in the next 48 hours, so the Premier's reluctance to tell us more about this fifth tax raising measure, this new tax, is one more example of the manner in which he continues to mislead the public about taxes and charges. He wanted the public to believe, during his unsuccessful campaign against extra imposts on the wine industry, that a visit to Canberra four days before Mr Keating delivered his Budget could have some influence on the Federal Government.

The Premier has now left the Chamber with his political advisers from the gallery and the press to try to cool down the press comments about the capital works programme and the fact that he has brought out a public statement once again misleading the public of South Australia about the capital works programme. His severe embarrassment has been demonstrated today by his actions. I presume that he is out there hurriedly trying to resurrect the situation, to have a look at his press statement and work out how he went wrong; that is, he included a figure he did not mean to include which has shown him up for what he is; it shows his absolute contempt for the Parliament and for the electors of this State.

This Premier wanted the public to believe, as I said during his unsuccessful campaign (and I repeat it at this point) against extra imposts on the wine industry, that a visit to Canberra four days before Mr Keating delivered his Budget, could have some influence on the Federal Government. What nonsense! Just as the ink was dry by then on the Federal Budget, so that nothing the Premier did had any relevance, the rate of the new financial institutions duty is also set but the Premier does not intend to reveal it until Thursday, in the hope it will be lost amongst reporting about Government-spending proposals in the Budget, that is, what is left of Government-spending proposals. For 10 months, the Premier has been trying to stage-manage his way out of the impact and the embarrassment of a litany of broken election promises. It is for that reason that the Parliament is discussing these measures today.

In unprecedented fashion, the Premier has asked this House to approve most of his major revenue-raising measures before presenting the full Budget—before telling the House how he will spend the increased taxes he wants it to approve. If we look at the schedule of capital works programmes released by the Premier today, most of them (all but about four) relate to initiatives of the former Liberal Government, merely continuing with Budget allocations.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr OLSEN: The Premier's strategy has been as obvious as it has been unsuccessful. We will get more of it on Thursday when the Budget skeleton is announced—it will be a skeleton as there is no meat left on the bones. It will have a welter of Government propaganda about its spending proposals—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has endeavoured, on three occasions, to point out to the House that this Bill has nothing to do with a Supply Bill or a Budget Bill. Yet, in defiance of my upholding a point of order and my pointing it out on three occasions, the Leader persists in carrying on a debate that cannot be described as other

than a debate on Supply. I ask him, for the third time, to come back to the Bill.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I rise on a point of order, Sir. The revenue coming from the introduction of this Bill will be contained in the Budget. I submit that the Leader is referring directly to that matter and, in fact, to the effect that the revenue accrued because of this Bill will have on the Budget. It has a direct reference to this piece of legislation.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order. I point out again that this debate is on the principles of the Bill before us. The question of the Budget or Supply is the subject of a completely different debate. This Bill simply deals with the Licensing Act, and I ask the honourable Leader to come back to the Bill.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I rise on a further point of order, Sir. I put a question to you, Mr Deputy Speaker: does your ruling mean that members on this side of the House are not allowed to refer to the way in which the revenue from this Bill is to be used?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I simply point out to the member for Torrens that the Chair is ruling on the basis that the Bill is dealing with a change to the Licensing Act. It has nothing to do with the proposed Budget to come down on Thursday. That will open a budgetary debate. That is the ruling of the Chair. I reiterate my previous ruling that this debate is simply dealing with a Bill to amend the Licensing Act.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: On a further point of order, Sir, I am sorry to have to take the matter further, but I am sure that all members in the Chamber will agree that Mr Speaker allowed a wide-ranging debate on the petrol franchise Bill and, in fact, all matters were canvassed during that Bill. It was a tax-raising measure, and Mr Speaker took the view that a wide-ranging debate should be allowed on it. In fact, he ruled that way, I think you will find, Sir.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chair has no intention of upholding the point of order. The Bill before us deals with a specific measure. It does not prevent the Leader from canvassing what the results of the Bill may be. The Chair has allowed him to canvass that, but it will not allow any speaker to canvass a whole range of budgetary items. The honourable Leader.

Mr OLSEN: In calling an economic summit on 9 September, the Premier has indicated that he wants to explain to that economic summit a whole range of things, including his tax-raising measures, of which this is one.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: That is before we have had a chance to debate it.

Mr OLSEN: Indeed, but that is typical of the activities of this Premier. There will be another serving on 9 September, I have no doubt, when the Premier stages his mini summit to explain his tax-raising measures—the summit which he claims is for consultation but which will merely present the participants with a *fait accompli* in a bid to give it some air of responsibility, respectability. That *fait accompli* is higher taxes for all South Australians, and nothing the Premier has done to fudge that fact will minimise its impact on his Government.

The people of South Australia are disillusioned and angry—and rightly so. This Premier promised them 10 months ago that he would not raise taxes for three years. He made that promise strongly and repeatedly. Yet he has gone on the greatest tax raising binge in recent memory, and he has compounded that massive breach of faith with the electorate by doing so at a time when South Australians can least afford it—when they have accepted the need for a wage pause to help economic recovery, to help more people find work. Labor has now revealed its formula for

economic management—Hawke plus Bannon equals higher taxes.

The average South Australian family will be almost \$30 a week worse off as a result of the taxes and charges the Premier and the Prime Minister have increased since their elections. The Prime Minister and the Premier have been acting with devastating hypocrisy. The Prime Minister promised he would reduce taxes for 99 per cent of Australians, and the Premier ran to Canberra complaining about the possibility of a wine tax. Now, the Prime Minister has increased taxes for all Australians, and the Premier, with this measure, will increase the price of a bottle of wine in South Australia by 15 cents.

But it is not only a double act—it has a double sting. This Bill will also increase beer prices in South Australia by 3c a bottle. That is a tax on a tax, because the Federal Budget has already increased the excise duty on beer, which accounts for just over half the wholesale price, by the equivalent of 3c a bottle. And there is an encore. The Federal Government has also indexed excise rates, so increases in beer prices will occur automatically every six months. That is taxation by the calendar as well.

The end result of the Hawke/Bannon formula will be lost jobs as well as higher taxes in South Australia. This tax and the Federal excise will have a severe effect on the level of operations of the brewing and wine-producing industries in South Australia. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it a table of a purely statistical nature.

Leave granted.

RECOMMENDED RETAIL PRICE OF ONE DOZEN BOTTLES
OF 750 ML BEER—COST COMPONENTS

	Pre-Budget (23.8.83)	Estimate (1.2.84)	Per centage Increase
	\$	\$	
Federal Government excise	5.40	5.94	+10.0
Wholesale price	(a) 10.20	(b) 10.76	+5.5
State Government licence fee	(c) 0.92	(d) 1.29	+40.2
Cost to retailer	11.14	12.05	+8.2
Recommended retail price	15.60	16.68	+6.9
Total State and Federal taxes	6.32	7.23	+14.4

(a) excise 60 cents per litre
(b) excise indexed to 66 cents per litre (assumes 4% c.p.i. September/December quarter)
(c) licence fee 9%
(d) licence fee 12%

Mr OLSEN: The table sets out step by step the components of the recommended retail price of a dozen bottles of beer, prior to the 1983-84 Federal Budget and the estimated cost components as at 1 February 1984, when the increased State tax and further indexation of the Federal excise will apply. The table illustrates the compounding impact of the State and Federal increases. I estimate that they will result in the recommended retail price of beer increasing by 6.9 per cent during the next six months. This would be about double the c.p.i. increase over the same period. I ask the House to note in particular that the total State and Federal tax component is estimated to increase from \$6.32 to \$7.23, an increase of 14.4 per cent.

The indexation of the excise duty will also result in a continuing upward thrust of the State Government licence fee payable by retailers. The table shows that this will increase by 40.2 per cent. These increases have serious implications for employment in South Australia. The Australian Bureau of Statistics estimates that beer consumption last financial year decreased by 2.8 per cent. I am disappointed that the Premier has not seen fit to sit in the Chamber while a significant taxation measure that he has introduced is being debated. The Premier is not present to listen to the debate so that he can respond to specific points.

Such is the contempt in which the Premier holds the Parliament: he is not prepared to sit in the Parliament as a responsible Minister when a piece of legislation that he initiated is being debated in this House.

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Perhaps the Premier is obtaining answers to earlier comments in relation to the Education Department public works programme. It is clear that the market cannot go on absorbing price increases without further loss of sales and, therefore, loss of jobs. About 10 000 people are employed in the production and retailing of beer in South Australia. The Chief Executive of the Australian Hotels Association in South Australia, Mr Bill Spurr, predicted (in the *News* on 24 August):

A very significant number of jobs would be lost in hotels because of the Federal Budget. The situation has been further compounded by the previously announced State licence fee increases.

I have now been advised that the South Australian Brewing Company has deferred planned investment expenditure amounting to \$4 000 000 because of the Federal and State Government imposts.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: How many jobs will be lost?

Mr OLSEN: Hundreds of jobs. It will affect subcontractors right throughout South Australia. This amount would have been invested in the upgrading of brewery-owned hotel properties in this State. I have also been informed that, because of future market uncertainty, the company is to embark on a detailed review of its future corporate strategy covering both brewing and hotel operations.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: In other words, they are questioning their expansion programme.

Mr OLSEN: They are explaining the expansion programme and whether the tourist demand in South Australia should equal services, to cater for, to attract, and to increase the tourist trade, from which, of course, jobs result. There is the double sting yet again from this Government. South Australia simply cannot afford to lose employment opportunities and planned investment expenditure of this nature. The hotel industry is a vital part of what is at least emerging as one of South Australia's largest growth industries—tourism—initiated by the former Minister of Tourism. Not only will these decisions inhibit investment of tourism but also they will hit the industry by limiting the opportunity for low and middle income earners to take holidays, for those people will be the hardest hit by these imposts. The present Prime Minister recognised this when, in a letter to his electorate of Wills dated 19 June 1981, in regard to increases in taxation on beer, spirits and cigarettes, he stated:

The Labor Party completely opposes any increase in this tax. These items take a much larger proportion of the income of low and middle income earners than they do from higher income earners, so to increase them further would be quite unfair.

That is a very familiar tune, I suggest.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: Hawke in Opposition.

Mr OLSEN: Of course. When one changes sides, one is able to forget about the promises that were made. While the Prime Minister has protected his own Budget by indexing (that is, taxing by the calendar) excise duties to take account of inflation, he has done so at the expense of the family budget. Inflation in Australia has been institutionalised. In Opposition, the promises spurted from the lips of the Premier and the Prime Minister unabated, but now, facing the reality and responsibilities of office, all they can offer is the dead hand of higher taxes.

In this respect the wine industry is somewhere between the devil and the deep blue sea. It has been hit once in each of the Federal and State Budgets and faces the inevitability of a further impost in the near future. The Federal Labor Party was unequivocal in its pre-election commitment, and

the Prime Minister said the following in his rural policy speech on 20 February this year:

Labor is pledged not to impose a sales tax or an excise tax [I emphasise excise tax] on wine.

Members are now aware of the fact that one half of that promise has already been broken. The Federal Budget contained a tax which will cost South Australian wineries something like \$20 000 000 a year in additional excise—\$20 000 000—which must be paid as the wine is made, not as it is sold to the retailers. However, there is worse to come—another double act by the Federal Government. The Prime Minister said the following last week:

The case of a tax on wine is clearly there.

An honourable member: What about the member for Kingston?

Mr OLSEN: I will get to the member for Kingston in a moment. The Premier has tried to give the impression that he has saved South Australia from a wine tax (another misleading statement—another fudge from the Premier). However, as he tries to play down in the Budget the new excise on wine, the industry is grappling not only with the impact of that excise but also with the inevitability of a sales tax on table wines. If that is making South Australia's voice heard in Canberra, if that is wanting South Australia to win, then this State is facing some bitter disappointments in the 922 days until the next election must be held.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: We had better ask him to keep quiet.

Mr OLSEN: As the member for Coles rightly says, in South Australia's interests he had better shut up. Winemakers have been advised that the excise duty must be paid within seven days of spirit usage in production. Unless this method of excise collection is modified, the wine industry in South Australia will be facing an extremely difficult period.

The effect of the excise will be to increase the working capital requirements of all fortified wine manufacturers. For example, Yalumba, at Angaston, which uses 1 000 000 litres of grape spirit for fortification purposes, will face an immediate increase in its working capital requirements of \$2 610 000 (incidentally, a piece of information the Opposition revealed first in this House in a question period immediately after the Budget had been brought down). This will compound by a like amount in future years, and will increase automatically because of the indexation factor.

This excise will place extreme liquidity pressures on producers. They will not be able to recoup the cost through sales of the product on which it is levied for a period from between three to 15 years because of the long maturation process involved. It is estimated that the retail price of a 750ml bottle of port will increase by 75c, and a flagon by \$2, with strong consumer resistance expected. A combination of liquidity pressures and a drop in sales means that labour shedding in the wine industry is inevitable.

Last Wednesday, I telexed the Prime Minister requesting him to review the impact of the wine excise as a matter of urgency. I suggested that, if he was not prepared to withdraw the tax, liability for duty should be deferred until the wine is sold under a bonded system. While I have raised the very serious consequences that this tax will have for the industry, some members of the Labor Party have been prepared to sit by supinely in an atmosphere of self-congratulation that there is no sales tax on table wines—this year!

Mr Groom: Thanks to the Premier.

Mr OLSEN: The member for Hartley (who is not in his seat) no doubt would not want that interjection recorded.

An honourable member: What did he say?

Mr OLSEN: He said that as a result of the Premier's efforts we have no wine tax. Obviously he has had his head in the sand for the past week since the Federal Budget was

brought down, as has the temporary member for Kingston, who said in the House of Representatives last Thursday:

The wine industry in my area is very happy with what is being done.

The member for Mawson, who consistently interjects, is deafening by her silence.

Ms Lenehan: You—

Mr OLSEN: Ah, she has come to life.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! It would be better if all members were quiet.

Mr OLSEN: Let me assure Mr Bilney that he is completely out of touch with the wine industry in the Southern Vales.

An honourable member: And the growers.

Mr OLSEN: And the growers, of course. His statement has been strongly denied by several of the major fortified wine producers in the McLaren Vale area.

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

Mr OLSEN: I am pleased to see that the Premier has shown some courtesy to the House by returning to the front bench when a measure that he has introduced is currently before it. The fact that the Premier was absent earlier shows his continued contempt for this Parliament and his lack of confidence in it on matters of significance, especially taxation measures. Certainly, I can understand why the Premier would want to be absent during this debate: such blatant disregard for election promises is something about which that anyone in his position ought to be embarrassed. I remind the Premier, because he was not here, earlier, that perhaps he should look at *Hansard* and note the comments of the member for Hartley, who said that we can thank the Premier that there is no wine tax.

That is wrong—there is a wine tax. I presume that we can thank the Premier that there is no general wine tax, but the Prime Minister has been willing to put a wine tax on fortified wine to the extent of \$2 000 000 on the industry in this State which will be a great impost on a whole range of small wineries and growers and which will mean labour shedding. If there is one prime objective that any Government ought to have at the moment it is tackling the problem of unemployment. In fact, we have seen this Government steer away from that problem. We have seen this Government prepare to put on a whole range of further imposts and taxes, measures that will wind their way through to the private sector and impact upon job opportunities.

What we ought to recognise, even if members opposite cannot, is that 75 per cent of the work force in this State is employed in the private sector. The more imposts and taxes that are levied on that area, the more job opportunities that are lost. Also, I point out to the Premier, and it is important that I travel over a little of this ground again, because the Premier was rude enough—

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I heard every word.

Mr OLSEN: I am pleased that the Premier left the Chamber and listened to the proceedings amplified in his office. Doubtless, he had his advisers around him to resurrect the result of his releasing a press statement on the capital works programme which contained, once again, fudges, that is—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader is out of order in two ways: first, by blatantly turning his back to the Chair; and, secondly, by repeating himself.

Mr OLSEN: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker, I will try—

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope that the Leader will apologise.

Mr OLSEN: Of course I apologise, Mr Speaker. I had become accustomed during the course of my speech to referring to the Deputy Speaker, and now that you have resumed the Chair I will acknowledge you as the Speaker of the House, and I am pleased to do so. What we should

be aware of is the result of this decision to introduce this revenue measure in Parliament: the South Australian Brewing Company Limited will reduce capital expenditure on its assets throughout South Australia by \$4 000 000 this year. In addition, it has been indicated that the company will look at a whole new corporate budget economic strategy for its operations in this State. Is that any wonder, with the imposts put on by the Federal Government and the South Australian Government—imposts which such companies can ill afford, imposts which impinge upon the tourist industry in this State, not to mention a whole range of subcontractors and other people who could be employed through the expenditure of that \$4 000 000.

I would like the Premier to answer that claim and tell the House how he will make up for the loss of job opportunities created by this decision of his Government. The information that I have placed before the House is such that all members should give serious consideration to the impact of this measure. The Premier has been unable to do anything to influence the Prime Minister's desire to break election promises with impunity. The wine tax is a classic example of that.

I have no doubt that if the Premier has not already done so he should speak to the temporary member for Kingston in relation to his attitude to the wine tax and how it really does not have an impact on industry in this State. Of course, the Premier on Tuesday night in his own words said, 'The industry in South Australia can live with this impost.' He had not done his homework yet again to find exactly what the impost was on South Australian jobs and industry as a result of that decision of the Federal Government.

This Premier has so far run his race according to similar tactics of the Prime Minister. Solemn promises have been completely disregarded and the interests of individuals and industry in South Australia totally ignored. We have under this Government the highest unemployment in Australia. We have under this Government the highest inflation rate in Australia. We have become the inflation capital of Australia—a record that no Government should be very proud of. With this measure, our liquor licence fee will become the highest in Australia, contributing to even higher unemployment and inflation.

If inflation is allowed to continue unabated and if we continue to be the State with the highest inflation in Australia, it will mean that we will be put at a severe disadvantage *vis-a-vis* the other States, particularly our manufacturing industry, in the cost of producing those articles. That is a disadvantage that we cannot afford to have in South Australia. We are in a vicious circle drawn by the Premier, by his promises to the people and his obligations to those who financially assisted his bid to win office.

The Premier's obligations are being met at the expense of his promises: more people are being employed in the public sector; the private sector is being squeezed out of Government contracts; departments have been overspending because Ministers cannot manage and cannot fulfil their responsibilities.

The SPEAKER: Order! Clearly this is now becoming part of a grievance debate.

Ms Lenehan: He's been grieving all night.

The SPEAKER: Order! I want to make three things quite clear so that we all know the guidelines on which we are working: first, we have before us a Bill which is restricted to a tax measure related to the liquor industry; secondly, in line with my previous decision and that of my predecessor that same measure does allow reference to other revenue measures, but it does not allow the same width of a Budget or Supply Bill debate, and certainly it is in no sense an opportunity for a general budgetary or grievance debate.

Mr OLSEN: With this revenue raising measure, as, indeed, the other measures that have been brought before this Parliament, the bottom line is the red ink of a significant Budget deficit, and the Premier has chosen the high taxing option. He has broken significant election promises and he is hitting South Australians when they visit the deli, the service station, the hotel, the bottle shop, the bank, and when they want to take out insurance or switch on a light, or get on the bus train and the tram. This measure will—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing in this Bill about buses or trams. I can clearly see the connection—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I particularly say 'Order' to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the member for Torrens, because neither of them knows what I am about to say. I ask them as responsible members to remain silent while I consider the matter. It is quite clear that the Leader of the Opposition is allowed, under my own decision and that of my predecessor, to link remarks with other tax-raising measures and revenue matters. What is not allowed is a total overview of the Budget or, taking it to its widest dimension, as I think that the honourable gentleman was about to do, taking it to a total consideration the State's financial position.

Mr BAKER: I rise on a point of order. The Leader did not do it. How can he be ruled out of order for something that he is about to do? I would like that point of order clarified. Sir, you admitted then that you said that he had not said it, but that he was about to say it.

The SPEAKER: So far as I am concerned, there is no point of order.

Mr OLSEN: I rise on a point of order. Mr Speaker, regarding the previous point of order, you said that I could in fact refer to other revenue-raising measures.

The SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr OLSEN: When referring to the deli, service station, the hotel, the bottle shop, the bank, insurance, switching on lights, and the train or tram fares, I was specifically referring to other Government announced revenue-raising measures.

The SPEAKER: My ruling on that is that a distinction must be drawn between three different areas: first, a general grievance; secondly, a budgetary or Supply debate; and, thirdly, a tax debate or a revenue debate of some sort. I agree (and do not deny) that there has to be a great width in which an honourable member can operate in addressing himself to this question. However, it cannot be a general grievance.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I rise on a point of order. Mr Speaker, I am seeking some clarification regarding your ruling. Are we entitled to deal with the effect of this revenue-raising measure on the Budget, bearing in mind that, in his second reading explanation, the Premier referred to the Government's Budget problems and went on to say that this measure would bring in an extra \$7 000 000 in revenue? Is it within the ambit of your ruling to allow us to deal with the effect of that revenue on the State's Budget?

The SPEAKER: If one likes, the dichotomy is between a general grievance or Budget debate, on the one hand (which any senior member of the place knows to be of unlimited width), and, on the other hand, a revenue-raising measure which must be related in strict terms to the overall budgetary situation. I do not think that that is too difficult.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I rise on a point of order. I seek further clarification. I have listened with extreme care to your last three rulings, Sir. If I heard you correctly, you said that honourable members had to be given general breadth in relation to the remarks they made. They have to be linked up with the matter addressed in the Bill and they must have some general revenue implications. Mr Speaker, I think that that is what you just said, all of which

would indicate that the material that the Leader is canvassing is in order because it has general breadth in relation to the Budget and it can be linked to the Bill before the House. Mr Speaker, I think that I understood correctly the three points that you made in the recent three rulings. It would then certainly admit what the Leader is saying.

The SPEAKER: Order! The point at which I cavilled with the Leader's remarks was the point at which he reached the reference to bus charges or highway charges. There he was clearly dealing with a semi-governmental authority which normally would be dealt with under the Budget or under a Supply or grievance situation as distinct from this type of Bill.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I further seek your clarification. No doubt you would remember the debate on the Highways Act Amendment Bill, which was in fact a revenue raising matter, as was the Business Franchise (Petroleum Products) Act Amendment Bill. During that debate when the member for Light was making his contribution you stated that:

The situation is that in a taxation measure the width of the debate is enormous.

Those are your words, Sir. You further stated:

That can be seen by reference to Erskine May, Pettifer or any of the standard text books. It was the standard used by my predecessor, who happens to be speaking at the moment (although that does not over-awe me in the least). It was the standard used by him and by Speakers before him, as far back as I can remember.

I repeat the fact that you stated that the width of the debate is enormous. During that debate I remember that the subjects canvassed in fact went far wider than the scope that you are allowing us now, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Order! I remember the debate, and I remember the ruling. In fact, by coincidence, I have the very page on which those comments appear open before me. I stand by the ruling, but in my earlier ruling (and I stand by that as well) given to the Leader of the Opposition I made it clear that there were distinctions to be drawn and I stand by those distinctions.

Mr OLSEN: I take it then that I am entitled to talk—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable the Leader will resume his seat. Did the member for Torrens reflect upon the Chair?

The Hon. Michael Wilson: The member for Torrens did not speak.

Mr OLSEN: I understand, Sir, as a result of your rulings, that I am entitled to talk about the increases, in taxes that the Government has imposed despite the fact that it had no mandate to do so, as they relate to imposts in the delicatessens, in the service stations, at hotels, at bottle shops and at the banks, but that I cannot talk about the extra cost to switch on a light or the extra cost for bus, train or tram fares—

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Or to turn on a tap.

Mr Olsen: Or to turn on the tap.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader will resume his seat. I consider that to be one of the worst insults that I have ever been given, and I also consider it to be one of the most childish remarks ever made. My remarks were perfectly clear: I said, and I repeat, that this Bill before the House is a measure related to the liquor industry. I would allow great width in regard to the debate, and I continue to support my remarks as set out at page 129 of *Hansard*. I stand by those remarks. However, in no sense is this an opportunity for a general budgetary or grievance debate.

Mr OLSEN: Mr Speaker, I certainly accept your point but I would say, and I trust that you will allow me to respond in defence, that I was seeking to clarify in very definitive terms exactly what I could and could not debate

in this House on this tax revenue measure. My purpose in clarification was to establish clearly, in definitive terms, the ground that I could traverse; there was no other reason. This measure increases imposts right across the board for those consuming any alcoholic beverages, and the increase in revenue it will generate will threaten the viability of hotels and bottle stores, particularly those operated by small business and family concerns. We have been given advice that a brewery will withdraw \$4 000 000 worth of upgrading, maintenance and renovating programmes as a result of this measure that this Government has brought before this Parliament. We know the impact it will have on the tourist industry through not having facilities that have had \$4 000 000 worth of upgrading, not to mention the effect on small businesses, subcontractors and the like who would have won contracts for \$4 000 000 worth of expenditure on those establishments. This measure is one which this Government had no mandate to introduce, as it had no mandate to introduce any of the other tax measures over the past few weeks. I remind the Premier of his words during the last State election campaign: 'the A.L.P. in Government will not introduce any new or increased taxes during the life of this Government'. It is quite clearly a promise that it had no intention of keeping, because of the way in which this Government has acted on this and a number of other measures. This measure will add to the difficulties of the wine industry, on top of those which Prime Minister Hawke has already inflicted on it. 'We want South Australia to win!' The Premier went to Canberra to avoid a wine tax and came back with a tax on fortified wines which will put some small wineries and growers at a significant disadvantage with liquidity problems, labour shedding, lost job opportunities—

The Hon. D.C. Brown: The Budget was printed then.

Mr OLSEN: The ink was certainly dry on the Federal Budget by the time the Premier went to Canberra.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: I remind the Premier that under a Liberal Government there was no tax at all imposed on the wine industry. There was no tax on fortified wines.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: I remind the Premier that performance is the name of the game and, if one looks at performance, the Tonkin Liberal Government performed, because there was no wine tax even on fortified wines. I remind the Premier that in 1981-82 tax levels fell by 5.4 per cent in South Australia—a far cry from what this Government has inflicted on South Australia in but a few months of taking over Government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr OLSEN: The Premier ought to check his facts and his position carefully before coming into this House and criticising. It is performance that counts, and there is a bench mark established in the community on the performance of the Liberal Government that will stand us in good stead in 922 days from now, when we go to the people of South Australia. They will be able to see the performance of one Government matched against the abysmal performance of this Government—the hypocritical nature of broken election promises which this Government has been prepared to throw to the wind with gay abandon.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: We said we would and we did: they said they would and they didn't.

Mr OLSEN: Exactly. Performance is the name of the game. The Premier has no mandate for the introduction of this measure: this House must oppose it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): This is a savage taxing measure which imposes a South Australian wine tax along with other massive imposts on the liquor industry in South Australia. To set the scene for my remarks, I will quote from the Labor Party's policy speech, delivered with such gusto by the Premier (then Leader of the Opposition) in our Festival Theatre not all that long ago. I will make several selective quotes from the Premier's policy speech to set the scene for the debate. The Premier stated:

South Australia needs a new direction—it needs a new start.

By golly, we got it! The Premier continued:

It needs new opportunities, new developments and new vigor.

Where has the Premier been in the last week or two? He has been hiding behind somebody—Terry Plane on Monday. What sort of Premier sends his press secretary out to front up for him on the Roxby Downs dispute? This one does! The Premier continued:

It needs to put behind it the stagnation of the past, the lack of effort and the failure. South Australia needs to start again. We need to stand up to Mr Fraser and make South Australia's voice heard again in Canberra.

We have done well with Mr Hawke and the railways! The Premier continued:

We need a Government willing to take positive action to protect our jobs and our lifestyle and to develop new employment opportunities for our school leavers. Under this Government we now have the worst employment figures in Australia. We were not the worst at the time when the Labor Government won office.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: When members opposite won office they deluded the public. We are now the worst by far. We have slipped more than three whole percentage points under a Government which said a short time ago that it would look after employment for school leavers. This legislation is designed to increase unemployment—it is legislation for unemployment. The Premier also promised:

In Government our major goal will be to get South Australians back to work in a productive way.

This legislation will go a long way towards achieving that aim!

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker, and refer to your ruling of a few moments ago, which I thought was a proper one. The House is being subjected to a tirade from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in which he is merely quoting extracts of the Premier's policy speech prior to the last election. I put it to you, Mr Speaker, that the Deputy Leader is miles wide of the mark.

The SPEAKER: Order! It is not a question of whether the Deputy Premier thinks that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is wide of the mark. It is a question of whether his remarks fit within the guidelines and, at the moment, they do.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am linking up my remarks, Mr Speaker. It is legislation for unemployment. I am quoting what the present Government said before the last election. It stated—no, I have read that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The former Leader of the Opposition's policy speech is so replete with quotable quotes that one hardly knows where to turn. It further states:

In Government our main goal will be to get South Australians back to work in a productive way. As a first step we will establish the South Australian Enterprise Fund—

have members ever heard of that?—

to assist the expansion of industry.

It will assist the wineries! The speech continues:

The Enterprise Fund will pump investment into high technology and export industries. The fund will get behind businesses which have potential to expand and create jobs.

Another extract from the Premier's policy speech which is very dear to my heart is as follows:

We will give strong backing to our resources and mineral developments. In Government we engineered the rapid expansion of the Cooper Basin fields.

What did they say about our liquids scheme—we were going too quickly? The speech further states:

On our return we will support further developments of the Cooper Basin/Stony Point projects.

What about the next quote? It states:

We would take all possible steps, including action at the national level, to ensure that oil from the Jackson field is piped through South Australia and not to Brisbane. This makes economic sense. It is more economical and it is vital for our State. But we have got to have a Government that will fight to ensure this happens and not like our present Premier who simply caves in to Bjelke-Petersen.

I put a Question on Notice—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader will resume his seat. I now rule that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has gone beyond the ruling that I gave. He made some introductory remarks in relation to this Bill, but now he is proceeding in a fashion that is of far greater width than could possibly be contemplated except in a budgetary or grievance situation.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Mr Speaker, I was just about to link up my remarks. This is a taxing measure: it is a measure to raise significant revenue for the State. If the Premier had done what he said he would do in his policy speech, if he had gone and thumped the table and told Joh where to get off, if he had directed the oil through Moomba, we would not be faced with this Bill. We would now be receiving significant revenues from oil flowing to South Australia. To pursue the point, having linked it up, I asked a Question on Notice, as follows:

1. What discussions, since the last State election, has the Premier had with the Queensland Government to see that oil from the Jackson oil field would flow to Moomba and, if any, what was the date of the discussions, where were they held and with whom?

2. What was the result of any such discussions and did that result line up with the Premier's election promise to make sure that oil from the Jackson field flowed to South Australia?

I asked that question last year and I received a reply by letter the day before Parliament re-assembled in July this year.

The SPEAKER: Order! It must be patently clear to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that, having been called to order, he told me that he was about to link up his remarks, but he then began to do so by referring to the self-same remarks—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair took offence to the remarks that were linked to some kind of, I take it, projected oil contract between South Australia and Queensland. Those remarks could be admissible only in the context of a general budgetary or grievance debate.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Mr Speaker, you said earlier that you would allow great width in the debate, and there was enormous width earlier. You stated that great width would be permissible in the debate as long as we related our remarks to taxing measures. The only restriction that was placed on the Leader was that he must not refer to semi-government authorities.

The SPEAKER: Order! That is not just defiance of the Chair, it is not just flouting of the Chair and paying very careful regard to every word, but it is to suggest that the Chair would play favourites. I am not happy with that attitude or with the Deputy Leader's remarks. I will take no action in that regard, but I can certainly assure the

Deputy Leader that, if he continues in this vein, he will be ruled out of order.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I apologise if you, Mr Speaker, drew that conclusion from what I was saying. I was simply referring to what I thought was a series of rulings made earlier this evening. The point I was making was that, if the Premier had fulfilled his election promise and had pursued discussions with the Queensland Premier, having accused the former Government of not doing so, the chances are that we would have escaped this Bill tonight. One of the bonanzas that would and is beginning to flow to this Government is the royalties—

The SPEAKER: Order! I rule the Deputy Leader of the Opposition out of order on the grounds that he is now debating what appears to be an oil royalties proposition as distinct from either the Bill before the House or a comparison between various tax measures in line with what I ruled at page 129.

Mr LEWIS: I rise on a point of order. From your ruling, Mr Speaker, I take it that your interpretation of the meaning of the word 'royalty' is other than a revenue-raising or taxation measure on any commodity and, accordingly, I would seek a definition from you, Mr Speaker, as to what a 'royalty' really is, if it is not a taxation measure.

The SPEAKER: It is not, using colloquial terms, for me to be the coach and to work out how someone is going to write his speech. The plain fact of the matter is that senior members on both sides of the House know that a taxation measure of this kind has been ruled upon by my predecessor and by me. It has also been ruled upon by those who came before us; at least since 1975, when Mr Speaker Connelly took the Chair, there has been a certain uniformity about this matter. I want to make it quite clear that I am not seeking to deter members of the Opposition now from doing exactly what members of the Government now did three years ago or one year ago. All I am seeking to point out is that this is not a grievance debate or a Budget debate; therefore it seems to me, with all humility to the House, that references to potential oil royalties, or whatever they may be, related to Queensland have nothing to do with this measure. The honourable Deputy Leader.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I will switch right away from that subject. However, I thought that I had linked the fact that this was a revenue-raising matter and that if oil flowed from Queensland to South Australia and, as a result, money flowed to South Australia, we would not need this Bill. I will quote from page 21, where the Premier got to the climax of his policy speech. He said:

Unlike the Liberals we will not allow State charges like transport fares, electricity and hospital charges to be used as a form of back door taxation. The A.L.P. will not reintroduce succession duties and will not introduce new taxes nor increase existing taxes during our term of office.

No equivocation there! The Premier continued:

We will set up an independent inquiry into the State revenue collections, and any changes to the taxation structure would come after that inquiry reported and take place in our second term. Over the last few weeks the Labor Party has published detailed policy statements on a range of areas. These documents have been well researched, thoroughly costed, and followed extensive consultation with those in the community they affect.

I wonder what the liquor and grapegrowing industries think about this Bill in the light of what the Premier said then when he came to the climax of his policy speech. We knew that it was false, and we said so. On the night that the Premier was elected he had had no further information, but he was in reverse, back-peddalling fast. The Premier deluded and deceived the public, but now the chickens are coming home to roost in terms of this Bill, along with others recently introduced. Not only was the Opposition a bit querulous, a bit doubtful about these promises; in fact we knew they

were downright untruths, and we said so. However, because of its high interest rates and other factors the Labor Party scraped in at the last election.

One or two journalists had some doubts about what the Premier said and the need to introduce taxing measures like this. In a report headed 'Trying for Respect', the Premier was interviewed—here is this man deluding the public and trying for respect. I wonder how much respect he has these days! 'Credibility gap' is the term the Leader uses. If ever the gap was widened, it has been widened by this Bill in the light of what the Premier said when he fronted up at the Festival Theatre and deluded and deceived the public. The Premier said that he had accurate financial information. The press report states:

Question: To fund your \$29 000 000 policy programme would you run to a deficit Budget or seek to increase your revenue?

Answer: We estimate that revenue collection will match the extra expenditure we propose.

Question: Do you have any aversion to deficit budgeting?

Answer: Providing they're planned, a deficit Budget is an acceptable thing, although one must be very careful at the State level.

Question: So your answer to an increase in revenue would be an outright 'no'?

Answer: In taxes? Increasing taxes, no. We believe our programme can be costed without a tax rise.

This is with all the extra teachers, electricity concessions—honourable members can name it: the A.L.P. would give it; whatever the Liberals promised the A.L.P. would do better. There was to be \$1 000 000 for the racing industry, and the A.L.P. could do it all without a tax increase. The report continues:

Question: But if elected would you perhaps use the Victorian Premier's excuse—

Cain had been through this, so has Hawke more recently and the record is getting a bit worn. Cain went in with the same deception: he would not raise taxes—

Question: But if elected would you perhaps use the Victorian Premier's excuse that he was forced to raise taxes after promising not to, because he didn't know the Treasury was in such a mess?

Answer: As I understand it, Cain had been given certain information which proved to be wrong.

Question: But could that happen to you?

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

He repeated that he had accurate financial information. The Premier claimed that there would be no new taxes, he said, 'we can fund our own programmes'. That is what the Labor Party promised during the whole period of the Liberal Government. Its economic policy was clear—it was not a bolt out of the blue, this fiction that it would employ more people in the public sector. I understand that the Government has employed 2 000 more people since the election—that is where the money is going. It has put 2 000 more people on the public pay-roll, but it has lost more than 2 000 workers in the private sector. It is measures such as this that are increasing job losses. The Government puts people on the public pay-roll and then worries about how to pay them.

It took the Liberal Government three years to reduce the public sector by 4 000 employees: it has taken the Labor Government seven months to put 2 000 employees on the public pay-roll. That is why we have Bills such as this. When in Opposition the Government did not have such strictures. At various times it claimed that South Australia needed more teachers, that more people, should be put on the public pay-roll, that workers should be given shorter working hours. The Government, when in Opposition, promised that; it also promised more perks.

The then Opposition claimed that, in Government, it would not increase taxes, and that claim was repeated during the election campaign. As I have said before, even blind Freddy could see that that had to be false. However, for some unknown reason (although I do not think the reason was unknown), the public bought it, because we were in tough economic times and because interest rates were high. The Liberal Government copped the backwash. The Labor

Opposition came out with false promises and offered false hope. The chickens have been coming home to roost in these last couple of weeks, and we have another one now.

Politics has reached an all-time low in this country. Certainly, I would be ashamed to rise in this House, as the Premier does, and introduce a measure such as this to Parliament after what he said at election time. He has introduced this Bill, as bold as brass, claiming that he had no idea that conditions were as they are. That is what he told the *Advertiser* reporter when doubts were expressed about his programme. We knew what a pack of lies it was. That is why we are lumbered with this recipe for unemployment. We make no bones of the fact that we deliberately reduced taxes in South Australia so that we became again the lowest taxed State in the Commonwealth bar none.

It was a position that we lost during the Dunstan decade; it was a position that we had during the Playford era, which led to an enormous amount of development, particularly since the Second World War. The Liberal Government from 1979 to 1982 deliberately reduced taxes, and there was only one way to do so: trim the work force without affecting services. We did that, and we recovered so that we were the lowest taxed State in Australia bar none.

Mr Olsen: And the Premier acknowledges that.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: And the Premier acknowledges it. We were holding the line in relation to unemployment. The other States were catching up. We had significant resource developments which were contributing to our economy and helping with unemployment. What has the Labor Party done since it came to Government? Under the pressure of a looming election it doctored its uranium policy; it put through a false, phoney policy which lets the biggest uranium mine in the world go ahead but bangs the door shut on two smaller operations which were employing people at the very moment of the election and which were ready to go. It closed down those operations. That is why we have revenue-raising measures like this.

My wife still maintains some links with the mining industry. There is a group called 'Mining wives', a group of wives of some people in the department and in the industry, and she still goes to its monthly luncheons. Every month when she goes to that 'Mining wives' luncheon, they say, 'We can't wait for you people to get back into Government.' One woman said that her husband had a job at Beverley, and he is now on the dole. I rang the Beverley company when the Government was making its decision. The girl on the switchboard said, 'We're worried; if the Government closes us down I lose my job,' and she has lost her job.

An honourable member: And you lost your job.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The buffoon opposite can sit there and make these snide remarks, but the fact is that this Government, with its phoney uranium policy, allows the largest mine in the world to go ahead but shuts down two others which are far safer in terms of mining (in one, all they do is pump a solution down under the ground, dissolve out the uranium and bring it to the surface: nobody has to go underground). They shut down the mine because it does not happen to have a bit of gold or silver trace. That policy is absolutely dishonest—the Government knows that it is—and it has created unemployment in this State. People are out of jobs, and that revenue is lost. The Beverley mine represented a \$500 000 000 investment in this State over its life.

Mr MAYES: I take a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is going wide of the mark set by the earlier ruling of the Speaker. I draw that to your attention and ask you to rule on the point of order.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Whitten): I ask the Deputy Leader to come back to the terms of the Bill.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Certainly. I will link up my remarks. We would not need this Bill if the policies

of the Labor Party had been to continue the developments which, with a great deal of effort, the Liberal Government had got going in this State. We got to record levels of activity in the resource area only to have the door bang shut on a number of them. We would not need this Bill or these extra taxes.

Mr MAYES: I rise on a further point of order, Mr Acting Speaker.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Bag your head.

Mr MAYES: I take exception to the Deputy Leader's remark as well, and I ask him, before I make my point of order, to withdraw that comment. I again draw attention to the Deputy Leader's remarks, which I believe have gone wide of the mark set by the earlier rulings of the Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader has made some remarks that have been offensive to the member for Unley and I ask him whether he is prepared to withdraw those remarks.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: They are not unparliamentary, but I will withdraw them.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I did not say that they were unparliamentary. I said that they were offensive to the member for Unley, and I have asked whether the Deputy Leader is prepared to withdraw them.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I withdraw them, although I understand under Standing Orders that I am not required to do so. The fact is that this Bill is before the House because the Labor Party has a bankrupt policy in relation to development in this State. I quote a case in point. It has turned its back on a \$500 000 000 investment in this State. It has put 300 people out of work this year, and has sounded the death knell only last week in a Ministerial statement by the Minister of Mines and Energy. It has turned its back on a billion-dollar uranium enrichment plant in this State because of its bankrupt uranium policy which lets one mine go, but not the safest part of the cycle of the development in this State. I will be saying more about this during private members' time tomorrow.

Let me give a few more quotable quotes in the time I have available in relation to this Bill. I refer to what the Premier said in December when he was dithering around about whether or not we would have a wage pause. He was the Premier who dithered around while Mr Cain, Mr Wran and the Western Australian Premier said 'we are in it'. Not our John: he said, 'No, we are not in it. We have to wait until we get our marching orders,' and he dithered around. If anything saved this Government it was the wage pause. He said:

Although we have inherited Budget problems of unprecedented magnitude we will take action to freeze Government fees and charges, not already announced, until June 1983, if a wage, salary and price pause is achieved. The freeze will include increases in motor registration and petrol taxes which were proposed to take place during this period, bus and rail fares, and water rates.

What else has the Premier said from time to time? I have already quoted from the policy speech. Another quote from the policy speech is as follows:

This Government will not get away with drip-feed taxation or back-door tariff increases.

The Deputy Premier has also made a few quotable quotes. He said:

Apparently the same people who do not want to pay taxes are quite happy about paying increased charges. Charges are being put up quite simply to pay the State's bills.

That is what he said during the life of the Liberal Government. He further stated:

The Tonkin Government was using electricity charges as a form of back-door taxation.

They had not seen anything at that stage. The Hon. Michael Wilson asked the following question in this place:

Will the Premier give this House an assurance that no State taxes will be increased while the wage pause is operational in South Australia?

The Premier replied:

Yes.

The Premier said that there would be no tax increases. This Bill is South Australia's own wine tax. Here is the charade: it is play-acting. The Premier went over on the Friday before the Federal Budget (when it was printed) in the guise of battling for South Australia to have the wine tax removed. The Budget was already printed and ready to roll. This is the build-up of the scene for South Australia. Here is the Premier battling for South Australia in relation to the wine tax. Then he comes back and puts on his own tax: that is what this enormous leap from 9 per cent to 12 per cent in licence fees is. What will that do to the wine industry? As the Leader pointed out, the brewing company has deferred a multi-million dollar project because of this. This Government is legislating for unemployment. Here is a Government that came into office with a bag load of promises and an economic basket which we all knew was entirely false. I believe that the public of South Australia know now that it was entirely false. The record of the Liberal Government will stand. The record of this Government will be appalling by comparison: it will bring the Government down, and the thing that will bring it down more quickly than anything else is this lack of integrity in Government. As I said earlier, we have reached an all-time low in terms of Government operation in this State.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Whitten): Order! The Deputy Leader's time has expired.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): At the outset I want to refer to remarks made by the Premier. First, I refer to comments he made when introducing the Bill to the House on 25 August. In the very first paragraph of his explanation, the Premier stated:

We had no alternative but to implement a number of taxation measures.

Secondly, I refer to remarks made by the Premier earlier this evening across the floor of the House, namely, that the Liberal Party was responsible for the State's being bankrupt. Let me analyse those two statements in relation to the taxation measure that is presently before the House. The Premier would have us believe that there is no alternative to taxation in regard to fulfilling his broken promises made to the people of South Australia, and that he is in a position of some economic difficulty because the Tonkin Government sent the State bankrupt.

Honourable members would appreciate that in a debate on a taxation measure during the previous Parliamentary session (the session from 8 December to 2 June 1983) the Leader of the Opposition put on record once and for all details of the information contained within the Treasury documents that had been presented to the previous Government. That information indicated that a potential deficit of, I think, \$13 100 000 had been identified by the Treasury in October 1982. With all the predictions that the Treasury officers undertake on a continuing basis and with the details that were known to them in relation to measures that had been placed before the Parliament and the commitments that had been positively given, it was known that for the financial year to 30 June 1983, there would have been a \$13 100 000 deficit. The very first action taken by the Government was to extend the amounts of money being expended by the Government of its own initiative which was to be responsible for increasing the costs to the Government.

Reference has been made to a number of those actions. An increase in the number of teachers in South Australia has been clearly indicated, as has an increase in the number

of public servants. Further, hand-outs to the racing industry have been increased. All these measures have added to the total cost of Government outlay for and to the people of South Australia. They are extravagances that we are now being asked to pay for by way of these additional tax raising measures. There is an alternative and viable way to address the situation, namely, by way of restraint: it is restraint in the sense that one costs out what a certain promise will mean and then either withdraws or withholds action in regard to fulfilling that promise until it can be shown that it is a viable proposition and that it is capable of generating its own funds or capable of stimulation in a general area of the economy, producing more funds to help overcome or pay for any deficit which might be inherent in that area of activity.

In relation to the very first charge made by the Premier to this House in relation to this measure, I point out to the Premier that I, together with other members of the House (certainly the Leader and the Deputy Leader have identified themselves as being of this opinion) do not accept that the only method of redressing the present situation is by means of additional taxes. The alternative, which is positive, and which this Government has shown an inability to fulfil, is to get out and initiate actions and show the way whereby there can be an increase in business expectations and in the drive by individuals in small and large businesses to get on with the job of generating further funds.

On Monday last week, when travelling in an aircraft from Roxby Downs to Adelaide in company with some members of Parliament and other members of the general public—people employed at that establishment—one young person, 21 years of age, who was on that aircraft turned to me and indicated that he was heading to Adelaide for his first real break in the three months that he had been employed at that establishment.

He was proud to say, 'I arrived from New South Wales with very little. I offered myself for work: I was accepted. I have worked seven days a week since and, apart from the cost of living, I have been able to bank in that three months \$9 500.' In three months he had banked \$9 500 earned from his physical efforts, and he said, 'I am going to Adelaide for my first break. I will be there for a week. I will buy a number of things which I require, and I will then go back to work.'

I mention this because it ties in with the other alternative to which we referred, namely, that by giving people work, by assisting them to be employed, they become spenders, and, when they become spenders, they generate funds into the public sector and into all community sectors. They purchase goods which are to be made by manufacturers, and they give the opportunity of greater employment. So, the whole cycle turns around. The alternative to which I refer is the benefit which would accrue to this State in not having to be responsible for so many welfare hand-outs, not having to be responsible for a down-turn in income from royalties and other areas of activity, and thus directly offset the amount of money that this Government is seeking to raise by this measure.

It may well be said that \$7 000 000 for a full year (\$2 000 000 in this financial year) which is exposed in this measure is only a small amount of the total which would be required for the State of South Australia to show a move forward. No-one is denying that. However, \$2 000 000 in this financial year and \$7 000 000 for a full year is at least a move in the right direction. That money is stimulating other activities and is stimulating people to work—thereby, increasing the potential of our exports, the potential of spending generally and, more particularly, giving people throughout the State a measure of pride in the State's achievements and a recognition that there is a chance for

their children and their children's children in the longer term.

I do not accept, first, in the statements made by the Premier, that this is the only alternative that he had or, secondly, that the previous Government left the State in a situation of bankruptcy requiring this type of measure. I do not know whether we will ever be able to identify in the 1983-84 financial year just how much of the \$2 000 000 to be raised by this measure will go into schools, transport, community welfare or any other specific sector of the community.

Most certainly, if it is \$2 000 000 in the Consolidated Revenue of the State, it will be distributed in those areas. It comprises funds coming from a sector of the community which has already been challenged over a period of years in a most unscrupulous fashion, and has been extracted from an area of the community which, as recently as last week, was attacked by the Federal Government in order to raise those funds.

A better way exists to achieve that result, namely, to be responsible in Government and to indicate that no expenditure will be permitted until we have a clear way of positively producing funds for the task from what I would claim to be a more legitimate source than the measure which we are being asked to support tonight.

We have the position where the Premier, on the figures relating to expenditure to 30 June 1983, saw a blow-out of \$26 000 000 of additional (and I emphasise 'additional') Government spending. Even allowing for those contingency situations which arise as well as the \$6 000 000 at least \$20 000 000 can still be identified as resulting from excessive spending by the present Government.

A clear indication exists that the fund of money made available from the Commonwealth, along with the good heartedness of the people of this State, who raised \$11 500 000 towards public hand-outs for people blighted by both flooding and fires, did not have a direct major impact on the Government's Budget. We find that a large number of the outstanding accounts for both the floods and fires had not been concluded by 30 June 1983.

When we come, at a later stage, to a full Budget consideration and, more particularly, to the Estimates Committees, one will certainly want to look at where the additional funds arising from the Commonwealth and made available to the State for those tragedies were hidden up to and including 30 June. I wish again to clearly point out that this Government has failed in the period of time that it has occupied the Treasury benches, to learn to say 'No' in those areas where the word 'No' should apply. It has had a *laissez faire* type of approach to those who say 'Give me'.

The 'Give me' has been far greater than the ability of the State to fund. We cannot, whether in 1983-84, in 1984-85 or onwards, impose upon the people of South Australia additional costs in this way. I can assure the Minister that the voice comes out just as well whether the collar is over or under the coat, and I do not need assistance from the Minister of Local Government as to how I might stand in this House.

Mr Olsen: The temporary Minister.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: My Leader has said that the Minister is only temporary. I believe that that temporary status is getting closer and closer to finality, as we will find in relation to another issue. The problems facing South Australia are greater at this moment than those in other States, although I can imagine that the Victorian Government, having lost a High Court case in respect of funds for its financial affairs associated with the pipeline, may be claiming that it is in a worse situation than is South Australia. However, the basis of my statement is another premise—

that, regrettably, South Australia has a much higher proportion of unemployment.

Our higher degree of unemployment requires that a greater sum be raised to assist in the general welfare area. I have suggested that the Government stimulate to advantage the employment of a large number of people by permanent measures rather than by temporary measures, a course on which the Government is embarking. I also note that this measure imposes on licensed premises an increase of 33.3 per cent, and that impost is far greater than is the impost of taxation measures, which we have been asked to consider under other legislation. This measure relates to an area in which we would normally expect to be seeking an improvement in employment and a reduction in spending. Motels, hotels, wineries, and tourist establishments, which will be embraced by this measure, come under an area that we are constantly advised has the greatest opportunity for up-turn of employment and, therefore, overall benefit to the State.

That overall benefit arises not only from the fact that people are employed but also because people are spending and thus are generating opportunities for further employment. Those people are injecting funds into a large number of communities across the State, and the only form of income for many small communities, other than pensions or income from service industries, is derived from generated tourist activity. It is important for those people that there be no impediment on those activities. The measure before us tonight will result in an impediment on the activities of the direct and associated tourist activities.

This increase is compounded by a general increase in the cost of fuel generated by the State and Federal Governments, which will, in its own right, impact upon the tourist industry. This increase, plus increases in stamp duty, and, in due course, the financial institutions duty (if it is implemented), will be a continued impediment to increased employment generally in South Australia. But, more specifically, this measure will add another straw to the back of the camel of tourism.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: As the Leader so ably indicates, another area which will impact upon the increases that I have already mentioned is the element of inflation associated with the c.p.i.; yet no action has been taken by the Government in relation to that. Therefore, we are being asked to accept a pig-in-a-poke in the sense that whilst there are identifiable sums of \$2 000 000 in 1983-84 and \$7 000 000 in 1984-85 there is a further increase which has not yet been identified by the Government. Here again, we come back to the challenge that the Premier identified in the first few lines of his speech, that is, that we have no alternative. One of the alternatives that the Government ought to have looked at, not only in relation to this Bill and other taxing measures but also in relation to all Bills (and I do not refer to other Bills except in passing), before it introduced this Bill was its assessed impact upon the community generally. There is no defined or assessed impact on the community in relation to these measures. They are hidden costs. They are costs above the increase in tax from 9 per cent to 12 per cent in the hospitality industry. When I say the 'hospitality industry', I mean hotels, motels and other parts of the tourist industry to which we have been referring.

If the Government had had the fortitude and foresight to put this measure, along with others that we have been required to consider, through a sieve, it would have been able to gain a far better appreciation of their total impact upon the community. I believe that there would have been a worthwhile revolution among Government back-benchers, who are here to represent the people (in the same way as Opposition members are here to represent the people), to the extent that they should have informed the Government

that it could not introduce these taxes because they are not in the best interests of the people of South Australia. I am quite convinced that this measure is not in the best interests of the people of South Australia. It is certainly not in the best interests of the people I represent in the Clare Valley on the fringes of the Barossa Valley, or at Morgan, which is a recognised holiday resort area.

This measure is certainly not going to assist the many people associated with the horse fraternity in and about the Gawler area. The horse fraternity collectively provides amusement not only by way of galloping and trotting but also by way of show-ring events such as show jumping and other equestrian events. Their costs in presenting this entertainment have been increased by the generality of the measure we are considering at the moment. I am advised that, in the District of Light, the dollar percentage of the \$4 000 000 downturn in the South Australian Brewing Company's expenditure, which will have an ongoing effect because of the number of organisations which relied on generated or increased spending power coming from that company, amounts to about \$100 000.

It is difficult to know how to identify or define that sum. However, I am advised by people in the district who have regard to the capital expenditure of the South Australian Brewing Company, that that is the order of the loss to the general economy in that area. That is just one district out of 47. When the Deputy Premier looks at the loss of spending within his district, in the Adelaide city area alone, the loss is considerable. As a Parliament, we are responsible for either accepting that loss or denying its effect. I am pleased to be able to advise that, from this side of the House, we will be seeking to deny the loss by opposing this Bill, which is not in the best interests of the hospitality industry or the people of this State.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON (Torrens): I, too, oppose this measure. I want to congratulate the member for Light for laying out before this House the effects of this measure on the South Australian community. Amongst other things the member for Light referred to the influence of this measure and four other tax measures that the Premier has announced, some of which have been through this House, in regard to the consumer price index, on the hospitality industry and on other areas in South Australia.

The most deleterious effect of this measure, aligned with the other four measures, will be on employment in this State. Nothing is more important in South Australia at the moment than the employment situation. As the Leader said earlier, we now have a State which has not only the highest prices in terms of cost of living and the highest rate of cost of living, but we have also the highest unemployment level as well.

The Government is introducing another of five taxation measures seeking to impose further imposts on the people of South Australia. The others include the Business Franchise (Tobacco) Act Amendment Bill, the Business Franchise (Petroleum Products) Act Amendment Bill, the financial institutions duty and the additional tax in relation to stamp duty. These five measures represent one of the most extraordinary turn-arounds in South Australia's Parliamentary history. Never before have I seen a promise made by a Leader of a Party so definitively broken within 10 months of coming to Government. It has been one of the most amazing things that one could ever see in politics. There has been no clouding of the issue: there has been a definitive breaking of a promise—a promise made before the last State election that there would be no taxation increases by the Government during its Parliamentary term.

Within 10 months of its coming to Government, we have had five new taxation measures, four of which have been

before this Parliament. I really believe that that is the most amazing confidence trick, because the people of South Australia knew what the then Leader of the Opposition said before the last State election. They knew that when they went to the polls and, no doubt, that promise influenced them when they cast their votes. They voted in this A.L.P. Government, and I repeat—and it cannot be repeated often enough—that within 10 months we have had five new taxation measures.

This measure, which is to increase the liquor licence fee by some one-third, is estimated to bring in another \$7 000 000 to revenue in a full year. Incidentally, I hope that this time, with this measure, the Premier will be prepared to tell this House, when he sums up the debate and replies to members on this side of the House, and to tell the people of South Australia, through this Parliament, what the effect on the consumer price index is estimated to be. Despite close and continued questioning on the Business Franchise (Petroleum Products) Bill, the Premier could not and would not tell this House what the effect would be on the c.p.i. As was mentioned at that time, there is ample expertise in the Treasury and in the Premier's Department to provide a projection of the c.p.i. increase occasioned by a taxation measure. I hope very much that the Premier will undertake to let the house have that information.

As I was saying, this taxation measure is designed to bring in \$7 000 000 in a full year. Being a taxation measure, it brings me to another point concerning a statement that the Premier made today in this House in Question Time in response to a Dorothy Dix question asked by a member opposite. The Premier said that there is a difference of opinion between my colleague the member for Davenport, the leader of the Opposition, and me. He said that this difference of opinion was that the member for Davenport and I had called for a withdrawal of some of these taxation measures, whereas a few weeks ago the Leader of the Opposition had said that there was some case for some increased taxation.

On the surface, and as presented by the Premier today, that may appear to be a truthful statement but, of course, it is not, and the Premier knew that very well. What the Leader of the Opposition was saying a few weeks ago when he made that statement was that there should be a temporary increase in some taxation to cover the short-fall occasioned by the recent disastrous bush fires and flooding in this State. That is very different from saying that the Leader of the Opposition was calling for increased taxation in this State in a general fashion, as we are seeing the Government do here and now.

I want to develop a little further the theme of State taxation and this particular legislation, because the Premier has said (in fact, he repeated it as recently as this afternoon) that he believes that it is an unhealthy practice (they are his own words) to use money allocated to capital works to prop up the Revenue Budget. In fact, the Premier has criticised the Opposition for using capital works funds in its term in Government to prop up the Revenue Budget, despite the fact that the Premier is to transfer an extra \$10 000 000 over and above the previous amount from capital works to revenue. When one adds the money to be collected from the business franchise (petroleum products) legislation (another taxation measure), which is no longer to be paid into the Highways Fund but into general revenue, we are looking at an extra \$20 000 000 being transferred from potential capital works funds to prop up the Revenue Budget, despite the fact that the Premier deplores this practice and said so this afternoon.

The \$7 000 000 that is coming from this legislation will go into the Revenue Budget. However, despite that, an extra \$20 000 000 over and above what was transferred last year

will go into the Revenue Budget from capital works expenditure, and the Premier makes an announcement that there will be a massive increase in funding of capital works. Once again, he has perpetrated a financial confidence trick on the people of South Australia, because that will not happen.

Let us take one instance. The Premier said today that \$24 000 000 was to be spent on the school building and redevelopment programme. Yet, when we look at last year's allocation for the school building and redevelopment programme, we find that under the previous Government it was \$26 700 000. That represents a reduction of \$2 700 000 in money terms, and of 18 per cent in real terms. Yet, the Premier is saying that we will get this massive injection of funds into the capital Budget. That just does not wash.

Despite the fact that \$7 000 000 is coming from this legislation in a full year (\$2 000 000 this year and \$7 000 000 in a full year), and despite the taxation that will come from the other four measures, there will be a reduction in the school building programme of 18 per cent in real terms. What sort of commitment is that? I am very pleased that the Minister of Public Works is in the House, because it is his responsibility. I would hope that he fought for this in the Cabinet, and that he fought for an increased allocation for the school building programme when the Budget was being discussed in Cabinet. However, a statement from the Premier this afternoon lays out the programme of the Minister of Public Works. This is an extraordinary situation. Before the Budget is even brought into this place all the taxation measures have been introduced, so what are we going to debate when the Budget is introduced?

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Mayes): Order!

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. This is a serious matter: there are two standards, one opposed to the other. In regard to the rest of this magnificent announcement made today we find that, once again, despite the money coming in from taxation measures, we are told that the Government is to continue with the O-Bahn project. We have been informed that the O-Bahn will be constructed west of Darley Road by 1986. In fact, the Government has slowed the programme down, because the previous Government would have had the whole thing completed in 1986.

Another momentous announcement was made about having the Adelaide to Glenelg tramline upgraded, although I announced that over 12 months ago, and my colleagues from the seaside councils referred to that matter over 12 months ago. Yet it is referred to in this momentous statement about capital works, despite the \$7 000 000 to be derived from the licensing legislation before the House and despite the fact that the Premier is transferring \$20 000 000 extra from the capital works line to recurrent expenditure. All the announcements are related to decisions made by the previous Government. For instance, the Government is to begin construction of a new remand centre, although that centre would have been constructed by now had the previous Government continued in office. The Government intends to continue the development of harbour facilities and the development of an industrial estate adjacent to the port of Adelaide as part of its plan to attract overseas shipping.

However, the development of harbour facilities and the industrial estate at Port Adelaide were begun by the former Premier, Mr Corcoran, when he was Minister of Marine, and were continued by the previous Government under the jurisdiction of my colleague the member for Victoria, and then under my jurisdiction, with the assistance of the member for Davenport in his capacity as Minister of Public Works. Yet, here in this momentous announcement the present Government has stated that it will continue with the devel-

opment of the harbour facilities at Port Adelaide. The shipping community will be pleased to hear that.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: What about the work that is to begin on the museum? When David Tonkin was Premier he went down and ordered some work.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Indeed, as the member for Davenport says, in regard to the announcement of a new wing for the museum, once again, that announcement is two years old.

Mr Becker: What about the Japanese/South Australian shipping agreement?

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I am pointing out the ridiculous nature of the statement made by the Premier this afternoon. A continuation of the Torrens River linear park and flood mitigation scheme was announced by my colleague the member for Chaffey, who said that it was to be part of the previous Government's sesqui-centenary programme.

Mr Becker: Started 12 months ago.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Yes. The work on the flood mitigation scheme is almost complete.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I draw to the honourable member's attention the Speaker's earlier ruling, and I ask the honourable member to refer to the Bill before the House.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. I will leave that, and I thank you for your ruling. I finish on that matter by pointing out that it was the previous Government that called tenders for the new Aberfoyle Park school which is mentioned in this statement to which you do not wish me to refer any longer, nor will I. I conclude my remarks by repeating that five taxation measures in the space of a few short weeks (despite the promise by the Premier of no further taxation) added to all the increases in charges (water rates, electricity, public transport fares) must be the most pernicious litany of taxation charges ever to be imposed on the public of a State in so short a time. The Government deserves to be condemned for it, and I state that I will oppose this Bill because the people of South Australia have had perpetrated on them a confidence trick which they do not deserve.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN (Davenport): In speaking against this Bill, I wish to draw attention to the effect of this increase in tax on the development of this State, and also relate that to the increase in other taxes which have occurred. I will be very brief but I think it appropriate that, when one looks at our State and sees that it has the highest unemployment rate, one needs to look at what factors should be considered when introducing any new taxing measures. I would have thought that the first priority of the Premier would be to ask the question: what effect will this particular tax increase have on any State development and on any employment opportunities in South Australia? Dealing with this and the other tax increases, first, the liquor tax will have an obvious effect not only on the brewing industry of this State but also on the wine industry.

As this State accounts for about 65 per cent of Australia's wine production, I find it incredible that this Government is almost leading the way in setting an example of taxing major industry in the wine and the beverage industry. Those two components of the liquor industry comprise a very considerable portion of the State's primary production and manufacturing production. It staggers me what percentage of beer sales goes out of South Australia, and what percentage goes out of Australia.

On two occasions I have launched export drives on behalf of Coopers Brewery and the South Australian Brewing Company. Both those brewers have now developed very sizable markets, particularly in the Pacific region, and I understand that Coopers' low alcohol beer is establishing itself on the American market. Taxing that industry, even though it is

in the wholesale area, will have an adverse effect on these two brewers. Then, of course, there is the adverse effect on the wine industry. However, it is more than just what effect this particular tax will have on South Australia: South Australia is showing the other States of Australia that it is not scared to tax the liquor industry, particularly the wine industry. I believe, therefore, that that sets a very bad example for the Federal Government and for other State Governments which are likely to follow suit. I find it quite incredible and hypocritical of the Premier to have made such a song and dance about any wine tax being imposed by the Federal Government, and then, following the Federal Budget, to criticise it, while at the same time applying very substantial increases in liquor tax in South Australia.

In fact, the Premier has imposed on the wine and brewing industry of this State an additional \$8 000 000 a year through this taxation. That must have an impact on the demand for the product. We all know that the sale of alcohol is not an inflexible demand and, as the price goes up, so consumption tends to drop off. Hence, by imposing an additional \$8 000 000 on the liquor wholesale industry, the Premier is, in fact, simply reducing consumption particularly of our brewed products such as beer, wine and fortified spirits. So, no doubt exists that this taxing measure will adversely affect the State's economic development in that area.

I also draw a comparison (as it is the appropriate time to do so) as to what effect the other tax increases will have. We have the 1c a litre increased tax on motor spirits. In Question Time today, the Premier said that the fuel tax in South Australia was only 1.5 cents. That was certainly the case before his announcement about three weeks ago. However, the fuel tax that will now apply in South Australia as from 1 September will be 2.5c a litre. I draw to the attention of the House what this means. From fuel, the State Government takes about 2.5c with its business franchise tax. The Federal Government takes a massive 25.5c a litre, some in excise duty, some through the import parity levy and some through the bicentenary road development programme levy. So, for every litre of petrol purchased, the motorist is paying the Federal and State Governments 28c a litre. That means that, if one fills up one's Commodore, one is paying to the Federal and State Government about \$17.

Mr Becker: A week?

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Well, every time one fills up the tank one is paying \$17 to the Federal and State Governments combined. I find that absolutely staggering. Yet, which industry is absolutely vital to the manufacturing and primary industry sectors of this State? It is the transport industry. Without it we will not get our manufactured goods to markets in Melbourne and Sydney. As the Deputy Premier, who is now sitting in the House, well knows, 85 per cent of our manufactured products are sent interstate. I challenge the Deputy Premier to deny that fact. Yet, the Government is turning around and imposing on that industry an additional \$15 000 000 a year, knowing that it will have to be passed on to the manufacturers involved who then become less competitive against their interstate counterparts. So, it is a significant additional burden to impose on industry. I stress that industry is not a bottomless pit of funds that can continually pay out money to meet increased Government charges and taxes.

On top of that, we are supposed to be debating later this evening the increase in stamp duty tax on insurance which, again, will be a direct additional tax on business in this State. On top of that also, the Premier, having promised that he would not do it, has decided to introduce the financial institutions duty. We do not know what the rate will be but the suggestion from leaked information is that it may be as high as .4 per cent. If it is that high, it will be the highest in Australia. The other States which have such a duty at

present—New South Wales and Victoria—have it at a level of .3 per cent. So, if the Premier selects .4 per cent he will be selecting the highest rate for that duty in Australia. Again, it will be a direct tax imposed on the business community in this State.

In addition, the State Government has increased the cost of water by 22 per cent this year, which means that business in South Australia is now having to pay more for its water than is business in any other State. On top of that, public transport fares have been increased by an average of 47 per cent, electricity charges have increased by 12 per cent, and before long there could well be, due to a backdoor taxing measure, a further 6 per cent increase in electricity charges.

During the past three or four months there has been an extraordinary increase in State Government charges and new taxes have been imposed. That will have an adverse effect on the State's economy and employment. I make a plea to the Government not to proceed with this measure, and not to impose an extra 1c tax on motor fuel, because I believe that these two taxes will have the biggest single impact on industry in this State. For those reasons, I intend to oppose the measure.

Mr Becker: They are highly inflationary.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Yes. Both the liquor tax and the fuel tax are very inflationary. They will have a big impact on the consumer price index in this State. In fact, they are likely to push up the c.p.i. in South Australia in comparison to the c.p.i. in other States, and again increase the cost of living. Those taxes will develop the reputation that South Australia has borne for the past 12 months as the State with the highest inflation rate in Australia. It is a rather dubious honour that South Australia has the highest inflation rate and the highest unemployment rate in Australia, and now it has an increasing level of State Government taxes per capita which is the highest in Australia. As the Tonkin Government went from office, it could state that South Australia had the lowest State Government taxing level per capita of any State in Australia, but the present Government has destroyed that. I oppose the proposal. This measure is against the best interests of the State.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Coles): The Opposition is well justified in opposing this measure and the other State taxation measures that the Government has introduced. In all, five measures, affecting the cost of fuel, liquor, tobacco, stamp duty, and financial transactions, are to be considered by this Parliament in this session. Every single one of those taxes, particularly the tax that we are currently considering, will impact very heavily indeed on the tourism industry. I wish to ask the Premier and the Minister of Tourism a rhetorical question, which I hope that the Premier will answer when he responds to the second reading debate: 'What does the Government believe is a tax affecting the tourism industry?'

Clearly, the Government does not believe that these taxes on liquor, fuel, tobacco, stamp duty and financial transactions affect the tourism industry, because the Minister of Tourism did not consult with the tourism industry about these taxes despite his promise to consult with the industry before the State Government imposed any tax that would affect the industry. Clearly, the Government believes that these taxes will not affect the tourism industry. However, I will demonstrate that this liquor tax will have a profound and adverse effect on the tourism industry as, indeed, will the other taxes that the Government has imposed and intends to impose.

It is an extraordinary situation when the Minister of Tourism can stand up in this House and state that he will consult with the tourism industry before a tax is imposed and then, when taxes are announced by his Premier and

when he is questioned in this House as to why he did not consult, he says, unblushingly, that the industry understood that he would consult on taxes that specifically affected it. What does the Minister believe will specifically affect the tourism industry? Has he in mind perhaps a bed tax, which could be imposed on hotels? If he has that in mind, I submit that that tax will be no more specific than will a liquor, fuel, or tobacco tax, stamp duty, or financial institutions duty, because each of these taxes will have a very definite effect on the tourism industry.

The Bill before us tonight provides for the licence fee, which is paid on the value of liquor sales, to be increased from 9 per cent of liquor turnover to 12 per cent of that turnover—a whacking great 33⅓ per cent increase. In a full year this increase will net the Government increased revenue of \$7 000 000, which will be extracted from the largest and most important section of the tourism industry (namely, the hospitality industry) yet the Minister can stand in this House and say that this is not a tax which specifically affects the tourism industry.

In the current year the Government will gain \$2 000 000 from this tax, taken from an industry which the Government promised to foster and support, with which the Government promised to do great things. So much for those great things! In the space of the past fortnight the Government has taken tens of millions of dollars from operators in the South Australian tourism industry. When those imposts are added to the levies imposed by its Federal partner, the Hawke Labor Government, one sees that there are more tens of millions of dollars extracted from the tourism industry in South Australia.

The tax now before the House also relates to the licence fee based on liquor sales by wholesalers and vigneron to unlicensed persons. So, it is not only hotels and the direct hospitality industry, as we understand it, but also the wine industry and cellar door sales (which are an integral part of the tourism industry in South Australia) that are affected. Traditionally, vigneron have had to pay 80 per cent of the standard rate fixed for wholesale purchase by retailers. The current rate that vigneron pay is 7.2 per cent. That rate is to be increased to 9.6 per cent.

I am pleased to note that the fee relating to low-alcohol liquor will remain at 2 per cent as determined by the Tonkin Government when in office as a measure to encourage responsible drinking and to provide an incentive for consumption of low-alcohol liquor. At least the Bannon Government has not tinkered with that (that is the only thing it has not tinkered with). I would like to deal now with the impact of this tax on hotels, because they represent that section of the industry which will have to pay the vast bulk of the \$7 000 000 that will be obtained by the Government in a full year from this tax.

Hotels represent one of the most decentralised industries in the State. In fact, there would scarcely be a country town in South Australia that does not have at least one hotel. Because of the decentralisation of the hotel industry, it also provides the best employment opportunities for unskilled people, for the young, for women and for migrants. I refer to the first page of the Government's tourism policy. Paragraph 3 states:

Tourism is labour intensive. It can further employment opportunities for those groups most affected by economic downturns, women, the young, the unskilled and semi-skilled, and migrants.

They are the very people who are employed in hotels: they are the very people whose employment will be placed at risk as a result of this tax. There is no doubt whatever that jobs in the hotel industry will go as a result of the imposition of this tax. This is confirmed in a report in the *News* of 24 August 1983 headed 'Hotel jobs to go'. The report states:

A very significant number of jobs would be lost in hotels because of the Federal Budget, the Australian Hotels Association (S.A. Branch) said today.

This was on top of the statement already made by the association in respect of the State liquor tax. The report continues:

The situation would be compounded by the previously announced State licence fee increases to apply in April, the association's chief executive officer, Mr W.T. Spurr said. He said the hotel and brewing industries were horrified at the latest beer price increases. The industries had gone to enormous lengths to point out to Governments how continuing excise and other imposts were affecting trade—and therefore profits and employment.

Trade had dropped significantly since the huge extra imposts imposed by the Whitlam and Fraser Governments. Mr Spurr said the actions of the Federal and State Governments could only fuel the situation. 'It's a fact job losses follow each excise rise.'

The hotel industry in South Australia employs about 9 300 people, which represents about one quarter of all the people employed in tourism in South Australia. Hotels, as a single sector of the industry, are undoubtedly the largest employer of semi-skilled and unskilled labour. That employment capacity of the hotel industry is backed by a capital investment of about \$350 000 000. It is tremendously important that the Government and the community understand that the prospect of capital investment being further developed represents one of our best prospects for job creation.

Indeed, the Leader of the Opposition pointed out in his speech that, as a result of this tax, the South Australian brewing company intends not to proceed with \$4 000 000 in capital investment that had been planned for the upgrading of hotels throughout the State. That \$350 000 000 could have been increased by at least \$4 000 000 for South Australian Brewing Company hotels and, no doubt, by a substantial additional sum for hotels in the ownership of other companies. However, as a result of the imposition of this tax, that development will not now proceed.

I referred to the employment of 9 300 people in the hotel industry and the certainty that that employment will be reduced as a result of this tax. We are now talking about capital investment and the inability of companies to proceed with capital increases in the hotel industry because of this tax, which means that we are talking about an adverse effect on hotel employees, especially unskilled and semi-skilled workers, and we are talking about an adverse effect on the skilled and semi-skilled workers in the building and construction industries who would have been employed in upgrading and new development in hotels.

Clearly, \$4 000 000 of development represents many pay packets for many carpenters, joiners, electricians, carpet layers, painters, decorators, small country businesses, and big businesses in Adelaide. Many people would have received pay packets out of that \$4 000 000. That will now not take place. Another interesting statistic that has been used many times in this House previously is that for each dollar spent in a hotel by visitors a further \$2.52 is generated within the local community. There is no doubt, as Mr Spurr has said, that consumers will spend less on liquor and, as a result, those single dollars, which multiply to \$2.52, will be reduced and the multiplier effect on local communities will not be as beneficial as it has been in the past.

The hotel industry in this State pays \$86 000 000 per annum in wages. As a result of this tax and the decrease in employment, we can expect that \$86 000 000 to be significantly reduced in the forthcoming 12 months. In addition to the \$86 000 000 paid in wages the hotel industry in South Australia pays out about \$55 000 000 a year on a multitude of services. These services range from maintenance and improvement services, painting and decorating, to services which are important to small businesses in country towns,

that is, the supply of flowers, food and goods of all kinds that are necessary in the hospitality industry.

My next point is critical to the Bill that we are debating. The industry currently pays \$12 000 000 per annum in State liquor licensing fees and yet, as a result of this Bill, an additional \$7 000 000 will be paid, bringing the total for the next full financial year to \$19 000 000, which is a very large sum to extract from an industry that the Government says it is trying to sustain, support and encourage. The Hotels Association states that the annual expenditure on purchases of wine, spirits and beer is \$164 000 000. In an earlier Address in Reply debate I pointed out that a Government attains enormous political power over a community when it seeks additional economic power.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: This will cost the industry over \$50 000 000.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: More than that. When one takes into account the cumulative and multiplier effects of this tax, not only in the payment of the tax but in the revenue foregone as a result of it, it will certainly add up to tens of millions of dollars. This tax (which will provide an additional \$7 000 000), and the other State taxes imposed in the four other measures that the Government has introduced, will allow the Government to deprive South Australians of the freedom of choice in terms of spending power amounting to literally tens of millions of dollars. The Government has aggregated unto itself the decision on how those tens of millions of dollars will be spent. It has taken away from individuals and mainly small businesses the decision as to how that money will be spent. That represents a vast shift of political power from individuals to a centralised Government that is unwilling to impose on itself the same restraints that it is imposing on the people that it claims to represent.

That is the crux of this matter, and that is why the Leader of the Opposition spoke with such force and vigour about the comparative record of the Tonkin Liberal Government in reducing the taxation burden (and thus enlarging the freedom of the individual and the community to choose how disposable income should be spent) and the record of this Government in depriving individuals of that choice by virtual extortion under false pretences (because the Government prior to the election said that it would not do what it is about to do) of literally millions of dollars by means of State taxation. The Government will allocate that money for purposes which it believes to be fit, but which may not be in accord with what the consumer and the individual would have chosen had they had a choice in relation to its expenditure.

The final interesting figure about expenditure within the hotel industry in South Australia is that it spends \$30 000 000 per annum on purchasing food. It could well be that the purchase of food will be reduced because of a reduction in hotel patronage by drinkers. Consequently liquor sales and food sales will suffer a downturn. That will certainly have a big impact on small businesses in country towns, because most country hotels in a spirit of community co-operation make their purchases through retailers in those towns. If one goes into a hotel in a small town like Kingscote on the day that it receives its supplies, one will see that those supplies come from the local grocer, baker and butcher. For every reduction in a food order per week there will be an effect on the profitability of food retailers in small country towns. That in itself could exacerbate the spiral of unemployment resulting from these taxes.

The Australian Hotels Association has pointed out that employment in hotels has dropped substantially because of the last three excise increases. Permanent jobs are rapidly disappearing and inhibiting career opportunities. Casual employees are approaching 90 per cent of the total in all

Eastern States. Those figures are interesting when one considers that the majority of people who lost jobs as the result of the recent excise increases are in the 18 to 35 age group, young family people trying to support a household by means of their jobs. No industry (especially the hotel industry) can survive if taxes prevent them from keeping pace with natural growth.

One of the outcomes that I fear as a result of the increased liquor turnover tax is not only a reduction in employment but also a marked reduction in standards of service. Particularly in country towns and small hotels, the publicans and their spouses are the pivot point around which the staff of the hotels revolve. Those people invariably work between 60 and 80 hours a week in an effort to make their hotel profitable, to maintain a hospitable presence and to literally act, in fact as well as in name, as the host and hostess. Because of the reduction in profitability that will inevitably occur as a result of this taxation, hotel proprietors and their spouses will have to work even longer hours if they are to maintain viability. They will have less time to spare for the oversight of staff and important host and hostess work that takes place in relation to house guests, particularly in country towns.

I cannot help reflecting on the impact of this tax on the excellent town and country pubs scheme that was launched by the Australian Hotels Association early this year. The scheme was launched to attract people to town and country pubs and let them have the benefit of comparatively cheap accommodation in often picturesque, warm and hospitable surroundings. The mainstay of the town and country pub scheme is the capacity of a publican to provide hospitality in terms of warmth and friendliness, and the capacity to recommend to house guests the kind of day trips that they can take and the kind of interesting facilities that might be available in the town.

No longer will the publican have the time to do that; he or she will be trying to make up for the loss of employees who have been retrenched because of the diminished viability of the hotel due to this tax. This tax is a disaster for the hotel industry. I do not see how the State Government can expect the generosity of community support and the philanthropy for which hotels in this State are renowned if it continues to soak the industry in the way that it has and deprive it of its very ability to perform the function for which it exists, namely, hospitality in the true sense of the word.

I refer now to the effect of this tax on vigneron. My colleagues who have spoken before me have amply demonstrated the hypocrisy and, indeed, the deceit of various members of the Opposition in claiming that there is no Federal wine tax. Quite demonstrably there is, and this liquor turnover tax will be yet another burden that the vigneron must bear. It is perhaps not well known that most, if not all, wine companies in South Australia are operating on very fine margins. They are experiencing difficulties with cash flow, and they are therefore trying to convert stocks into cash. In order to do that they are turning, in a highly competitive situation, to the technique of discounting. That is why, from the point of view of consumers, we are getting the benefit of extraordinarily cheap wine, which may create in the minds of some people the notion that the wine companies can afford to sustain a tax because they are selling their product at such a very low price. That is an entirely erroneous view. Because the companies have been attempting to convert stock to cash and have been discounting their product in order to achieve that goal, they are now working on extremely narrow margins with little margin of profit and, as a result, have very little in the way of funds available for diversion into capital development.

This is happening at a time when capital development is essential to get the economy going and to get employment on the move. So, the same situation that applies to the South Australian Brewing Company in its forgoing capital development of \$4 000 000 because of the impact of this tax also exists in regard to the wine companies. No longer will we see the kind of expansion that took place at Thomas Hardy and Sons at Reynella, the kind of superb addition to the tourism industry in South Australia undertaken at the expense of the wine companies to enhance their facilities and attract visitors, to develop some kind of brand loyalty while in the process of providing a fillip to the local tourism industry. We simply will not see that kind of capital development taking place because the wine companies will not have the capital funds to make it possible. There is no question that the wine companies and the hotels will simply draw in their horns. The incentive that the Government claimed that it would give to the industry to expand and develop will simply not materialise.

In the time available to me I have not been able to refer to the South Australian tourism development plan and its forecast of job creation on an annual basis if we can achieve a 10 per cent growth over the next five years. There is no doubt that, if a plan were being evaluated again by the tourism industry this week, there would have to be a recasting of that possibility of a 10 per cent growth. There is no way that an industry can expand and grow when literally it is being compressed down to its bare bones by the continued imposition of taxation measures by both State and Federal Governments.

The hospitality industry will be affected by this tax. The hospitality industry is the back-bone of the tourism industry. It provides the greatest opportunity for employment development. It will now suffer and employment will be reduced, not only direct employment but indirect employment, in terms of opportunities forgone for capital development. The Government stands thoroughly condemned, both for its lack of foresight and for its deceit on two counts: first, in undertaking not to increase State taxation; and secondly, in promising to consult with the tourism industry before any taxation affecting the industry was introduced. That promise was given in this House, it was repeated in writing and an unequivocal assurance was given to the South Australian Tourism Industry Council by the Minister. That assurance has been breached not once, not twice, not thrice, but five times. The Minister and the Government stand condemned, and I certainly support the Opposition in opposing this measure.

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

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

Motion carried.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): There must be literally countless thousands of South Australians who are kicking themselves to death at this time for having allowed themselves to be conned in the way they were in November last year. If there is one thing that the people of South Australia will not tolerate and about which they will clearly indicate their annoyance at the next State election, it is to be treated as though they are idiots: that is exactly what this Government did. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition read out in some detail to this House many of the statements and promises made by the current Premier in his election speech prior to the last State election. The number of South Australians who took the now Premier at face value and who have been totally and utterly disillusioned as a result of the faith they placed in him at that time is beyond belief.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: A spate of broken promises.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: There is no doubt about that whatsoever. The Premier gave a complete and unequivocal assurance to the people of South Australia that there would be no increase in taxes during the three years of a Labor Government. The Premier referred to the Auditor-General's Report as the document on which he could give that unequivocal assurance. What is he saying now? Is he saying that the Auditor-General's Report is crook? If he is, let him get up in this House and say so. That was the basis of his statement to the people that there was no need to increase taxes in South Australia during the three-year period of a Labor Government.

That undertaking has been broken time and time again. We see the sheer audacity of the Premier in coming into this House and introducing a Bill such as that that we are now debating, in the light of his little public performance of heading off to Canberra and trying to make arrangements with the Prime Minister that there would be no wine tax or excise on fortified spirit used in the production of fortified wines. This measure is a direct impost on the liquor industry, increasing tax from 9 per cent to 12 per cent. We have seen the Government increase water rates in the irrigated areas by an incredible 28 per cent, which has a direct effect on the wine industry. Yet the Premier has the nerve, the audacity, to put on a public performance in South Australia claiming that he is fighting for the interests of the State, the wine industry, and the wine grape growers of this State by endeavouring to stave off a wine tax, and what is more, he claims to have been successful.

The fact that the wine excise will cost the wine industry and grapegrowers of South Australia something like \$20 000 000 is of little consequence, according to the Premier. That is absolutely beyond belief. Where does the problem lie with this Government? One only has to analyse the front bench. We can start with the Premier. We have a Premier in South Australia who has made those incredible election promises to the people of this State—a Premier who has never been out in the real world. He has lived a protected life from the time he was at school, after school through university and through employment within the Government service. He has never been out in the real world. He has never been a small business operator. The only business he has ever tried to run in his life is running the State. He has had no experience whatsoever. He has never run a corner delicatessen or any small business whatsoever.

Yet, he puts himself forward to the people of South Australia on the basis of a lot of false election undertakings and promises which he knows he has not a chance in a million of keeping. He places himself before the people on that basis without one ounce of experience whatsoever and without ever having run a small business undertaking employing even one or two people. Yet, he wants to run the whole of the State. We can see the disastrous results we are getting. That can be said of most of his Cabinet. We can hardly find a single member in Cabinet with any experience of running a business of any nature whatsoever. So, what hope has the State got? The people of South Australia will come to recognise this by the time the next State election comes around.

The Premier proudly got up in this House a few days ago and extolled the virtues of having been awarded a Tennyson medal. I venture to say that Sir Thomas Playford never obtained a Tennyson medal but he could have taught the Premier a few lessons when it comes to running a business and running the finances of this State. One only has to look at his record to see how he went about it: through careful management and not by expanding the Public Service. He made sure that he lived within his means, the same as any business operator has to do.

Whether a large or small business undertaking, the first lesson is to live within your means or you are out of business. However, the Premier is working on the assumption that all one has to do is extract more money from the public. Nothing could be further from the truth. If he does not learn that lesson very quickly he will not have much chance in Government to learn it in the future. The people of South Australia will not tolerate that sort of action. The action he is taking will virtually destroy the financial base of this State, and it will take years to recover.

The industries which he is attacking have been clearly outlined by members on this side of the House. This tax has a devastating effect on the liquor industries. As the member for Coles has just said, it will have a devastating effect on the tourist industry, which largely revolves around hotels, motels and principally the liquor industry—one of the vital parts of tourism in South Australia. The Government is taking away the ability of that industry to improve its facilities, yet, to put money back into the vital facilities which the public demands in this day and age, the money must remain in that industry. It is the same with any other industry: whether it be tourism, agriculture, horticulture or any small business in South Australia—in fact, whether it is small or large—the same principle applies.

What will the farming industry do? It will curb its spending: it will limit the amount it spends on new vehicles, fencing, and any other requirements on a property. That means that the job opportunities in the city will diminish immediately. By increasing taxes one does not provide a quick solution to the problem. If there is no money in the community that can be extracted, one is simply destroying the income base: one is killing the goose that lays the golden egg. The industry must be viable and must expand. No industry can stand still: any industry that does not develop and expand must ultimately go backwards. The Premier has created that situation in South Australia, and that is why the unemployment rate in this State is skyrocketing. Unemployment levels will continue to increase at a far greater rate than occurs in any other State in Australia if the Premier continues on that tack.

How can the Premier understand those fundamentals if he has never run a small business of any type? It is ludicrous that members opposite have had virtually no experience in what I would call the real world. Most members opposite have lived a protected existence, working either in a Government department or working for an employer in private industry. They have never had the responsibility of generating the base income or the cash flow of a business, and that shows clearly in this place.

There is no doubt whatsoever in my mind that the people of South Australia will exercise their right in two years. I can well remember a Government that tried to take the people for a ride some 10 or 12 years ago. The then Premier, Mr Dunstan, endeavoured to take the people of the Riverland for a ride, and I can assure the present Premier and members opposite that people of the Riverland—

The Hon. R.G. Payne: We won Chaffey.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Yes, the Labor Party won Chaffey, but it has not won that seat since, because the people have never forgiven the underhandedness and the dishonesty of the then Premier. People have a long memory, and the response of the people in the Riverland has been very clear ever since that time. If members opposite believe that they can take the public for a ride time and again, they have a lot to learn, because that will not wash. People will remember, and they will not be taken for a ride a second time.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I would like to commence my remarks by quoting from a policy document from the A.L.P.—

The Hon. R.G. Payne: Put the book down and say what you think for once.

Mr OSWALD: Perhaps the honourable member was not at the A.L.P. conference: he may be interested in hearing what was contained in the policy document.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Klunder): Order! The member for Morphett has the floor.

Mr OSWALD: Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. I do not need any help from the honourable member. Perhaps the Minister is not familiar with the policy document. I will proceed, and I will tell the House what the policy document contains. It states quite clearly:

Labor recognises that the tax system has become grossly inequitable since 1975. There has been a deliberate reduction in the progressivity of the tax schedule, rampant tax avoidance and evasion, provision of tax concessions to wealthy groups, and increasing reliance on indirect taxation. A Labor Government will change this situation by basing the tax system firmly on the principle of ability to pay, on the need for an adequate minimum standard of living and on the desirability of reducing inequality in the Australian community.

The policy continues:

To achieve these purposes Labor will—

and here is the crunch line—

reduce the relative incidence of indirect taxation.

I hope that the Minister heard that direct policy statement which refers to a reduction in the relative incidence of indirect taxation. And what did they do as soon as they got into Government? They turned around and not only introduced indirect taxation in the field of wine and spirits but they also tackled cigarettes, petrol and insurance (and we are going to hear about a new f.i.d. to be introduced shortly). Also Housing Trust rents are increasing. These are all indirect taxes.

The Government knows jolly well that it is prepared to raise revenue by any means whatsoever to finance its policies. I suppose that there are members of the public who accept this, but I do not, nor do my constituents. This is backdoor taxation by any reference to the ledger. Usually, when I stand to speak on this subject of taxation, it is interesting to pull out a pamphlet which was placed in letter boxes around my district and which is a litany of broken promises. One can go to any heading, because we are one at a time proving them to be broken promises. One such promise states:

We will stop the use of State charges like transport fares, electricity, water and hospital charges as a form of back-door taxation. We will not introduce new taxes.

I am pleased that the Minister has quietened down and assume that he has done so because he realises that I am on solid ground in suggesting that the Labor Party had as a plank of its policy that it would not indulge in indirect taxation. However, as soon as it got into office what did it do at the State level? It increased charges as a form of indirect taxation, and we are to see a financial institutions duty introduced. At the Federal level they did the same thing in the Budget. This has been a hypocritical and deceptive approach, and the Labor Party will at the next election find out clearly what the public thinks about this.

The Hon. R.G. Payne: How do you reckon you will do at the Boundaries Commission—any good?

Mr OSWALD: I am concerned tonight not about the Boundaries Commission but about what people think the Government is doing to the Treasury in this State.

The Hon. R.G. Payne: What a lot of rubbish.

Mr OSWALD: The Minister may think that this is rubbish, but the people in South Australia do not think it is.

They are not impressed with what the Ministry opposite is doing with the economy of this State at the moment. If the Minister was showing a little interest he would be doing something about stopping the upheaval at Roxby Downs at the moment so that we could do something about improving this State's economy. Instead of laughing he should get up there, show some strength and bring some resolution to the problem that we have on our hands at Olympic Dam.

The Hon. R.G. Payne: I—

The ACTING SPEAKER: Interjections will cease, and the honourable member for Morphett will return to the debate.

Mr OSWALD: I will heed your advice on this matter, Sir. This whole matter of increases in liquor licensing charges is a completely devastating decision so far as the hospitality industry is concerned. There is no doubt that the hotel industry, and the whole of the hospitality industry generally, is being attacked from every angle by both State and Federal Governments by way of excise tax and licensing fees that are being introduced.

It was interesting to hear in early August, when the Premier announced a liquor licence fee increase, that some 53 per cent of the retail price of a bottle of beer in metropolitan Adelaide was absorbed in the licensing tax. I read an article in a newspaper at the time which sketched a bottle of beer showing a breakdown in its costs. Federal Government excise was 45 per cent of the cost, the State Government licensing fee was 7.7 per cent, the retailer took 7.3 per cent, and raw material, production and distribution costs were running at 40 per cent.

This means that out from a bottle of beer worth about \$1, the retailer receives about 7c. With the savage increases in the recent Federal Budget, these costs will be higher, but the profit per bottle will not be higher at all. It is inevitable that sales will drop and, with the resulting loss of profit from the lost sales, what happens? Hotels, motels and restaurants will have to consider their position seriously in regard to profitability. The big risk is that staff may have to be put off.

The problem is that the champagne socialists opposite (and that is an apt description for many of them) will not worry about this because, on their side, they seem to have the obsession that 'profit' is a dirty word. I do not know why, because profit can be related to jobs: without profit, employers cannot employ. If Government members believe that 'profit' is a dirty word, so be it, but it reflects throughout their philosophy and how they present themselves to the business community. The reality is that unless the hospitality industry can make a profit and get a reasonable return on its investment, it will have no option but to put off staff. That is a serious matter, and that is what many businesses in the industry are planning to do.

The liquor industry is tied in closely with the hospitality and tourist industry, and both the Federal and State Labor Governments, through the imposition of taxes and licensing fees, are obviously determined to destroy all incentive for tourism to expand and create jobs. I refer to the Chief Executive Officer of the Australian Hotels Association and his comments on the impact of such taxes, as he sees it. I believe that earlier this evening the member for Coles may have referred to some of these comments, but it will not harm honourable members to hear them again.

Mr Becker: I would be pleased to.

Mr OSWALD: I am sure that the honourable member would be pleased to hear those comments. Government members and members of the public would be interested to hear of the impact of these licence fees on our hospitality industry. The press report states:

'Our survival is threatened.' Beer sales—which made up 70 per cent of hotel liquor sales—dropped 6 per cent after last year's

Budget. In 1982, the Federal Government lifted the excise on beer 8c a litre, to 45 per cent of the cost of a bottle. This had come on top of the disastrous excise increases under the Whitlam Government. Mr Spurr said the increases had direct impact on many small country towns, where hotels often were the largest employer. Since last year's rise, the net profits of South Australian hotels were down 20 per cent and many publicans were cutting staff and working long hours themselves to survive. Further tax increases would lead to higher unemployment in the industry and the failure of small business operators.

There we have the A.H.A. referring to the imposition of any future increases in South Australian liquor licensing fees which have now finally been announced. The report continues:

'The hotel industry could be the one bright spot for employment,' Mr Spurr said. 'Why don't Governments recognise this?' The South Australian hotel industry comprised 600 small businesses, employing 9 300 people, and was one of the biggest employers of unskilled and semi-skilled labour in the State. The industry had a capital investment of almost \$350 million, and outlayed \$86 million a year on wages.

Mr Spurr said hotels:

- Spent \$30 million a year on food.
- Spent \$164 million a year on wine, spirits and beer.
- Spent \$55 million a year on local services.
- Paid \$12 million a year on State liquor licences.

Of course, those figures refer exclusively to the hotel industry and do not take into account the motel industry, restaurants and other businesses such as convention centres and foyers of our own Festival Centre, where refreshments are continually being served.

It is interesting to read what the brewing industry has to say about the liquor licence fee. I will not quote at great length, but the House should be aware of what the South Australian Brewing Company has to say. A report in the *Advertiser* of 5 August 1983 states:

The South Australian Brewing Company would be forced to review its investment in South Australia following the decision to raise liquor licence fees, a brewery spokesman said last night.

Members will now, with hindsight, realise how that spokesman was right on the mark. The report continues:

The brewery's public relations manager, Mr R.L. Folley, said the 33 per cent fee rise was a 'savage blow to the State's beer brewing and retailing industry'. The Australian Hotels Association's chief executive officer, Mr W.T. Spurr, said the liquor retail industry was 'devastated' at news of the rise. Mr Folley said: 'The increase will take South Australian licence fees to the highest in Australia . . .'

That will probably please the Minister of Mines and Energy, who persisted earlier in suggesting that the State Government was not about to embark on massive increases in direct taxation, but such increases have now raised us to be the highest inflation State in the Commonwealth. The report says further:

State liquor licence fees were 'a tax on a tax' . . .

That is a fact. Without repeating what the Leader of the Opposition said earlier today, I point out that it is a fact that the Government cannot get away from. It goes on:

. . . as they were levied on wholesale prices, 53 per cent to 64 per cent of which was Federal excise.

That is an absolute disgrace for the South Australian public to have to accept. The report continues:

Mr Folley said the latest impost would accelerate the drop of already declining sales and would cost jobs in the manufacturing and retailing sides of the industry.

Of course, it will bring about a decline in sales because, quite naturally, when the price of a product goes up one gets to the stage of questioning one's ability to pay, and not every member of the public can afford to pay out the growing cost of entertainment. The family man who goes out with the family, or anyone who goes out with a husband, wife, girlfriend or boyfriend, finds that, whereas once upon a time they could spend one or two nights a week out in entertainment, that now has come back to one night a week,

one night a fortnight or one night a month. Because of the rising cost of entertainment (particularly the cost of food and wines), whereas once upon a time people could go out and have pleasure and entertainment, nowadays that does not happen. I have those people in my electorate, and I am sure that members opposite also have cases where people no longer can afford to go out. Of course, if they cannot afford to go out, it becomes a catch 22 situation, and it means that those people who have set themselves up in businesses and in the hospitality industry find that their customer traffic drops off, all over this problem of people's ability to pay when they go out.

If they do not pay, of course, the money does not circulate, the cost of running the business goes up and ultimately the jobs are lost and businesses fold up. The report continues:

Mr Spurr said the hotel industry had been attacked on every angle by governments through excise and licence fees, an ever-increasing number of licences granted and by the 'crushing' effect of discounting.

Of course, it is a big factor. He forecasts further unemployment and then says:

The Government has continued to use the liquor industry as a source of revenue but that source is now exhausted.

He is saying, 'Fair is fair; the industry has gone far enough now in carrying this impost. It can no longer carry on and keep it up.' I will go back to the original question that I raised earlier. The Leader of the Opposition of the time said in the *Advertiser* on 24 July 1982 (it was not in his policy speech, nor in this document that he put in all the letter boxes down in my electorate, but it was in the following statement that he made to Matt Abraham of the *Advertiser*):

An A.L.P. Government would not use State charges to raise general revenue, the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Bannon, said yesterday.

The last paragraph said:

'Our attitude to charges is they should not be used as general revenue raisers,' Mr Bannon said.

Of course, we now know the situation in relation to that. I know that I cannot say that it was obviously a lie, so I say that he was bending the truth drastically to achieve his ultimate goal of persuading people at the polls that he was fair dinkum. Of course, we have since proved that he was not.

I thought that it was interesting to note, when listening to the Leader of the Opposition's second reading speech earlier today, that he repeated references to the way in which the Government on the one hand has introduced a tax on liquor as a revenue raiser while at the same time it has made cuts in capital works, despite these savage increases we have had lumped upon us under this whole banner of State charges and State taxation.

Eleven State charges have now been announced and goodness knows what we will receive when the Budget hits the deck. There will be more. I shudder for the people in my district who are in extraordinary trouble trying to keep their weekly housekeeping accounts. The whole tourism industry has been betrayed (I think that that is the best word to use) by the imposition of new State taxes and charges.

Mr Lewis: The member for Mawson doesn't think that.

Mr OSWALD: Maybe she does not think that. Maybe she is not interested in tourism in her district, although she should be, because there is a coastal strip, wineries, and a lot of hotels and restaurants in that district. I would have thought that it would be a very key issue there.

In Glenelg there are major hotels, motels and restaurants which all depend on profit, and without that profit they will not survive. A lot of this profit comes from the sale of liquor. It is well known that there is not much money in the food side of any business in the hospitality industry. As a result of these taxes, wine and beer will soon be priced

up, as I said earlier, to the stage that the ordinary man will not have the ability to pay. If he cannot pay those high prices then there will be a drop in sales; if there is a drop in sales there is a corresponding drop in profits; if there is a drop in profits but the overheads of the business still go on, of course, the proprietor has no option but to try and economise somewhere. The only area in which he can economise is to drop staff off the end of the line. That is a situation which we should not accept, because the former Government established a new horizon for tourism development, and nothing at all must be put in its way. Imposts like this on the hospitality industry will ultimately bring about perhaps not the demise of the tourism industry but certainly numerous difficulties and will set it back years in progress if the profitability of local tourism enterprises are placed in jeopardy because this Government chooses to use an indirect form of taxation to raise revenue to prop up some of its programmes.

I am opposed to this Bill and, on behalf of the constituents in my district, I violently protest at the Government's using this measure as a means of revenue raising, and I will be voting against it at the appropriate time.

Mr LEWIS: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): 'We want South Australia to win'—what a way to go about it! With the Government's present policies we have about as much hope of winning as Port Adelaide has of winning the premiership this year. It is incredible that on the one hand the Premier in his policy speech of 1982 said that the A.L.P. would not re-introduce succession duties, that it would not introduce new taxes or increase existing levels of taxes during a Labor Government's term of office, and yet on the other hand, just a few days ago, on 25 August, in the Labor Government's very first year of office, the Premier said:

We had no alternative but to implement a number of taxation measures.

The Bill before the House relates to one of those measures. When the Premier introduced this Bill and made his second reading explanation we all knew that he did not really mean what he said. We all know that the Premier cannot be relied upon to be sincere and that, like the Deputy Premier, he can be relied upon to fudge things. I guess that in due course the rest of Labor's promises of any substance whatsoever will go out the door in the same way that other promises in regard to taxation have gone out the door on no fewer than 11 occasions already.

In general terms, taxation increases have occurred in 11 instances already. We have the spectre of this oaf of a man parading himself in front of the television cameras and the rest of the electronic media, as well as capturing space in the columns of the print media as he bolts off to Canberra in what appears to be a last minute bid to save South Australia from the devastation of a wine tax, when, in fact, we all know that the Budget has been put to bed months ago and that by the time the Premier made his announcement of his intention to run off to Canberra and beg Mr Hawke not to put a tax on wine, the Budget had been printed already and was probably ready for distribution, if it had not already been distributed around Australia, to members of the media who go into a lock-up situation before its introduction. What a farce! What does the Premier take us for? Does he take the people of South Australia for fools? Does the Premier really think that we are that naive and that stupid? Why on earth would the Premier attempt to do that?

Clearly, the Premier was attempting to make the situation seem more plausible to those people who in politics have one eye, with A.L.P. written on both lids. The Premier's

action makes it possible for them to feel a little less galled by the deceitfulness of their representatives in this Parliament who have formed a Government—a Government the foundations of which are based on deceit, as evidenced by the Labor Party's election policy speech and the propaganda it issued prior to the election last November. It was not so much a pity that the Premier did such a foolish and naive thing as to run off to Canberra, making out that he was saving us from the effects of a wine tax to be imposed by the Federal Government (which in itself would not have been so bad), but the fact is that he intended to do the same damn thing himself.

What sort of credibility can an argument like that have, advanced by a man who intends to do and who has now done exactly what he was supposed to be begging the Commonwealth not to do: impose a tax on the wine industry? Of course, his belated supplications to the Commonwealth (and I would be surprised if he ever said anything of that nature when in Canberra on that occasion) do not really stand up.

The Premier cannot claim to have been successful because we now have a tax on wine. We now have a typical Labor Party policy approach, obviously made on the run. The Government did not think through the consequences of this measure before it was applied; or perhaps it did, but I will come to that in a while. I am referring to the impact of this tax on the wine industry at the present time. Quite clearly, if it had been thought through, the Government would know very well that the wine industry would scream the moment that it was hit with a tax on fortified spirit put in wine, and that, in due course, it could do what Fabian socialists always do, that is, take a yard and give them an inch. When the wine industry came begging to be spared the devastating consequences of such an unreasonable, thoughtless and destructive tax, it would then be in favour of a general sales tax right across the board to replace it, and the Federal Labor Government would then achieve what it wanted in this regard.

I dare say that that is what they had in mind all the time, because at the present time the measure will have the regrettable effect of reducing demand for those grape varieties already oversupplied in the market place and, in a glut situation, have to be turned into either fortifying spirit or, alternatively, wines which need to be fortified with that spirit and sold as sweet wines (whether ports, sherries or something of that nature). It is the growers of those varieties who will be hardest hit. They are the most sensitive wineries; therefore, the grower organisations will support them in their attempt to get an amelioration of the impact of this tax on the industry.

We have heard some substantial and eloquent contributions on that very point, particularly as they relate to the impact on South Australia's tourist industry, because we are renowned for our wines. Goodness me, South Australia produces about 80 per cent of Australia's brandy, 60 per cent of Australia's wine and a little better than that as a percentage of the fortified wines. Clearly then, the people who visit Australia will be interested (if they have a mouth anything like mine) to try the best Australian wines. They will be inclined to come to South Australia but less so now as a result of the measure that the South Australian Government has introduced with this Bill. Their opportunity to obtain sweet wines of such a high standard at the same price as was possible before will no longer be as great. People from within Australia who might have thought of taking a holiday in South Australia will now find that the publicity given to the Premier at the time that he trotted off, with tears tumbling down his cheeks, to talk to dear Bob, has increased the cost of the commodity that he said that he was trying to protect. The Premier thereby destroyed some

of the interest they might have had in coming to South Australia to consider our wines, especially our sweet wines.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: What would you have done in the circumstances?

Mr LEWIS: Well, I would not have told any lies. More than that, I think the clear record of our Party in Government indicates, as did our policies at the time of the last election and when we were in Government, that we would not have sought the taxation option to balance the Budget. We would have pursued the policies that we were pursuing to reduce the size of the public sector.

Mr Trainer: Like the member for Todd, you would have sacked public servants.

Mr LEWIS: The member for Todd, of course, has been misrepresented by some fools in this place. The member who interjects (of whose name I am not sure) ought to know that the member for Todd at no time said that he would sack public servants. This Government has sought to misrepresent not only my Party but also certain members of it. The Government to which I refer is the Government of the Labor Party and the members to whom I refer are members of the Opposition, the Liberal Party. Members opposite seek to imply, or have indeed stated untruthfully, that members of the Liberal Party would advocate sacking public servants. That is not, and never has been, Liberal Party policy.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: It is not what you advocated—you did it over the years you were in Government.

Mr LEWIS: At no time was any member of the Public Service sacked. I challenge the Minister at the bench to give me one example of where a public servant was sacked by the Tonkin Liberal Government during its term of office simply to get rid of that public servant as a member of the Public Service. If any sackings took place at all, they would have been for normal disciplinary reasons.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: The member who interjects out of his place, the member for Hartley—

Mr TRAINER: I rise on a point of order. Unfortunately, the member concerned, who has been accused of interjecting out of his seat, cannot take a point of order. However, it is unfair for the member opposite to accuse him of having spoken out of his place.

The SPEAKER: Order! There can be no point of order. The honourable member for Mallee.

Mr LEWIS: Tender as the point may be, it is nonetheless valid. It does not need restating at the present time, as the member for Ascot Park well knows. It is regrettable that Labor members cannot understand the difference between reducing the number of employees by attrition, and reallocating those employees from one area where they are less needed to other areas where they are more needed within the total structure of the Public Service, to ensure that services are maintained to the public through the bureaux that serve them as agencies of Government. It is a pity that they cannot see that it can be done and, indeed, was done very effectively. Their policy, on the other hand, is to increase the Public Service pay-roll—and finance its increase by this and other measures to a point which would be at least equal to what it was at the time when we came to office if not, indeed, greater.

The member for Unley (who I cannot spot around the Chamber at the present time) would know a lot about that. I put to the House that that man in no small measure, has contributed to the necessity, by his actions prior to his coming here, for us to consider this measure now: to raise the revenue necessary to pay the increased costs of paying each public servant employed by the South Australian Government. It was his purpose to do that. It was what he was paid to do. He did it without regard whatever for the taxpayers of South Australia and without regard whatever

for the consequences of his actions on the total number of jobs which would exist collectively in the private and public sectors in the South Australian economy as a consequence.

If the member for Ascot Park and others who look quizzically at me from the other side of the Chamber cannot understand my reasoning, let me explain. If one takes \$1, \$100 or \$1 000 from the private sector of the economy and reallocates that money to the public sector, saying that by doing so one is restoring the number of employees, indeed creating jobs in the public sector, one is destroying more jobs than are being created, because it is known that the average cost of each job in the public sector is substantially higher than the average cost of a job in the private sector. Therefore, every dollar that one takes, indeed every job that one creates in the public sector, destroys more than one job in the private sector, and we end up with a net loss.

Not only are we seeing a net loss in total employment that results from the kind of punitive taxation increase measure that we are considering tonight; but also, by increasing these taxation measures as we are doing tonight (and as we have been and will be doing in the ensuing days in this place), we are destroying more jobs in the private sector than we are creating in the public sector, we are destroying incentive and we are reducing South Australia's competitive position to attract investment here. We are driving off the prospect of—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable gentleman has strayed well beyond the guidelines that were laid down three times earlier tonight, and I ask him to come back to the Bill.

Mr LEWIS: Thank you, Mr Speaker. By this measure, we are frightening off investment in this State's economy, because we are increasing the tax burden that has to be borne by every dollar invested here comparative to other places in the Australian economy. It is destructive of South Australia's industrial base and South Australia's capacity to employ people, and it is destructive of the private sector in this State.

The unfortunate thing is that, as has been pointed out by my Leader, this measure means that the South Australian Brewing Company will not proceed with its \$4 000 000 capital improvement investment plans, and it has announced that publicly. That being so, jobs that would otherwise have been available in the construction industry and in the provision of goods and services that would have been involved in that capital improvement works of the South Australian Brewing Company will be destroyed. The sum of \$4 000 000 is not an inconsiderable sum, and it will not be invested as the direct result of the destruction of incentive to invest in South Australia that these taxation measures have produced. Yet the Government says that it had no alternative but to implement a number of taxation measures. What cods wallop, what hooley, what piffle, what deceit! There is quite a realistic and sensible alternative to this measure, and it is that which was adopted by the Liberal Party when in Government—to reduce expenditure and not increase taxation to achieve a balanced Budget.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: Have a look at the licensing fees.

Mr LEWIS: All I have to do is to look at the A.L.P. policy speech that was made less than a year ago when you all clapped and cheered when your Leader—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! On the one hand, the honourable member must not be harassed; on the other hand, the honourable member must refer to other honourable members by their electorate.

Mr LEWIS: Honourable members opposite have only to look at the statement that was made, at which they all clapped and cheered, at the last election campaign by their Leader, who stated that the A.L.P. would not reintroduce

succession duties, and would not introduce new taxes, nor increase existing levels of tax during its term of office.

When did members opposite leave office? Are they out of office now, or have they broken a promise? What is it that members opposite have done—it is one or the other? I think that this Government should resign. I have thought that ever since the Premier reneged on his undertakings. In opposition, members opposite said that they would not break their promises, but while in office they have broken them. It is unfortunate that the people of South Australia were so deceived and misled by the statements made by the Labor Party. We had the Premier saying that, although the Government had inherited Budget problems of unprecedented magnitude it would take action to freeze Government fees and charges not already announced until June 1983 if a wage, salary and price pause was achieved. There has been a wage, salary and price pause (if one can call it that, given the behaviour of some of the trade unions), yet we see a measure here tonight that increases charges.

The Premier promised that the freeze would mean that increases in motor vehicle registration charges and petrol taxes proposed for that period, as well as other increases of that nature, would not occur. We have seen that promise broken. Now we see another part of that promise broken, as the Premier is breaking the whole bang lot. Therefore, it was not only during the election campaign but also since that campaign that the Premier has engaged in double talk, the sort of talk that has won him the reputation conferred on him by the member for Elizabeth of being weaker than orange flower water. I presume that the member for Elizabeth, when he made that statement, was referring to the Premier's inability to make up his mind about what he believes.

I turn now to an aspect of this measure that strikes me as somewhat clandestine in its operation. Earlier this year a great deal of publicity was given to the gabfest (not the economic summit) between the Prime Minister, various State Labor leaders and Premiers about the policies they would pursue to pull Australia out of the rut it was in and how the Labor Party, through its other gabfest, the economic summit, was going to be able to accomplish that. It seems to me that that meeting between the Prime Minister, Premiers and other Labor leaders was not really what they said it was at all and that they were working out which commodities (such as wine and spirits) they could tax concurrently so that the poor working man who did not have the time or interest to work matters out was clobbered to a point where he was too numbed by these taxes to work out which Government was imposing them on him.

The working man cannot understand and does not realise that both Governments are imposing these taxes. The result will be that members in Labor districts will now be able to say—whenever confronted by an irate member of the general public who is not quite sure of his ground but is a bit rotten about these matters and say to him, 'You imposed the tax on my drink'—'No, not I, it was the Federal Government.' Conversely, if it is a Federal Labor member who is so confronted he can say, 'No, that is a State tax you are talking about,' so they will both be able to get off the hook. The word will then get around that it is not so bad, it was terribly confusing, we have to pay the tax anyway, that there is nothing we can do about it, it is three years before an election, 'so let's have another drink.' That is the kind of thing I have heard and, indeed, have read in an article inadvertently left behind by a member of the Labor Party. It was an article which sets out how Labor members can answer criticisms being made of the State and Federal Governments.

It was a publication distributed through a union, and I thought it was pretty crook. I will not quote the source because in an electorate like Mallee there are not many

people who believe that unions can help. If I quoted the union and the source of the information, it would not be too difficult to identify the individual who inadvertently left that paper lying around before it came into my possession.

The State Government's introduction of this measure was not just a matter of policy resulting from a decision made well before the last election: it was a matter of policy that it had decided upon in concert with the Federal Government. It was done to enable members of both the Federal and State Governments not to fudge but to smudge the issue publicly. It does not look so bad if both Governments impose a tax on the same commodities at the same time. The public has had difficulty in working out just how it has been hoodwinked, rolled and bled. That is the pity of it, but that is what the Labor Party hopes it will get away with by this measure.

I do not believe that it will get away with anything, and I have no intention of allowing it to do so. I regret that it has been necessary for me to point it out in those terms. It is not the kind of politics that elevates this institution or its members in the minds of the general public. People begin to see what is happening as a result of such political measures introduced in such an atmosphere, and they become more cynical than ever of Parliament and its members, who say one thing and then do another, as illustrated by the Premier and the Labor Party in this instance. The Bill has only three clauses and, as not many people get to read a Bill, I will read it for them. It provides:

1. (1) This Act may be cited as the 'Licensing Act Amendment Act, 1983'.

(2) The Licensing Act, 1967, is in this Act referred to as 'the principal Act'.

2. This Act shall come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation.

Before I refer to clause 3, I point out that whilst the Bill is being introduced now, because it is the longest possible time before the next election, it is not intended to proclaim the damn thing until next year. I do not know why it is necessary for me to stay here tonight to debate the measure if it will not come into force until April 1984, and the Premier made that clear in his speech. Why could he not have included that provision in the Bill? Clause 3 provides:

Section 37 of the principal Act is amended—

(a) by striking out from subparagraph (i) of paragraph (a) of subsection (1) the passage '9 per centum' and substituting the passage '12 per centum';

That is an increase of 33⅓ per cent on the original figure. The clause further provides:

(b) by striking out from subparagraph (i) of paragraph (b) of subsection (1) the passage '7.2 per centum' and substituting the passage '9.6 per centum'.

Again, there is an increase of 30 per cent. An increase of 2.4 per cent on 7.2 per cent amounts to 9.6 per cent. So, I suppose that there is consistency in that, if nothing else. Whilst the Premier reckons that he will get \$7 000 000 out of it in a full year, he expects to get only \$2 000 000 out of it this year for the reason that I mentioned just a minute ago, namely, that the rate will not become payable until 1984.

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

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I will begin by referring to a couple of quotes from the I.P.A. magazine, which seems to be a fairly constructive magazine when it comes to talking about taxation. It says:

The incontestable arguments for reducing taxes should be obvious but, as they do not appear to be so to those in Government circles, they will be set down briefly here.

First, lower taxes are necessary to increase market demand (and thus employment)—as distinct from the artificial stimulus to demand from more Government spending. Second, lower taxes will contribute to the containment, if not the reduction, of business costs, assist the all-important need for strengthening Australian competitiveness at home and overseas, and encourage business. Third, lower taxes are necessary to take some of the heat out of the economically destructive demands for higher incomes. In a nutshell, reduced taxation is an indispensable ingredient of the medicine needed to revive the ailing private sector.

There is no question that one of the most important things that we need to do is improve the lot of the private sector and not necessarily increase Government spending. The second quote is from the same book, by Richard Vedder, from the *Journal of Contemporary Studies in America*. His statements on State taxes and economic growth are as follows:

Most State Governments are experiencing severe budget problems. Increasing State taxes and charges may well be counter-productive, according to a study carried out on fiscal policies of State Governments in the U.S.

An analysis of current State tax policies strongly suggests that . . . tax hikes—whatever short-term fiscal relief they may bring—are likely to have damaging long-term effects on the economic growth of the States and localities that adopt them. The results . . . of a systematic comparison between taxation levels and economic growth rates in the various States show a striking inverse correlation between growth and taxation; overwhelmingly, the fastest-growing States prove to be those with the lowest taxes.

There is no question that high taxation takes away incentive and that incentive is the most important thing that we need to put back into our society. There is no question that with the current situation we need to provide the private sector with more incentive. The promises of the Labor Government of no taxation increases have created a certain situation, perhaps because of its increase in expenditure or because of the situation which they themselves do not understand. One of the major sides of any budgetary problems of a business is that if one does not control expenditure one needs to control the other side which, in this case, is revenue. All that we have heard so far in my short time in this House is increased revenue, increased revenue, increased revenue. Perhaps in the next few days we might hear about some of the outlandish expenditure which has obviously taken place because of the need to increase this revenue output.

Perhaps if Government members had ever been in business they would realise that there are two sides of the equation, one of which is to control expenditure. It will be interesting in the next few days to see what the expenditure overruns of this Government have been. Until we see the expenditure, it is very difficult to be critical of the Government. All that we have heard is that it needs more money. What does the Government need it for? Is it because the Government does not know how to control its expenditure? Is it because it does not know that the most fundamental important thing in any business is that it needs to control the person at the top—in this case, Ministers.

One needs to control the person at the top and, if the person at the top cannot control his budget, how can one expect anyone else to control his budget? In the first year this taxation will bring some \$2 000 000 to State revenue. That is another tax slug and another promise broken by this Government. In a short time there have been increases in tobacco tax and petrol tax, a beer and wine tax (which is the one we are talking about now), and there is the possibility of an f.i.d. tax.

Mr Groom: Tell us what you would have done in Government.

Mr INGERSON: Perhaps in the next few days we will know what you have done in Government and then we might have a few more answers.

Mr Groom: You have got no policies: is that what you are saying?

Mr INGERSON: The most important thing in any business is to have control of both revenue and expenditure. In the last few days all we have seen is revenue upon revenue upon revenue. Let us look at the wastage that has gone on in expenditure. Let us highlight those sorts of things in the next few days. My experience in small business has shown me very clearly, having been responsible for running a few businesses, that unless I control my expenditure my staff suffers. Perhaps one of the problems that the Government has is that, if it keeps on putting on staff, it must increase its revenue purely and simply to pay for the staff. Perhaps that is something that the Government has not learnt yet. Perhaps that is something that you might have to learn, Mr Groom.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr INGERSON: I apologise. Perhaps that is something that the member for Hartley might have to learn. Perhaps that could be one of the reasons why he left. Perhaps that is the reason why he did not learn and why today he is increasing taxes so that he can gain revenue.

Mr Groom: What public servants would you not have employed?

Mr INGERSON: I think that all one needs to do is control one's expenditure, and then one may not have so many problems.

Mr Mathwin: We never sacked one public servant in three years, and you know it.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: That is not true.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr INGERSON: What concerns me is that we have a fairly traditional thing in this Parliament, and that seems to be something about which this Government is not at all concerned. One of the traditions has been that the Budget is a programme which one lets out in a particular period of time and one explains very clearly both the income and expenditure side. In this case, it seems that all that anyone is concerned about is leaking out all the bad things so that all the goodies and big hand-outs will happen in the next few days. I think that that is a fairly poor sort of thing. It is a pity that we could not line up revenue and expenditure and get right down to the nitty-gritty right away, instead of purely and simply—

The Hon. J.W. Slater: That is the way you operated in Government for three years.

Mr INGERSON: I do not believe that that is true. I think that when we were in Government we ran it like a business, and that is why things were under control.

Ms Lenehan: You were \$50 000 000 in debt.

Mr INGERSON: We will find out when we look at the Auditor-General's Report after it comes out. The Government promised that we would be a fairly low taxed State. What are we now? We are the highest taxed State in Australia. How long has it taken for that to occur? It has taken just over six or seven months of a Labor Government for South Australia to become the highest taxed State in Australia.

We had promises that there would be no tax increases for three years, but what do we have? We have the highest taxes and as has been reported many times in the last few days in the press, if one combines both State and Federal taxes, one sees that families are \$30 a week worse off than they were previously. That is an incredible situation and one that can only be placed upon a Government that does not understand that it has to control its expenditure.

In this situation we have a tax on a tax. Most Governments and most businesses sit down and at least talk about what is going on, yet here is a situation where two political bed mates cannot even sit down and put their tax business in order, where the Federal Government decided to put a tax on a commodity which we at the State level gave another kick along because the State Government cannot manage

its own budget. The liquor tax has now been indexed so that it has an inbuilt guaranteed system in relation to inflation that will guarantee that money can be handed out and spent as though there was nothing to be concerned about.

The effect of this taxation on small business concerns me. Those members who have been in business would know that rising prices cause a corresponding reduction in production. As soon as sales go down, jobs also decline. The thing that concerns me is that by increasing taxation the Government is almost certainly guaranteeing that there will be some increase in unemployment. I am concerned about the problems of the large wineries arising from the amount of extra tax that they will have to pay. The South Australian Brewing Company's having to put off investments in this State must affect the unemployment situation and small business as well. The hotel industry is vital to the tourism industry and obviously that will be affected because increased prices will reduce sales which will create problems as far as jobs are concerned. In conclusion, I indicate that I oppose this measure purely and simply on the grounds that it is not in the best interests of the State and that any further increase in taxation can only put us in a very unviable position.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): The Premier has advised the House that this measure will raise some \$2 000 000 this financial year and \$7 000 000 in a full year. Further, it is anticipated that licence fees in future will raise about \$19 000 000 per annum. Taking a reasonable figure, on a very quick calculation I believe 1 000 jobs are lost in South Australia due to liquor licensing. Therefore, over a period of a few years following the introduction of this tax, and now with the extension of that tax with a 33½ per cent increase, 1 000 jobs per year will be lost because the Government of the day wants legislation in force to provide fees from the sale of liquor. When one looks at the Government's policy and its attitude in relation to its own programmes, one starts to question the reason for all these fees and the huge increases.

I often feel that little heed is given to the impact or the ramifications of these taxes. It is very easy to come out with bold policies on economic development, policies within a Party platform, that read well and look well year after year at conferences and symposiums. More and more resolutions are fed in until a document is produced that is unwieldy and unworkable. The Labor Government is locked into an economic situation which it cannot get out of. It is A.L.P. policy not to reduce expenditure but to increase taxes to pay for expanding programmes. That policy was enunciated in the A.L.P. platform and amended in 1981. It states:

Where possible, regulate the financial position by raising the tax rates rather than cutting the public expenditure programmes. I believe that that clause of the A.L.P. policy platform is the one that has rebounded and taken the A.L.P. into a situation that it cannot retrieve. It cannot retrieve the situation even if it wants to. I believe, if not in my own constituency then certainly throughout the State, that the public of South Australia would be aware of that policy, and would be aware that when the Premier made the policy speech on 25 October 1982 clearly he said that there would not be an increase in State taxes or revenue, and the people accepted it. The people accepted that here is a Government that will come in and manage the State finances, as tough as they are. There have been other economic documents which have been put out by the Labor Party over the past three or four years explaining the situation and what it would do if it came into Government. They explained how the A.L.P. would form committees of review to look into the taxation base, and at other ways and means of replacing some taxes.

Time after time the Premier said that he believed that pay-roll tax should be abolished. Do not ask me what he would replace it with. However, I have a feeling that this licence fee increase is now proving the difficulty that the Government has, and that we are being conditioned for a total package, some time in the future, which may include value added tax. I believe we have to be very careful in the present situation because of the impact it will have right through the whole of the particular industry. As we have been advised earlier by the member for Morphett, there are some 9 300 people employed in this industry.

Mr Mathwin: You don't think they are going to put v.a.t. in it as well, do you?

Mr BECKER: I think it is to come. I think we are being conditioned for it. The South Australian *Year Book* for 1982 sets out the Licensing Act provisions, as follows:

The licensing of hotels and the issue of liquor licences and permits is governed by the Licensing Act, 1967-1982, under which is constituted a Licensing Court consisting of a Licensing Court Judge, Special Magistrates designated by the Governor as members of the Licensing Court, and Licensing Court Magistrates. The classes of licences that may be granted are:

- (a) Full publicans licence
- (b) Limited publicans licence
- (c) Wholesale storekeepers licence
- (d) Retail storekeepers licence
- (e) Wine licence
- (f) Brewers Australian ale licence
- (g) Distiller's storekeepers licence
- (h) Vignerons licence
- (i) Club licence
- (j) Packet licence
- (k) Railway licence
- (l) Restaurant licence
- (m) Limited restaurant licence
- (n) Cabaret licence
- (o) Theatre licence
- (p) Special licence
- (q) Twenty-litre licence
- (r) Hotel brokers licence.

Fees for licences are paid in accordance with the amount of liquor purchased (or in some cases sold) during the preceding twelve months. From 1 January 1982, in the case of the retail licences, fees are calculated at 2 per cent of the amount of low alcohol liquor purchased and 9 per cent of the amount of other liquor, in lieu of 8 per cent as previously.

This legislation proposes to increase the fees by 33½ per cent to 12 per cent. Under a brief description, and probably the best description I have read for some time, one finds all of the ramifications of the Licensing Act, the licences that are involved, the organisations that are involved in this legislation and this taxing measure, the ramifications of what appear to be simple tax measures on the community, and it worries me to think that we may lose jobs.

I would not like to think that we are going to lose any jobs. I would like to think that this tax is so small and so insignificant when measured in glass size that it will have very little impact on the average worker who knocks off from work and has a couple of pints or schooners of beer or on a person who goes out to a restaurant and has a glass or two of wine with a meal. Some people do not support the drinking of alcohol at all. They do not care whether the licence fee goes up 20 per cent, 30 per cent or 2 000 per cent. However, we have to be realistic, because some people enjoy alcoholic beverages.

Mr Mathwin: It's a relaxation for some people.

Mr BECKER: It is. It is also a means of support for many organisations. A full publican's licence controls the hotel industry as well as the hospitality industry. I have very little sympathy for the hotel industry; it has a long way to go to improve its standards. It certainly has improved its standards over the years since I have been in Parliament, but it has a long way to go to lift its accommodation and general standards if it wants to have any major role in the tourist industry in this State.

We have also seen tavern licences emerge. Some taverns are not too bad but some are an insult to the industry. I do not like them. Taverns have been established in areas where there has been trouble and they have discos which attract the wrong clientele and do not do anything advantageous for the industry. They are just cheap booze joints. They are all over the world. They are just cheap places that pump out booze to young people. Some of them have poor reputations and are the scene of a lot of violence, particularly on Friday and Saturday nights. We do not want those sort of places, because they make no contribution to the tourist industry. They are an absolute nuisance. Perhaps we would do well to discourage those places.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: Which hotels are you specifically referring to?

Mr BECKER: They are not hotels—I am talking about taverns. We had a situation recently in Hindley Street, and it has been admitted that that street must be cleaned up. One hotel has agreed to do something about it. They admit that a problem exists.

Mr Evans interjecting:

Mr BECKER: A demand exists among young people for that type of place for relaxation but, unfortunately, the situation gets out of hand and out of control. As the member for Fisher says, the big problem is with under-aged persons drinking. This is where an identity card would help to solve the problem. The member for Fisher has been saying that for 15 years, but nobody takes any notice.

Mr Mathwin: I am very sympathetic.

Mr BECKER: Yes, the member for Glenelg and some of our colleagues do support the member for Fisher. We also have limited publican licences, wholesale storekeeper licences, and we can go through the various categories until we get to club licences. The Minister realises and appreciates as much as I do that we would love to give all the money raised under this measure to sporting clubs in South Australia. However, we cannot do that. If we did that we would create more employment than anything else. I believe that sport and recreation will become a growth 'industry'. Sports injuries, physical fitness centres and lifestyle leisure clubs as we know them, are all growth industries.

Mr Mathwin: And will mean a healthy community.

Mr BECKER: Yes, and that will continue. We appreciate that, if sporting clubs are to develop, they must have liquor licences. Again, the impact concerns me. It may only be a few cents per glass of wine or beer, but it hurts when we have to consider legislation which affects those organisations, whether it be a sport and recreation club or a working man's club. I have seen some fine clubs in Whyalla, Port Pirie and in other rural areas as well as in the cities of this State. Clubs are places where workers can get together in a congenial atmosphere to enjoy each other's company, for leisure and recreation. To continually tax the pleasure that one derives from a club creates a problem.

Mr Mathwin: It creates hardships.

Mr BECKER: Wages are not at a high level, and some workers in this State have had to bear a wage pause for eight months or longer. To ask workers in this State to go without while Governments, commerce and retailers increase charges is pretty hard. It is denying an opportunity to the very people who can create reserves, and it is denying people the encouragement to save and to provide for the generations that follow. I have always said that I was a member of the very lucky generation: I do not believe that our grandparents or our parents had it so easy. I cannot see my generation, considering the difficulties of the past 10 years, providing for our children as well as my generation was provided for, and that worries me.

The time has come to start putting a halt on some of the very emotional issues that are costing, causing, and creating

hardships in the community. By the very fact that this measure will affect so many licences and organisations, it will create a hardship. South Australia has a large number of restaurants, and it has been stated that the electricity bill for a restaurant now amounts to more than the rent for the premises. I did not think that that would ever be possible, but it is now a fact of life, and it is unfortunate. Restaurants are changing hands, sometimes weekly.

The wineries, which have been establishing cellar door sales, believe that they have a real role to play in tourism. The physical attraction and the genuine beauty of the Barossa Valley attracts interstate and overseas visitors notwithstanding its wineries or wine tastings, and that is a bonus. The wineries in the Southern Vales have realised that they must do something to improve their standards to attract tourists to that area. Recently, I had the opportunity to take some people from New South Wales to the Southern Vales. Among others, we called into the Reynella Winery, which Hardys has just purchased. I do not know how much was spent—

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: It cost \$8 000 000.

Mr BECKER: I thank the honourable member for that information. The restoration of one of the main cellars is something to be seen. The standard of the restoration work is absolutely superb and the work which has been carried out on the original cellar and the family homestead will make that winery a major tourist attraction. A winery that spends \$8 000 000 must have a tremendous amount of faith and confidence not only in its own industry and its ability to produce top Australian table wines and, hopefully, export some of that wine but also in the benefits that it will receive from tourism. Personally, I cannot see how the company will get back that \$8 000 000, let alone the sum that it paid Rothmans for the Reynella Winery.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Glenelg cannot have an extension of time by interjection. The honourable member for Hanson.

Mr BECKER: Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr BECKER: At least I have 100 per cent attendance from the National Party.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: There are not many Liberal members over there; they know you better than we do.

Mr BECKER: They do. I am concerned by the ramifications of this legislation. I think it tells a story so far as the number of liquor licences in South Australia is concerned. I turn to page 167 of the *South Australian Year Book* for 1982, which shows the number of licences and permits issued in that year. The number of full publican licences in 1977 was 603; in 1979, still 603; and in 1981, 608. Therefore, over a five-year period there has been an increase of six full publicans licences. The number of limited publicans licences in 1977 was 58; in 1979, 66; and in 1981, 77; one can say that there has been reasonable growth there. The number of storekeepers licences in 1977 was 109; in 1979, 192; and in 1981, 197; there has been minor growth there. Turning to vigneron licences (and I think that this tells a story) in 1977 there were 86; in 1979, 103; and in 1981, 116. The number of club licences in 1977 was 199; in 1979, 241; and in 1981, 270. There was quite a substantial growth in club licences.

Of course, it has been argued on many occasions that club licences have had some impact on publicans licences. That is why I am concerned that this taxing measure may retard the growth of certain sections of the industry and could well have an impact on club licences. The number of restaurant licences in 1977 was 202; in 1979, 254; and in 1981, 334; there has been more than a 50 per cent increase in restaurant licences in five years. Here, again, I am worried

that, because of the impact of this legislation and other licensing measures in the Federal Parliament, we may see a swing in future to family restaurants rather than the ones we now know. The number of special licensed premises and permits in 1977 was 3 451; in 1979, 2 307; and in 1981, 2 160; that is quite a substantial drop during that period. This means that the industry has experienced difficulties in some areas, yet the number of special unlicensed area permits grew from 17 797 in 1977 to 20 768 in 1979, and to 21 476 in 1981. Booth licences have grown from 8 221 in 1977 to 10 272 in 1979, and they dropped to 10 049 in 1981. The peak in 1980 was 10 625.

In 1981 there were 2 381 club permits; in 1979, 2 452; and in 1977, 2 092, and members can see that variation. We have a picture of wide fluctuation and steady growth in various areas as well as decline in others, and a holding pattern in other areas, all of which reflect the difficulties of the liquor industry. Any taxes brought in can cause difficulties and economic problems throughout the State. We have heard that, as a result of this measure and because of the possibility of other taxes, the South Australian Brewing Company has withdrawn \$4 000 000 of development capital.

That worries me. I hate to see such an amount of money and jobs lost. The South Australian Brewing Company, I believe, owns the Pier and Family Hotels at Glenelg. The Pier Hotel is an important part of the history of Glenelg but, according to rumour, it could become a prime site for amalgamation with the Family Hotel for redevelopment as a casino site. If there is any possibility of redevelopment in that area, I hope that this taxation measure will not affect the plans.

It is suggested that perhaps that location would lend itself to an international hotel similar to the redevelopment of the Manly Hotel, in New South Wales. However, I believe that any development that we can attract, be the cost \$20 000 000 or \$30 000 000, will be an important part of our tourist industry and should be encouraged, not retarded, as is possible by such a taxing measure. Rumours are rife and, as the member for Henley Beach would know, there is a suggestion of a redevelopment programme involving Harvey's Henley Hotel and properties through to Del Monte, on the Esplanade at Henley Beach. That rumour has been around for some years.

I do not know whether the money is there, and whether it is \$60 000 000, or whether it is pipe dreaming. Certainly, some development ought to take place in that part of the city. Henley Beach could do with it, as could many other areas. Will this legislation have any impact on that type of redevelopment? Is it possible that multi million dollar projects could be chosen as a casino site? I do not know how the owners of the Hilton Hotel in Victoria Square feel, but I know that they are losing heaps of money and have little possibility at this stage of showing any profit. The Oberoi Hotel has done well in taking over the Hotel Australia and has maintained a good standard, but the city is limited in regard to new developments. Another suggestion for a casino has been in regard to a Murray River paddleboat, so that we would get a Mississippi-style standard of gambling on the Murray River. Perhaps that has a chance.

Again, does this liquor licence fee mean that the project may not be viable? I do not know. That is why I keep coming back to my original statement that any new taxing measures must be carefully and seriously considered. It has been found and proved in the past few days, federally, that one has to be very careful of the advice that one receives from officers in the Treasury and Taxation Department. I certainly hope that with any advice that the Government has sought—and it has said that it would seek advice before it considered any charges—it would take heed of the warning in the *News* on 5 August that the average family could be

up for \$125 per annum on certain taxes that have already been mentioned, and that the Hotels Association had predicted that more hotel jobs would go. Heaven knows that the hotel industry has had problems.

Now, of course, there is the warning of the black market involvement in cigarettes. The statement was made this morning that somebody in Queensland is mail ordering cigarettes to South Australia at a saving of some 38 cents a packet. I hope that there will not be mail ordering of South Australian wines from Queensland and that they will not be brought into South Australia on the same system. For those reasons there is an air of caution. There is no mandate, and I therefore oppose the Bill.

The SPEAKER: The question is 'That this Bill be now read a second time.' The honourable member for Glenelg.

Mr MATHWIN (Glenelg): I was more than surprised, Mr Speaker, that the list of speakers in this debate was not before you.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat immediately and withdraw that remark.

Mr MATHWIN: I am not reflecting on the Chair; I am just saying that I am surprised that there is no list in front of you as Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! I asked the honourable member to withdraw the reflection on the Chair.

Mr MATHWIN: If I have reflected on the Chair, I withdraw it.

The SPEAKER: I do not ask for a conditional withdrawal—simply an unconditional withdrawal.

Mr MATHWIN: I give you an unconditional withdrawal of those words which I said to you and which were upsetting you—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Glenelg.

Mr MATHWIN: I oppose this Bill, because it will raise a further \$7 000 000 by way of an increased tax on one section of the community, and particularly because the Premier, when the Leader of the Opposition, stated that there would be no increases in taxation and certainly gave a commitment to all the electors of South Australia. Of course, it will affect a certain section of the community who enjoy the relaxation of a drink. The beer drinkers will have to face up to a warning given by the Premier that the increase would cost them an extra 3c a bottle. If past estimates that have been given by the Premier are any criteria, it could well be more than 3c a bottle of beer.

For those who drink spirits (for many reasons—some of them health reasons), the increase according to the Premier will be up to 30c per bottle. The Australian people are noted throughout the world as partakers of the amber fluid. The climate has quite a lot to do with that; in hot weather and dusty places (and even in non-dusty places) the really refreshing drink for a person is beer. I think that it is one of the most refreshing drinks that one could have—in the summer, particularly.

Of course, we are unlike the people in India who years ago brought out the drink of gin and tonic, which was another way of having a strong drink that was less heating than were most of the others like whisky, rum and the like. The tonic water was added to help with the problems they experienced in relation to the climate which affected them in different ways. I understand that that was the reason why the gin and tonic drink was invented.

However, we in Australia lean more towards beer because, of course, it is a longer drink and here it is drunk very cold indeed. It is unlike custom in the United Kingdom where one has beer which is mild and quite warm. In fact, when I was in the United Kingdom and asked for a cold beer, they went around and felt the bottles to ascertain whether

or not they were cold enough rather than getting them out of the refrigerator. It is pretty hard to drink semi-cold beer. However, that is the reason why I oppose this Bill.

Mr Groom: It's not cold enough.

Mr MATHWIN: It is not because it is not cold enough: it is because of the effect that it will have on the ordinary people of this State, namely, the working man who is a beer drinker. I am sure that my colleague the member for Price who, of course, enjoys a beer in my company quite often, will be very upset by this added tax on one of his favourite drinks. As I said earlier, a lot of people drink spirits because of their health and because they do not wish to put on the weight that beer tends to put on people who drink plenty of it. I would rather drink beer but more and more frequently now I have to drink spirits because I have to worry about my trim figure.

Mr Meier: By worrying about your weight, I think that you have put them in their place.

Mr MATHWIN: I am glad that the honourable member thinks that I am not bad. I hope that a lot of people think the same. I know that a lot of people in Glenelg think that I am not bad, because they returned me with a majority.

The SPEAKER: I think that one should return to the Bill and forget about one's figure.

Mr MATHWIN: Thank you for bringing me back to reality, Mr Speaker. I would like to relay to the House some announcements made in the press about this obnoxious Bill. Mr Edward Nash, who is the economics editor, made a statement in the *Advertiser* about the Jones family. He talks about cigarettes, which do not come under this Bill, so I will not mention them. He said that cigarettes will add \$1.08 a week to the family budget, while Fred's (Fred must be the husband's name, obviously) 10 schooners a week are likely to cost another 20c. Poor old Fred has a problem. He has a wife who smokes, and that will add \$1.08 to the family budget. He knocks off 10 schooners a week, so that will cost him another 20c. There is a problem, and it all comes down to the common denominator: the ordinary man in the street with a family has to worry about when the next increase in wages will be, what will happen, and who will pay the bills. He has to have some relaxation some time in his life away from the worries and traumas that raising a family creates in these modern days. In the *Advertiser* in August Mr Kym Tilbrook stated:

New State Government taxes would destroy all incentive for the tourism industry to expand and create new jobs, a Liberal M.P. said yesterday.

'It will inevitably send some marginal tourist operators to the wall,' the Opposition spokesman on tourism, Mrs Adamson, said.

'The outback areas, which hold good prospects for growth, especially with international visitors, will suffer very badly indeed.'

That is referring to the hospitality industry, which is part of the tourist industry, although one wonders about the choice of words in describing it as a hospitality industry, having regard to some aspects of tourism. The press article further states, in part:

The Leader of the National Party of Australia, Mr Anthony, said yesterday the taxes were 'yet another shock to the people of South Australia.'

So Mr Anthony is also concerned about the problems here in relation to the vicious taxes that are being levied on the ordinary people, the little people of this State, of whom the Government pretends to be the protector. The members of the Labor Party think that in their own little way they are the only saviours of the working people of South Australia, yet, they thrust this extra tax on to that section of the community.

Mr Groom: Tell us what you would have done.

Mr MATHWIN: The best thing that the Labor Party and the Premier can do for this State is resign; that would settle

all the problems. In the *News* of 25 August, in an article headed 'Brewer blasts beer excise rise', it is stated:

Government revenues from beer sales in South Australia would grow more than three times faster than forecast inflation by early next year, Mr R.L. Folley, of the S.A. Brewing Company said yesterday.

Mr Folley was further reported as saying:

The continuation of the escalation of excise and licensing costs would further hit beer sales which nationally were running in June and July at levels 13 per cent lower than for the same months in 1982.

I remind members of the House that that was when South Australia was in the good hands of the Liberal Party and the Tonkin Government; they were the good days.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: It was the right Government, which reduced State taxation by 5.2 per cent in 1981-82.

Mr MATHWIN: Yes, I believe that that is quite correct. It should have been a shining example to the present Government as to what to do, but, of course, as was stated by my colleague and neighbour, the member for Bragg—

An honourable member: Neighbour?

Mr MATHWIN: He is a neighbour in the House.

The SPEAKER: Order! I would ask the honourable member to come back to the clauses of the Bill.

Mr MATHWIN: The member for Bragg said that the present Government could not run a Christmas club or a boy scout group, or words to that effect, and that is quite true. An article in the *News* of 5 August, under the heading of 'New fees a "savage blow"' which stated:

The S.A. Brewing Company would be forced to review its investment in South Australia following a decision to raise liquor licence fees, a brewing company spokesman said last night.

The brewery's public relations manager, Mr R. L. Folley, said the 33 p.c. fee rise was a 'savage blow to the State's beer brewing and retailing industry.'

The Australian Hotels Association's chief executive officer, Mr W.T. Spurr, said the liquor retail industry was 'devastated' at news of the rise.

'Devastated' is a very strong word indeed. The report continues:

Mr Folley said: 'The increase will take S.A. licence fees to the highest in Australia and will add to the already intolerable levels of excise levied by the Federal Government on beer.'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MATHWIN: I missed that, too. It is a pity. The article continues:

The State liquor licence fees were 'a tax on tax'.

Even the Minister for Water Resources cannot beat that: a tax on tax. The report continues:

They were levied on wholesale prices, 53 per cent to 64 per cent of which was Federal excise. Mr Folley said the latest impost would accelerate the drop of already declining sales and would cost jobs in the manufacturing and retailing sides of the industry.

That is the crux of the matter and the serious part of the whole situation; that it will cost jobs. That must be a serious matter to any member of this House, because, irrespective of our political outlook, we are, I hope, all concerned about the unemployment situation. Therefore, we should be looking at this matter very seriously indeed, and heeding the warning given by Mr Folley. The article continues:

The companies will be forced to review carefully local investment decisions. He said 66 p.c. or \$88m. of the company's revenue had gone in Federal and State taxes last year.

That is a massive amount of money, no matter how fast one may say it: \$88 000 000. The article further states:

Mr Spurr said the hotel industry had been attacked on every angle by Governments through excise and licence fees, an ever-increasing number of licences granted and by the 'crushing' effect of discounting.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to bear in mind the extraordinary tolerance which I have

shown up to date. I ask him to come back to the Bill before the House.

Mr MATHWIN: I am referring to a press release by Mr Folley in the *News*, which states:

'The Government has continued to use the liquor industry as a source for revenue but that source is now exhausted,' he said.

That is what Mr Folley said in relation to the situation. Another release of 21 July 1983, relating to hotels and the liquor industry, states: '120 jobs lost if beer rises'. That was a warning to the then Government that it ought not to consider imposing an extra tax on beer or spirits. However, this matter relates to beer only, and the article written by Craig Bildstein states:

South Australian hotels will have to sack at least 120 full-time employees if beer excise is increased 10c a litre in next month's Federal Budget and also the State Budget.

That was the warning given. Although it is said that it will not be increased by 10 per cent, nevertheless, we have the warning that it will increase by at least 3c a bottle. Of course, it could be more, as we well know. The article further states:

Any increase in the excise would have a disastrous effect on hotel liquor sales, the Australian Hotels Association (South Australia branch) chief executive officer, Mr W.T. Spurr, said today. 'Our survival is threatened.'

That was a fair warning to the Government, to Cabinet and to the Premier. Mr Spurr said that the industry's survival was threatened. It was not an off-hand comment but rather genuine concern expressed by that person in regard to beer sales. The article continues:

Beer sales—which made up 70 per cent of hotel liquor sales—dropped 6 per cent after last year's Budget.

So, the warning is that if we are going to increase the taxes this year, the sales will drop even more. It continues:

In 1982 the Federal Government lifted the excise on beer 8c a litre to 45 per cent of the cost of a bottle.

That was the warning given. It is further stated:

... the increase had direct impact on many small country towns ...

That has now been related to the tourism industry and hotels. People who wish to go to hotels often take with them their friends and families. While on holiday they may go to the local hotel for a counter lunch or tea. They will often have a drink with it. Regardless of whether they drink wine, beer or spirits, they will have to pay. They may also have an aperitif before or after their meal. If they have a few ports after dinner, they are in trouble again as they are paying tax on that as well. The article continues:

Since last year's rise, the net profits of South Australian hotels were down 20 per cent and many publicans were cutting staff and working long hours themselves to survive.

So, that is what has happened, and it will happen to an even greater extent. It further states:

Further tax increases would lead to higher unemployment in the industry and the failure of small business operators.

As my friend and colleague the member for Hanson stated earlier, a number of licences, which he recited to the House, will be affected by this amendment which involves an enormous number of businesses both large and small. It affects not only the brewers and big hotels but also the small restaurant owner or operator—the taverns and such like. They will be affected by this measure. They will be hit much more heavily than the large hotels. It is stated that the hotel industry could be the one bright spot for employment. Why does not the Government recognise that fact? It ought to reassess the situation. The article continues:

The South Australian hotel industry comprised of 600 small businesses, employing 9 300 people and was one of the biggest employers of unskilled and semi-skilled labour in the State.

That is quite obvious in relation to the employment of people, whether they be barmen or whatever. There are many semi-skilled and unskilled people employed by the industry. The article continues:

The industry had a capital investment of almost \$350 000 000 and outlayed \$86 000 000 a year on wages. Hotels spend \$30 000 000 a year on food.

We then come to the tourism and entertainment aspect of it where the article continues:

Hotels spend \$164 000 000 a year on wine, spirits and beer.

That is a fair bill. I believe that beer comprises the biggest part of that \$164 000 000.

[Midnight]

Indeed, the second biggest portion would be spirits, with wine coming last. The sum of \$55 000 000 a year is spent on local services and \$12 000 000 a year is paid for State liquor licences. So, already \$12 000 000 a year goes into the State coffers, ripped off through licences. It is only right that licensed hotels or businesses should pay a licence fee if only to cover the cost of administration. It would also be expected that the Government has the right to impose revenue raising measures, but there is a limit to the amount of money that can be demanded from these people; there is a limit that the extent to which they can be thrashed and to which more tax can be ripped off. In an election policy speech, the previous Leader of the Opposition stated:

The A.L.P. ... will not introduce new taxes nor increase existing taxes during our term of office.

That was a definite Labor Party promise. It was further stated:

We will set up an independent inquiry into the State revenue collections and any changes to the taxation structure would come after that inquiry reported and take place in our second term.

The then Leader of the Opposition stated that the A.L.P. would not increase taxes during its first three years in office and, if it won another run of three years, in the second term of office and after an inquiry that it would initiate, it might take action. That Labor Party policy speech was delivered on 25 October, at the Festival Theatre, if my memory serves me correctly. People may say, 'We didn't know what was going on', but the then Leader of the Opposition stated that the documents had been well researched and thoroughly costed. The Government cannot say that it did not know what would happen: it was stated that taxes would not be increased and, if that was to happen, it would occur in the second term of office. To follow up, it was stated that the operation was well researched and thoroughly costed.

It is quite obvious that the promise that the A.L.P. made in its enthusiasm to obtain the reins of government has now been broken. That promise was broken in the southern area policy package of Friday 29 October, four days after the original policy speech. The measure before us relates to tourism and the licensing of hotels, restaurants, and taverns, and in regard to tourism it was stated:

The A.L.P. believes the tourist potential of the south is far from fully realised. The southern vineyards, beaches and the Fleurieu Peninsula are under-promoted. Tourism is labour intensive.

Obviously, the Premier would have known then as he knows now that tourism is labour intensive. If one is to kill the goose that lays the golden egg, things will change. People will lose jobs. It was further stated:

It can further employment opportunities for those groups most affected by economic downturns; women, the young, the unskilled and semi-skilled and migrants. For the southern suburbs an energetic partnership of the public and private sectors will be crucial to tourist development.

That relates to tourism—beds in hotels and eating places.

Those industries come under the tourism umbrella because, of course, we know that any hotel that applies for an extended hours or a Sunday trading licence has as its only criterion for such an application that the extension is to cater for the tourist industry. If a hotel can prove that it is a tourist attraction and that it will cater for tourists, it will receive an extended trading hours licence. Therefore, these two matters must be linked. This measure will not only affect the hotel industry and many hundreds of restaurants in South Australia but will also affect the wider field of tourism, which some people call the 'hospitality industry'. I prefer to call it the tourist industry, because it is a large industry which creates employment for many thousands of people in South Australia. Therefore, this increased tax of 3 cents a bottle on beer and 30 cents a bottle on spirits will affect the tourist industry, workers in hotels and people throughout the State.

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

Mr MEIER (Goyder): This amendment to the Licensing Act will have a detrimental effect on the State of South Australia. It will also have a detrimental effect on the District of Goyder which, on my reckoning, has at least 34 hotels and well over 100 clubs and associated bodies, depending on how one defines them, subject to the Licensing Act. There are also various wineries, restaurants, motels and the like in the district, all of which will be affected by this amendment and by this increase of 3c a bottle for beer and between 20c and 30c a bottle for spirits.

This measure is most ironical, because the Premier clearly stated on several occasions that he has the interests of South Australia first and foremost. However, that statement is proving to be more and more inaccurate as each day passes. I refer to the paper issued by the Australian Labor Party entitled 'South Australia's economic future', which was issued in May 1982 and authorised by J.C. Bannon, Parliament House, Adelaide. That paper contains the following statement:

South Australian rural industries have been innovative in their concern to boost productivity and output.

The key words are 'have been', because it appears that this is to be a 'have been' industry while this Government is in power. It will take the Liberal Party a long time, when re-elected at the next election, to get it out of this mess. It is a shame that the industry seems to be getting more and more into a mess (I suppose I could use the pun getting more and more into the mire). The article continues:

Our wine industry accounts for almost 60 per cent of total Australian wine production, with sales estimated at \$300 million a year. Increasingly intense interstate competition has encouraged local producers to experiment with wine styles and new technology to maintain our position as the leading wine State.

It is good to see that the Premier acknowledges the important position of our wine industry, yet at the same time he has decided that the industry, one of the few industries that South Australia can look to with any confidence in the future, is to be subject to this tax. The paper also states:

Other factors remain beyond the control of the industry or the State Government. The wine industry has been plagued for the past three years by the fear that an excise or sales tax will be reimposed in the Federal Budget. The industry estimates that a 15 per cent tax will cost South Australia more than \$50 000 000 a year and reduce employment by about 2 000 jobs. A wine tax must be vigorously opposed.

That document is authorised by J.C. Bannon, who says that a wine tax must be vigorously opposed. At the same time, he levies a state tax through the Licensing Act. That seems to be complete hypocrisy. The paper also states:

The outlook for the rural industry in South Australia is promising.

That could be restated as, 'The outlook for the rural industry in South Australia was promising so far as the wine industry is concerned.' We could take it a step further in regard to the brewing industry. I was interested to see an advertisement in yesterday's *Advertiser* entitled 'Kaboom but not Kaput'. In the case of South Australia we could say 'Kaboom and Kaput', because that is the way that this State is going with this tax and the other taxes that have been introduced. Another paper entitled 'Tourism', also authorised by the Premier, states:

Tourism is already a major employer in South Australia. It is estimated that the industry contributes more than \$300 000 000 a year to the economy of our State. The A.L.P. recognises that tourism is one sector of our economy that has considerable potential for employment growth.

This tax measure will have a net result, particularly in Goyder, where we have so many hotels and other licensed establishments (including wineries) that they will have to put off people—and employment will go down. Many of the licensed clubs on the peninsula, in the Gilbert Valley and further north, rely on tourists, but tourists will not drink as much and they are not going to support this important industry as much as they have done in the past. One could look at other taxes that have been introduced but not as part of this Bill. The paper further states:

Unlike many other industries, tourism offers a greater chance for decentralisation.

How true! What a great shame when we do have an industry that can be involved in decentralisation, especially when this Parliament knows the debate that has gone over the years about decentralisation and about how Monarto, for example, will apparently never eventuate. Why is it that an industry that will be severely affected by this tax increase will be restricted in its development so that, in turn, it will probably reinforce centralisation in this State? It is something that we could well have reversed. The paper further states:

Despite the economic importance of tourism, Governments have too often treated the industry as a poor relation.

I suggest that the industry is being kicked in the stomach at present. In fact, it is being whipped to death and is well on its way to being strangled. Certainly, it is hardly being supported as the paper suggests should be the case. I now refer to the paper headed 'Small business: growth sector for the '80s'. That could be reworded 'Growth sector for the '80s' and other words indicating that under this Government it looks as if there will be no growth. The paper continues:

A Labor Government will act to encourage the development of the job creation potential of small business in South Australia.

We have heard statistics cited during this debate indicating that employment will drop off. The member for Glenelg cited an article which indicated that many jobs will be lost. So much for the Government's proposition that there will be a full job creation potential with this current Administration!

It certainly is time, after nine months, for a change in Administration. It is a shame that that opportunity is not given to the people, and obviously cannot be under the arrangements that we have. How the Government will sell this tax I do not know. I know that many members of the Government will pass through Goyder from time to time, and I suggest that there is no way that their safety can be guaranteed in the literal sense in hotels and other licensed clubs in the electorate of Goyder.

Mr Ferguson: Are you suggesting that they will be gunned down?

Mr MEIER: No, I am not saying that: I am saying that the reception in hotels will be somewhat negative. I saw in last night's *News* an article indicating how the M.P.s will try to sell the Federal Budget. The last paragraph states:

New A.L.P. members in marginal electorates were angry that they were given the difficult task of explaining the Budget without public relations assistance.

It appears obvious that this Government will need very good public relations experts to sell to South Australia the taxes that it will bring in.

Members interjecting:

Mr MEIER: As has been pointed out, the Government will need a new tax to give it sufficient publicity to try to sell it to the people, but, of course, it will not be possible to sell it to the people. I really fear for the future of this State at a time when we really need to see employment going ahead, not going into reverse, so to speak. The tax is counter-productive, negative, and certainly inflationary, and it will discourage further enterprise in the private field, particularly as it applies to licensed establishments and wineries.

Mr BAKER (Mitcham): My concern about this measure and a number of others that the Premier has introduced and is about to introduce relates to some very simple economic factors. It is a great pity that when the Premier went to university at the same time as I did he did not do an economics course, because it may have given him a greater understanding of the relationship between taxation and jobs.

Mr Becker: You were both there at the same time?

Mr BAKER: That is true.

Mr Mathwin: You went to different schools, though.

Mr BAKER: We did, indeed. The basic premise is—and it is accepted—that taxation costs jobs in a number of spheres and in a number of ways. The economic argument is that taxation leads to a redistribution of income. It can add to the community wealth only if the money spent through those taxation measures creates more opportunity than it did where it has been taken from.

I will look at several of the possible loss areas. Some of these have been canvassed by my colleagues, but it is worth remembering tonight that we are talking about part of a massive taxation programme on South Australians. We must feel sure that whatever moneys are raised will be used for the betterment of South Australia so that the total economic good from the redistribution will be of benefit to South Australians. We cannot guarantee that, as I and a number of other members have pointed out previously. We have no details of the expenditure on the Budget. We have again preliminary revenue items without any justification as to why that revenue is required. We have had a number of explanations from the Premier about the Budget over-runs, but in fact, the Premier—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has already pointed out on several occasions that this Bill does not open a debate on Budgets. I ask the honourable member to come back to the Bill.

Mr BAKER: The principle of the taxation measure (which is what we are debating tonight), as I said before, is that, to be of benefit to South Australia, the jobs created by the spending of that revenue must be greater than the jobs lost by the taxation measures. Of course, we have grave doubts about that proposition, extreme doubts indeed.

I will tackle them from the two propositions: where the losses occur and where the gains might accrue. On the taxation side, we already know that taxation adds to costs in various forms. The imposts by the Licensing Act are a direct cost which has to be paid, first by the distributor and then by the public at large. In fact, in many ways they are retrospective because they relate to a previous year's revenue. We are saying that they are increased costs which must be borne and are placed on the price of the product. Anyone with simple economic knowledge will understand that, if

the price of a product goes up, the demand for that product goes down. It is called elasticity of demand.

There will be some effect from the measures introduced by the Premier as well as those introduced by the Federal Government. We have a compound effect which will add significantly to the total cost of the product to the consumer. Therefore, we can also expect that there will be a decrease in the demand for that product. Any decrease in demand for that product must relate directly to or impinge directly on the people who supply it. That means that they have to rationalise their employment resources to meet the decrease in demand.

It has already been pointed out to us (the member opposite who is yawning might learn something if he listens) that in fact the demand curve for beer is static: it is not increasing. In fact, one would suspect that increased costs associated with the industry will cause a downward trend. We are costing the industry a considerable amount of money. However, more importantly, we will affect the jobs of the people, whether it be at the point of distribution in the hotels or bottle shops, or at the point of manufacturing and growing. At this stage we cannot calculate that effect, and I am sure that we would appreciate the problem much more if we could. Suffice it to say that there will be a job loss from this taxation measure.

The second effect which I have to address tonight is the decreased amount available for other goods, which is the consumption function of the household. The ability of the person who buys the same number of bottles of beer or wine to spend money on other goods is decreased because more of his household revenue is spent on those goods. Therefore, his net disposable income (if one likes) is decreased. It is a simple proposition that, therefore, the consumption function is affected. The ability of people to purchase other goods, which may well have quite a significant multiplier effect in employment terms, is reduced. One cannot undersell that aspect of any taxation measure, because taxation does affect the consumption function in every sphere.

The problem of incentive for investment has already been pointed out to us. It is well recognised that taxation provides a disincentive for investment. That has been recognised by the Premier, and one of the Budget initiatives put forward at the last election by the then Tonkin Government was that in fact there would be a decrease in pay-roll tax. It is recognised that imposts on industry decrease its ability to not only employ people but also to supply domestic or internal revenue for the financing of its various projects. The incentive to invest depends on the probable return: obviously, if the demand curve is downward sloping rather than upward sloping, this affects the decision making process. The beer companies, faced with what I would regard as a downward sloping curve, would hardly be enthusiastic about investing in the industry.

Mr Whitten interjecting:

Mr BAKER: For the benefit of members opposite, I point out that pay-roll tax certainly does affect the situation, because it was recognised in the pay-roll tax measure that imposts of taxation on industry affect employment opportunities.

Mr Whitten: We are talking about licensing tax.

Mr BAKER: If companies are faced with decreased revenue because of increased taxation they will be affected because less net revenue means that a company's ability to employ and invest is reduced. I would hope that the member for Price can understand that simple proposition. It is recognised that increased taxation does have all those effects. What makes it worse as economists will point out, is that during periods of down-turn, such as that which that we are experiencing at the moment, the difficulty is compounded

because the ability to get a return on an investment is reduced. Imposts made during a period of strong employment are not so severe in their effect because they can be passed on to the consumer with very little effect. During periods of down-turn it is important that imposts put on industries will not affect their ability to perform. Of course, we are in a very delicately balanced situation. Any increase in costs or any diminution of demand caused by external factors other than market demands will decrease the ability of industry to perform in the way that we would hope it can perform in regard to the creation of jobs. The creation and maintenance of jobs is the key element of what we in Australia and in the rest of the world are talking about today.

Mention has also been made that taxation adds to inflation. I do not know whether members opposite can understand that simple principle. Taxation affects the cost of goods and pushes the price of goods upwards, which affects inflation. It also impinges on the consumer price index, which I am sure members opposite have heard of. We are well aware that the c.p.i. is one of the major determinants, and has been in the past, of the wage negotiating process. We have already heard from the Prime Minister on this issue: he wants to support a 4.3 per cent increase in the wages allocated, because that was the prior six-monthly increase in the consumer price index. There is a relationship between inflation and wages, and we are well aware of the fact that increasing wages are causing difficulties in our international competitiveness. Taxation adds to costs, which adds to inflation.

A taxation impost in its various forms also has an effect on the standard of living. It affects it through the net disposable income mechanism and by means of the inflation mechanism if there is not sufficient catch up in the process. It also affects the ability of any household to maintain the standard that it has been used to previously. So, taxation decreases the standard of living. I have talked about five factors tonight where taxation has a detrimental effect. If taxation is to increase, to cause a redistribution of income it, must be demonstrable that the way in which taxation is spent will add to the net worth of the community. Then there is the matter of what that taxation will be spent on, but I am not allowed to speak about that tonight as that affects the forthcoming Budget.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chair is waiting with bated breath for the honourable member to come back to the Bill.

Mr BAKER: If one spends money in a particular way, it can be lost as a value to the community. If there is excess capacity in any industry, including the Public Service, and one adds to the cost of wages an additional person, one is doing the equivalent of what a transfer payment would do in the Federal Budget, in that it has the same effect as a pension or unemployment benefit. Something is paid out, not for nothing because it does meet a need, but it does not have a strong impact on the community in terms of its flow-on effect. It is different if that dollar is spent on something which creates and adds to the production function, or is a necessary adjunct to community services, because otherwise the cost of not having it is greater. They are very simple propositions which I hope the Government will understand. The taxation measures imposed by the Government must be seriously thought through and most importantly it must be able to justify what is spent. Every job expended in the public sector has to be justified. Every additional job which is created must be thought about in terms of the jobs lost because of the taxation measure in question. I refer to what the Premier said in connection with the Stamp Duties Act Amendment Bill (the next Bill

this House will consider), which has a direct relevance to this Bill. The Premier stated:

The most recent report of the Grants Commission—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair does not intend to allow the honourable member to transgress on to another Bill.

Mr BAKER: I will quote a particular statement:

The most recent report of the Grants Commission indicated that South Australia's taxing effort relative to the other States was below average in this area.

That relates to stamp duties, but what an incredible statement by the Premier! If one extends that proposition to cigarettes, what has happened in Queensland, where the price differential is some 21c? The difference between what it costs to buy a carton of cigarettes in South Australia compared with Queensland is \$3.80 per carton. If South Australia is going to be taxed because it is below the other States, and this measure takes South Australia to above the other States, I wonder about the morality of that statement, because in many areas, South Australia's taxation is the highest in Australia. To justify it by saying, 'This is one area you have missed out in; you'd better catch up,' is absolutely disgraceful.

I now refer to the Licensing Act and the proposed revenue measures. Under the proposition that we have before us, there will be an increase from 9 per cent to 12 per cent of taxation on the gross purchase of liquor at retail outlets. That is, in fact, an increase of some 33½ per cent. I am sure honourable members will admire my mathematics. It relates to the previous year and, as the Premier is well aware, there was an increase in retail sales in excess of 11 per cent during that year. Therefore, we can say that the taxation measure will reap revenue in excess of 40 per cent of the previous base—something which the Premier has failed to point out to the House. Therefore, we are talking of an excess of 40 per cent of income that will be derived from this measure. The Premier did not really come clean on that matter.

Of course, the other taxation measure relates to wholesale outlets and to liquor sold through those outlets other than to the retail outlets. Again, we have an increase of some 33½ per cent in the rate of taxation. We have had a significant rise in that area, and we are again pushing the 40 per cent mark in terms of the revenue gained. I find that consistent with the rapacious taxation that the Government has imposed in the last few months. I find it quite abhorrent that South Australians have been subject to increases of this nature.

Mr Becker: So the taxpayers have been raped.

Mr BAKER: No, I think the taxation system has a rapacious effect; I will not say that the taxpayers have been raped. To return to this one point, we have an extraordinary increase—a massive increase—in the amount of revenue to be generated from this source. In fact, it will be generated from the previous year, when the demand was not affected by the increase in prices, so that the impost on the industry is even greater.

Mr Becker: Could there be a down-turn in the next financial year?

Mr BAKER: There could well be a down-turn in the industry in the next financial year because of the costs associated with the product. Returning to the demand curve situation, the cost imposed by Federal and State Governments will impact on demand. People's desire for those products will decrease, and it is a matter of contention as to what the net effect will be.

If we went back to the brandy excise situation of the 1970s, the effect could be quite massive. However, we hope that we do not go back to it, as it will destroy the basic industries that we have in South Australia (the wine and

beer making industries). South Australia now produces some of the best wines and beer in the world. Industry has to look forward to exporting its product and being more vigorous on international markets. However, the industry can hardly be expected to be vigorous on international markets if it does not have the revenue available to promote the product.

I have returned to the simple argument regarding the horrendous effects of taxation on industries and the proposition that taxation for redistribution of income must add to the public good. With those remarks, I thank the House for its tolerance. I hope that some members opposite have learnt a little basic knowledge about the effects of taxation in pure economic terms.

Perhaps when Cabinet talks about increasing taxation, it can ask, 'What will happen to the jobs of our friends, to the jobs in industry? What are we doing for South Australia?' Members opposite may reconsider the taxation measures that they are imposing. If nothing else, I have had a good listening audience, and I hope that members opposite will put to good use the knowledge that they have gained.

Mr EVANS (Fisher): My first experience of an increase in taxation for licensed premises was in 1969, when there was a Liberal Government. At that time, the increase in tax was only 1 per cent, whereas the proposed increase now is 3 per cent, 200 per cent more than that proposed in 1969. At that time the Hon. D.A. Dunstan, who had been Premier and who again became Premier on 30 May 1970, made the point that the hotels in several other States paid licence fees under a different system. In other words, half of the licence fee was paid by the owner of the property and the other half by the licensee. In that regard, Mr Dunstan stated:

In consequence, we find that this impost will bear more heavily on the licensees in South Australia where many hotels are leased, and this will reduce the kind of services that can be given by the lessees to the public. On that score I am not at all happy about this increase. It was because of this consideration that the previous Government, although it needed revenue, tempered the wind a little to the shorn lamb.

That was at page 2369 of the 1968-69 *Hansard* of 12 November. At that time, another gentleman who ended up becoming Premier of the State (Des Corcoran), in the same debate, stated (page 2371 of *Hansard* of 12 November 1968):

I am not happy because, realising this will mean another \$500 000 in a full year—

and I emphasise that—

and about \$250 000 this year to the Government, this money will again come from the people who are possibly taxed to the limit now and who can least afford it.

In both cases, we find that people who had been or who ended up being Premier of the State for the A.L.P. saw the seriousness of such action in regard to an increase of only 1 per cent, whereas the present Government is increasing this tax by 3 per cent, a 200 per cent difference. Mr Dunstan was concerned about the effect on the industry to which he referred as a shorn lamb. He wanted to temper the winds to the shorn lamb. The hotel industry at that time was in a better situation than it is in today. We all realise that.

Over the years, the hotel industry has been experiencing more difficult times. The Hon. Des Corcoran pointed out that \$500 000 a year extra was a lot to expect from that industry, yet here we have a Government of the same political ilk saying that it wants to take another \$7 000 000 a year from that industry, 13 times the amount suggested should be taken from it in 1968. There is a limit to the amount of taxation that any industry can carry. Parliaments continue to impose tax measures on hotel operators and other licensed premises, but those businesses still have to compete with other forms of entertainment and relaxation.

More particularly, this State wants to compete with the rest of Australia and other parts of the world for the tourist trade, yet people forget that there are two things people talk about on returning from holiday — that is, how much their drinks cost and how much their food cost. If one enters into a discussion with anyone who has travelled overseas or interstate one finds that they refer to a nice restaurant or a lousy restaurant and the food and liquor prices. They often do that before they refer to the quality of those commodities.

The shadow Minister of Tourism, the Hon. Jennifer Adamson, pointed out that the hotel industry is one area where unskilled people can learn skills reasonably easily to enable them to continue in that industry as a waiter, waitress or bar person. It is an industry in which there are job opportunities for the unskilled, students, part-time work for deserted wives or supporting parents, whether male or female. It is a place where the unemployed can earn the \$20 that they are allowed to earn to supplement their unemployment benefit or pension and at the same time serve the community.

This tax is being implemented by a Government that said before the election that it would not raise taxes and charges because it was conscious that such increases affected employment in the private sector where it wanted to stimulate employment. We know that it is the private sector that controls the supplying and selling of products from licensed premises. The Government claims that it represents all people, though it does not do it any better than any other group. In fact, it is less effective in helping and protecting the disadvantaged while making the claim that that is its goal. Although the Labor Party and its leaders have said in the past that this type of measure knocks the small man, the Government has decided to tax the liquor industry.

During the 1968 debate on this subject, Mr Corcoran and Mr Langley made the point that it was nice for a working man to be able to drop in to a hotel and have a drink on the way home. They said that they were disappointed that the Government of the day was going to tax the liquor industry. One would have thought that the persons that the Government is taxing to the greatest disadvantage are the people that it is supposed to represent. Tied to the Government's action is the fact that its Federal colleagues are imposing a tax on the wine industry through a fortified wines excise. Yet, the Government they know that this will affect job opportunities for people in this industry. The Government knows that, and it is a farce for its members to say that there has not been a direct tax imposed on table wines by the Federal Government. At the same time, the State Government is imposing a 3 per cent tax which will be absorbed by the consumer. We did not want the Federal Government to tax our table wines because it would affect employment. The measure will have an effect on sales and therefore, employment. Is the State Government saying that a tax imposed on wine by the Federal Government affects sales, but a tax imposed by the State Government does not affect sales, because one is a State tax and the other is a Federal tax?

That has to be hogwash. It must affect sales. If it affects sales, it affects the industry. We have heard members say in this House and we have read press articles indicating that the Government is out to protect the small winegrower, the small producer; it does not want a tax from the Federal Government or any greater tax. Now a tax has been levied by the Federal Government and the State Government has placed its own tax on top of that.

That has to be a form of hypocrisy, tongue-in-cheek politics, hoping that the man in the street will not see through it. A person going to drink any alcoholic beverage will note that it has increased in price by 2c or 3c overnight

and will realise that an impost has been levied by someone. The hotel keeper is not going to say, 'I put it on because I wanted a bigger profit.' He will say that he put it on because the Government has taxed him that much more, so he has had to charge it to the customer.

Tourism is an important industry in this State, and I do not want to say more than this: by this move the Government has placed another burden on the tourism industry, an industry that has struggled for several years to stay in front. If it was not for under-age drinking, which the police have a problem controlling, the industry would be in a worse position. If ever a move was made to stop that activity, many hotels would become unprofitable overnight. A 12 per cent tax levied as a licence fee is a severe burden on any industry. In fact, it is totally unacceptable. I oppose the measure in the strongest terms and believe that the Government has been nothing but a sham; it made promises to the people when, I believe, it was aware that it would have to find revenue from somewhere, yet it chose to take it from an industry which could least afford it at this stage. I oppose the Bill.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): This debate has been a fairly long one. In many respects, it has

been a tedious and repetitious debate. Since the Bill is a precise one, I would have thought that its provisions could have been canvassed in precise terms. In fact, we have had a wide ranging yet repetitious debate on the whole question of taxation. I do not believe that anything constructive has come out of it. A number of questions have been raised by members about the possible impact of measures such as this; tourism has been mentioned, as was the impact on the industry itself.

No-one denies that there may be some impact, although I suggest that the measure of it has been considerably exaggerated and, in such speeches, the central issue of the need to do something about the State's finances and the benefits which come from doing something about the State's finances has not been addressed at all. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

At 12.55 a.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 31 August at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 30 August 1983

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

STATUTORY AUTHORITIES ANNUAL REPORTS

4. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: Have all annual reports for statutory authorities for the year ended 30 June 1982 been tabled in Parliament and, if not, why not, how many are outstanding and from which authorities?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The answer is 'No'; not all statutory authorities are required to table annual reports in Parliament; the time needed to provide this information is not warranted.

POLICE FORCE

6. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. Are members of the South Australian Police Force required to meet medical and physical fitness standards, dependent on age and, if so, what are the standards?

2. Are members of the force subjected to regular medical and physical fitness examinations dependent on age?

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

1. Applicants for employment within the force (18-29 years of age) are required to meet definite physical standards in order to gain entry into the force. These standards include minimum and maximum weight proportionate to height, normal hearing and speech and unaided vision of 6/9 in each eye. Defective colour vision is not acceptable. Applicants are also required to undergo agility tests including a 100 metre run to be covered in 17 seconds or less and a 2 500 metre run to be covered in 13 minutes or less.

2. Members are medically examined upon recruitment, upon graduating from the Police Academy, and upon permanent appointment to constable. Annual medical examinations are conducted upon STAR Force members and police pilots. Members are also required to undergo a medical examination prior to promotion to sergeant and the ranks above.

DESALINATION OF SEAWATER

7. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources: What experiments are being undertaken by the Engineering and Water Supply Department in desalination of seawater as a supplement to the State's water supply and, if none, why not?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: Experiments of this nature are not being conducted nor have they been conducted by the Engineering and Water Supply Department. Developments in the use of desalination techniques are specialised and are conducted by research institutions or by desalination equipment manufacturers who wish to improve the performance of their products. These developments on a world-wide scale are being monitored by officers of the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

ASH WEDNESDAY FIRES

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

1. What cubic quantity of pine logs are being stored in lagoon waters following damage from Ash Wednesday fires in the South-East of South Australia?

2. What proportion of the damaged logs have been stored to date?

3. What proportion of the stored logs is expected to be recoverable from the lagoons?

4. What proportion of the logs recovered is expected to be suitable for milling?

5. When is it intended to commence withdrawing logs from the lagoons?

6. When is it anticipated all logs deposited in wet storage will be withdrawn and processed?

7. Is it anticipated that the stored logs will yield the same quality as those of similar age but unaffected by the fires and, if not, what are the timber recovery proportion details?

8. From what source was the research into wet storage undertaken and on whose recommendation was the authority given to implement the scheme?

9. Were private forestry and milling operators consulted on the issue of whether or not it was feasible, economic and/or advisable to commence the scheme and, if so, which private operators were involved and when?

10. What interest rebate and/or other assistance incentives has the Government extended to the private timber industry to encourage the storage of flitched or milled timber whilst awaiting future markets for their current over supply caused by the bushfires?

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

1. It is planned that between 500 000 and 700 000 cubic metres of *pinus radiata* logs will be stored in lagoons (Lake Bonney).

2. To date 350 000 cubic metres have been stored in Lake Bonney out of a total 550 000 cubic metres in total storage.

3. 95 per cent.

4. 100 per cent.

5. In the first quarter of 1984.

6. December 1988.

7. Available evidence suggests no significant change in quality.

8. From published and unpublished information from various research sources—including C.S.I.R.O., Forestry abstracts, New Zealand Forest Service and North American and European sources. The scheme was implemented on the recommendation of the Director, Woods and Forests Department.

9. Yes. The proposal was discussed widely with all major client sawmills and harvesting contractors in the South-East prior to the commencement of salvage operations.

10. By deferred payments of royalties on salvaged logs and an adjustment to landed cost to offset additional processing costs and abnormal haulage costs into mills. In all cases the concessions have been made following negotiated agreement between the department and log purchasers.

PRIMARY INDUSTRY

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

1. Which primary industry licence authority and permit fees does the Minister intend to increase during each of the years 1983-84 to 1985-86 and, if any, what is the extent of the proposed increases in the respective industries?

2. Does the Minister intend to recover the costs of administration of any other South Australian primary industries as proposed on 1 July 1983 to apply in the fishing industry and, if so, in which industries?

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

1. In terms of the agriculture portfolio the level of all fees is under constant review in keeping with long standing Government practice.

2. The basis of any resultant increases (including costs of administration if applicable) would be made known to the relevant industries.

RURAL INDUSTRY ASSISTANCE

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

1. How much money did the Rural Industries Assistance Division of the Department of Agriculture lend primary producers during 1982-83; under which Acts was the money lent, and what proportion of the respective loan amount was State funded?

2. How many primary producers were assisted in each of the identifiable categories and what were the respective interest rates charged?

3. Does the Minister intend to adjust the interest rates applicable to farm build-up loans, debt reconstruction loans or carry-on finance loans during the 1983-84 year and, if so, to what extent in each case?

4. What is the interest rate currently payable to the Commonwealth on interest bearing loans to the department?

5. What is the current State debt to the Commonwealth on loan funds under the various primary production Acts and Commonwealth/State agreements?

6. What is the programme of repayment to the Commonwealth of the abovementioned debts in each of the years 1983-84 to 1985-86?

7. Does the Minister intend to obtain an extension of the loan criteria to enable funding assistance to young persons seeking to enter farming pursuits?

8. Have any share farmers been provided with loan funding and, if so, how many, when, and under which Acts have these loans been extended?

9. Has the Minister sought Commonwealth approval to lend fishermen any funds for the purposes of readjustment, entry or expansion of activity in the fishing industry and, if so, from which fund have such loans been extended and, if not, does the Minister intend to embrace fishing industry loan assistance under any of the primary producer assistance Acts he currently administers and, if not, why not?

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

1. The following amounts were loaned to farmers during 1983. The proportion of State funding is indicated.

	Loans \$ million	% State funding	\$ million
Rural Industry Assistance Act, 1977	4.2	Nil	Nil
Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act, 1967	39.6	23	9.1

2. The following number of farmers were assisted during 1982-83 at the interest rates indicated:

	No. of Farmers	Interest Rate %
Debt reconstruction	62	8-10
Farm build up	49	8-10
Farm improvement	19	8-10
Household support	38	Nil
Drought carry on	1 323	4
Bushfire carry on	183	4
Flood carry on	14	4
Frost carry on	113	4
Small business carry on	58	4
Bushfire fencing	468	Grant
Fodder subsidy	3 013	Grant
Freight	3 403	Grant
Stock disposal	105	Grant

3. Plans to apply to a minimum interest rate of 8 per cent per annum to all rural adjustment loans will be implemented from 1 January 1984.

4. The Commonwealth charges 7 per cent per annum on all interest bearing loans used for providing rural adjustment assistance. Arrangements are being finalised whereby the Commonwealth will charge 8 per cent per annum on rural adjustment funds.

5. and 6. The current State debt to the Commonwealth relating to loan funds is as follows. Repayment programmes are also indicated.

	Debt (\$m)	Repayments		
		1983-84 (\$m)	1984-85 (\$m)	1985-86 (\$m)
Rural Industry Adjust- ment Funds	16.982	1.57	1.68	1.74
Rural Industry Assist- ance Fund	13.320	1.64	1.64	1.64
Farmers Assistance Fund	37.8	2.0	2.0	5.7

7. Current planning does not include new initiatives to assist young people into farming.

8. Some 20 share farmers have been assisted by way of natural disaster assistance.

9. The Minister of Agriculture has not sought Commonwealth approval to provide financial assistance for fishermen. No plans exist to include fishermen for assistance under any of the primary producers assistance Acts.

TRAVEL AGENTS

15. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare representing the Attorney-General: When will the Government introduce legislation to control travel agents?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The Government's tourism policy includes a commitment to include legislation to regulate travel agency operations. The Government has also undertaken to consult with the industry and to seek uniform legislation on this question.

A self-regulation scheme has recently been approved by the Australian Federation of Travel Agents and the industry favours uniform legislation to support the scheme and ensure that it applies to all operators. A joint working party of tourism and consumer affairs officers has been established to recommend to Ministers the nature and extent of legislation which should be enacted on a uniform basis.

SCHOOL LEADERSHIP POSITIONS

17. **The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Which education organisations have been consulted by the Minister over the Education Department's discussion paper 'Leadership Positions in Schools—Proposals for Change'?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: During 1980 the Education Department, with the co-operation of the Teachers Institute, undertook a far reaching information giving and opinion seeking project. This project, the JESIFA project, informed teachers of the difficulties that were already apparent and which are likely to occur in the future due to falling student enrolments. A comprehensive report was produced in 1981 as a result of this exercise. Arising from this consultation process and influenced by subsequent discussions a series of personnel policy papers were planned.

One of these papers addressed the lack of flexibility that exists and could continue to exist in the leadership positions in schools. This lack of flexibility is apparent in a lack of options for such persons to gain transfers, a lack of sufficient movement to make possible the creation of new forms of leadership positions, the existing limitations to our ability to address the male/female imbalance at these levels and the future difficulties that may occur at the school level as enrolments continue to decrease.

A discussion paper that put forward a set of possible structures and procedures that gave considerable flexibility was circulated to all teachers, the South Australia Institute

of Teachers, SAASSO and SAASPC. Principals were asked to ensure that a copy was made available to their school councils. This paper was issued on the basis that it should be a catalyst for discussion rather than a definitive statement of Government intent that pre-empted any public discussion.

Reaction to the paper was invited and over 350 meetings for teachers to discuss the paper have been attended by senior officers from central or regional offices. Responses to the paper are now being summarised and it is anticipated that a set of alternative proposals will be developed for future discussions as a result of this feedback.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL POLICIES

18. **The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What time frame does the Minister envisage applying to the implementation of the proposed personnel policies of the Education Department in the following areas:

- (a) release of discussion papers;
- (b) consultation;
- (c) release of modified proposals; and
- (d) implementation?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Not all papers will be handled in the same way. The first paper on leadership positions in schools has been released and discussion, consultation and feedback will continue until at least the end of this year. It is anticipated that some alternative proposals will be released for discussion during this time. Formal negotiations with the South Australian Institute of Teachers will commence early in 1984 and these negotiations will determine the extent and timing of any changes.

Other papers are being handled by direct negotiation with the South Australian Institute of Teachers. There has, for example, been considerable negotiation on staffing formulae and some revisions are expected for the 1984 school year. Negotiations concerning the effect of leave without pay on teachers' holiday pay are still proceeding and it is not possible to indicate when these will be concluded. Further papers are currently being developed for discussion.

The timing of these has not yet been decided but it is likely that one further paper (*Teacher Stress*) could be distributed for discussion later in 1983 or early 1984 and a further paper (*Part-time Teaching*) will be distributed during mid-1984. Depending on the outcomes of the consultation process, changes resulting from these papers would be implemented in 1985 or 1986. Further policy areas such as country service and teacher housing will also be handled during 1984.

TEACHING POSITIONS

19. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Are unsuccessful applicants for teaching positions within the Education Department advised by letter that the position has been filled and, if not, why not?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Generally applicants for permanent teaching positions are not interviewed for a specific position: rather, potential candidates are interviewed for a range of positions to which they may be appointed. Therefore, applicants are not notified of the success or otherwise of their application immediately following their interview. However, at the end of the staffing of permanent positions, a letter is sent to all applicants to give them an indication of the current status of their application. Further, an attempt is made by a member of the interviewing panel to contact by telephone all unsuccessful applicants who have

been interviewed to tell them that they are not being offered a permanent position at this stage.

PERPETUAL LEASE LAND

20. **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 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 Government is presently reviewing the policy regarding the freeholding of perpetual lease land and it is expected that a decision will be reached in the not too distant future. When that decision has been reached, the terms and conditions which will prevail will be suitably advertised.

VETERINARY SCIENCES DIVISION

21. **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: Presuming that the honourable member is referring to what is now the Veterinary Sciences Division of the Department of Agriculture and to services rendered by that division, there is no intention to reduce the current personnel numbers or level of services to users of diagnostic laboratory facilities, laboratory animals or animal products.

SCHOOL COUNCILS

32. **The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: How does the Minister intend to conduct the inquiry into the role of school councils, what personnel will be on the inquiry, and when will it be finalised?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: A number of circumstances have suggested to me that we should look again at the powers, roles and responsibilities exercised by school councils. As the honourable member will know, the current regulations date back to 1972, and there have been no revisions since.

I am anxious to engage in the widest consultation about what possible changes in functions now need to be addressed since the moves of 1972 and for this purpose the investigation will proceed as follows:

- I have asked the Assistant Director-General of Education (Schools), Mr J.R. Giles, to chair a small group consisting of Mr T. Barr, Mr A. Anderson and Ms I. Brown, which, in the first instance, will investigate the issues. The group will write to the relevant bodies enclosing a copy of the current statements of the powers, roles and responsibilities of councils, and seek from those bodies a statement of what are perceived to be the issues in this area. These will be allocated and turned into an issues paper.
- The group will then arrange a series of 'search' conferences in which a cross-section of people will be invited to discuss the paper, make suggestions about further issues, and indicate their views about the ways and means of dealing with the issues.
- At this point, the small group will be augmented by appropriate representation and the larger committee,

with Mr Giles as Chairperson, will then take the issues paper, the feed-back from the search conference and other relevant material, and put together for me a Government policy paper.

- The policy paper will be printed and distributed widely and at this point I will ask the committee to proceed formally to receive feed-back about its propositions. That feed-back will come to me in a collated form with recommendations as to whether the existing legislation defining the powers, roles and responsibilities of school councils should be varied in any way.

I know the honourable member will be pleased to hear of this extensive consultation process which will endeavour to achieve a consensus among the community with regard to the powers, roles and responsibilities of School Councils.

DRIED FRUIT INDUSTRY

37. **The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education representing the Minister of Agriculture: Has the Minister supported a dried fruit industry request to the Federal Government to assist in curtailing the import of low-priced, poor quality fruit to Australia and, if so, when was that support extended and, if not, will he do so in the interest of State-based dried fruit packers?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The matter is being canvassed with all sectors of industry and the Minister is awaiting industry's advice as to the nature of any support that might be desired.

PASTORAL ACT

41. **Mr GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Lands:

1. Does the Minister intend to significantly amend or repeal the Pastoral Act and, if so, why and on whose recommendation?

2. Does the Minister intend to resume any pastoral leases or operations of pastoral leases and, if so, where and why?

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

1. The Government does have under consideration a review of the Pastoral Act and that matter, in association with other relevant matters, has been discussed with interested parties, including United Farmers and Stockowners. No decision has been made at this stage.

2. There are no current proposals to resume specific pastoral leases. Any decision to do so would be taken on advice from the Pastoral Board and no such advice is under consideration at present.

JACKSON FIELD OIL

42. **The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. Who were the interested parties with whom the Government had discussions concerning oil from the Jackson field in Queensland flowing to Moomba?

2. When were these discussions held?

3. When was the decision made by the Queensland Government not to allow oil from Jackson to flow to Moomba?

4. What were the reasons for the delay in answering question No. 206 of the previous session on this matter?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

1. The producers.

2. November 1982; February-March 1983.

3. The decision was made in October 1982 and formally communicated in November 1982.

4. No reason.

ENERGY INFORMATION CENTRE

43. **The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy:

1. How many persons per week on average have visited the Energy Information Centre during 1983?

2. How many staff are now at the centre and what are their classifications?

3. What advertising does the centre now undertake?

4. How frequently do school parties visit the centre?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The replies are as follows:

1. The average number of persons to have visited the Energy Information Centre during 1983 has been about 470 per week, and exceeds 600 per week in periods of peak demand. In addition, the centre averages just under 200 telephone inquiries per week.

2. There are three staff at the centre and their classifications are Administrative Officer—Grade 3, Energy Project Officer—Grade 1, and Clerical Officer—Grade 1.

3. Currently there are three small advertisements per week in the *Advertiser*, which advertise the facilities and information available at the centre.

4. On average, two school parties per week visit the centre.

LAW COURTS

47. **Mr MATHWIN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Public Works:

1. How many official invitations were sent out for the opening of the new Law Courts in Victoria Square?

3. Who were the official guests?

3. How many members of Parliament received invitations, who were they, how many accepted and how many sent apologies?

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

1. A total of 271 invitations were issued.

2. The official guests were: His Excellency the Governor Lieutenant-General Sir Donald Dunstan; Acting Chief Justice Mitchell; and the Hon. C.J. Sumner, M.L.C., Attorney-General.

3. Seven members of Parliament received invitations. They were: J.C. Bannon, Premier; D.C. Brown, shadow Minister of Public Works; K.T. Griffin, shadow Attorney-General; T.M. McRae, Speaker of the House of Assembly; J.W. Olsen, Leader of the Opposition; C.J. Sumner, Attorney-General; A.M. Whyte, President of the Legislative Council. Four members accepted their invitation and three tendered apologies.

DIRECTOR, STATE EMERGENCY SERVICE

50. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. On what date were applications called for the position of Director of State Emergency Services, what was the closing date and how many applications were received?

2. When does the current Director leave that position?

3. When is it anticipated that the new Director will be appointed?

4. What are the names of the people serving on the selection panel for the position, and why were they chosen?

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

1. Applications for the position of Director, State Emergency Services were invited in the press on 11 June 1983 and in the Public Service Board Notice on 15 June 1983. The closing date for applications was 29 June 1983. Fifty-one applications were received.

2. The current Director retires on 16 September 1983.

3. A date from which the new Director will be appointed has not been decided.

4. The selection panel for the position will comprise the following: Mr R.E. Killmier, Acting Commissioner of Police; Mr D.J. Hughes, Director, Administration and Finance, S.A. Police Department; Mr C. McNamara, Executive Officer, Office of Emergency Service and Defence Liaison, Western Australia. The membership of the selection panel was chosen bearing in mind the organisational responsibility of the Director, State Emergency Services and the duties of this position.

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ACT

52. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: Has a legal officer been placed in the Crown Law Office to assist in legal matters relating to the Department of Correctional Services and, if so, when was that person appointed and what involvement has that officer had with the regulations associated with the Correctional Services Act, 1982, in the past six months?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: An additional legal officer was added to the Crown Law Office in the middle of 1982 to assist in legal matters relating to the Department of Correctional Services. The person appointed has not had a substantial involvement with the regulations associated with the Correctional Services Act. In fact, a number of officers within the Crown Solicitor's Office have been involved with the regulations. In the past six months, the regulations have been subject to the general supervision of an Assistant Crown Solicitor. Other officers in the Crown Solicitor's Office have been reviewing the lengthy draft to ensure as much as possible that these regulations do not create difficulties of the kind encountered in proceedings recently before the Supreme Court.

YATALA LABOUR PRISON

58. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: What progress has been made concerning the change of name of the Yatala Labour Prison and what improvements in the current situation at Yatala are expected as a result of a change?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The Department of Correctional Services is considering a change of name for the Yatala Labour Prison. It cannot be expected that a change of name will impact one way or the other on problems currently being faced at Yatala.

REMAND CENTRE

60. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: On what dates will the new remand centre be commenced and completed, and what is the anticipated cost of the project?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: It is anticipated that construction on the remand centre will start in the spring of 1984 and that the centre will be operational by late 1986. The project is expected to cost \$20 000 000.

NORTHFIELD GAOL

63. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: Is it the intention of the Government to construct a 'temporary' gaol at Northfield and, if so, how far advanced are the plans for the provision of this facility?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The Government does not intend to construct a 'temporary' gaol at Northfield. However, a proposal for the construction of a 40-bed low security prison adjacent to the Women's Rehabilitation Centre has been referred to the Public Works Standing Committee. Construction will start almost immediately.

TAXATION LEGISLATION

78. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: Is it intended to introduce legislation to enable the collection of State income tax or a surcharge on income tax?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No.

PRIVACY

85. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Attorney-General: What effort has been made to prepare legislation to establish ongoing privacy rights for South Australians as announced on 19 May 1983, and will such legislation be in conflict with the proposed guidelines for the national crimes commission?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFT: The Attorney-General announced on 30 May 1983 the re-establishment of the Privacy Committee. That committee is not expected to report for some time. It is unlikely that any State privacy legislation would conflict with investigations of the type proposed to be undertaken by a national crimes commission.

NATIONAL CRIMES COMMISSION

86. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare representing the Attorney-General: Will the Government fully support the Federal national crimes commission initiative and, if not, why not?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFT: The Government supports, in principle, the concept of a national crimes commission. A national body is needed to monitor and investigate organised crime in Australia, particularly organized crime which crosses State boundaries. A decision as to whether the Government fully supports the Commonwealth proposals for a national crimes commission cannot be made until the Commonwealth proposals are finalized.

SUCCESSION DUTIES

92. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: Is it the Premier's intention to introduce succession duties for the rich only and, if so, what criteria will be applied?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No.

LAND TAX

93. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: What is the Premier's definition of 'extraordinarily high ratable property' for purposes of land tax as referred to at the recent A.L.P. convention?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The matter has not been considered.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: This matter has not been considered.

CAPITAL GAINS TAX

94. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: Is it intended to introduce taxes on wealth and capital gains and, if so, why and how will they be implemented?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No.

PRIVATE COMPANIES

95. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: When does the Premier intend to introduce legislation compelling private owned companies to disclose all their operational and financial details to the public?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: This matter has not been considered.

STATE CHARGES

96. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: When will the tribunal as agreed at the recent A.L.P. convention be established to monitor increases in State charges?

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

97. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: Which private enterprises in South Australia does the Premier intend to take over so as to conform with the dictate of the recent A.L.P. convention?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: This matter has not been considered.

JURY MANNING

104. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Attorney-General: What action has been taken to review the existing system of jury manning?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The Attorney-General has sought a report from the Sheriff, who is responsible for the selection and provision of jury pools for criminal trials in South Australia. The report will cover problems with and suggested reforms of the Juries Act. When this report is received comprehensive reform proposals will be developed.