

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 22 September 1981

The **SPEAKER** (Hon. B. C. Eastick) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PETITIONS

The **SPEAKER**: Concern has been expressed for some time that the House does not give as much consideration to petitions as it should. At a recent meeting of the Standing Orders Committee it was agreed that one way of bringing petitions to the attention of the appropriate authority would be to forward a copy to the responsible Minister for his information. In due course, this will be one of a number of recommendations which the committee will be putting to the House but, in the interim, I have decided that it is appropriate for this action to commence immediately and I have, therefore, directed the Clerk accordingly.

PETITION: HEALTH CARE

A petition signed by 41 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to uphold the Commonwealth-State Hospitals Agreement until 1985; abandon the policy of 'user pays'; and re-establish in this State a policy of health care according to needs financed by payment according to means was presented by Mr Crafter.

Petition received.

PETITION: GYMNASIUM

A petition signed by 38 residents of South Australia praying that the House call upon the Minister of Education to exercise his authority to retain the gymnasium at the Adelaide College of the Arts and Education for multiple use was presented by Mr Slater.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the written answers to questions, as detailed in the schedule I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos. 6, 48, 110, 122, 124 to 126, 133, 135, 136, 138, 140, and 141.

GROUNDWATER QUALITY

In reply to Mr **LEWIS** (19 August).

The Hon. E. R. **GOLDSWORTHY**: Mineral companies are controlled by the Mining Act, which allows conditions to be imposed on their exploration activities. In areas where useful supplies of groundwater occur, the companies are bound by a specification covering the abandonment of their exploration holes. This may mean that the holes have to be cemented in particularly sensitive areas. Additionally, mineral exploration holes should be blocked at the surface after abandonment as a safety precaution.

No cases are known where the deterioration of groundwater can be attributed to mineral exploration drilling. However, should the member know of any examples where exploration drillholes have not been abandoned correctly in areas of groundwater reserves, the Department of Mines

and Energy will investigate and pursue the matter with the company concerned.

STATE BANK REPORT

The **SPEAKER** laid on the table the report and accounts of the State Bank of South Australia, 1980-81.

Ordered that report be printed.

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT
AND PLANNING

The **SPEAKER** laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Department of Environment and Planning, Savings Bank Building, Grenfell Street.

Ordered that report be printed.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: INTEREST RATES

The Hon. D. O. **TONKIN** (Premier and Treasurer): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. O. **TONKIN**: The headline in last night's paper could lead people to believe that a new round of interest rate increases is imminent. It is important to correct that misapprehension. Contrary to the impression given, the building societies did not lift their interest rates recently when the Commonwealth approved a 1 per cent increase from 11.5 per cent to 12.5 per cent for the savings banks' housing loans. They have adopted a policy of holding back approved increases as long as they can, and that approach has been taken in the interests of their own clients. In doing this, the societies have given further evidence that they have answered State Government calls for responsible management leavened by compassion for people facing financial limitations. Since last December, rates on bank mortgages have increased by 2 per cent. The building societies have done their best to hold increases below that level and some of them, including Hindmarsh, have been able to do that.

I am unable to confirm or deny the report that Hindmarsh Building Society sees a further increase as imminent. However, I believe it is important for people to realise that, if it does, the increase mentioned would simply bring Hindmarsh Building Society back into line with bank clients. It is important to convey to people who were affected by the savings bank increases, which were the subject of wide publicity a few weeks ago, that this would not represent an additional burden to them.

While the State Government has made, and will continue to make, representations to the Commonwealth on behalf of householders, the action any State Government can take is circumscribed by national economic conditions and policies. To ignore national economic conditions by preventing building societies from moving their lending rates as the banks move theirs would have the effect of squeezing the societies out of business, and thus putting many home owners at risk.

Interest rates on home loans are a source of great concern. I am heartened, though, by reports that the savings banks and building societies have responded positively to my request that they make appropriate and flexible arrangements, wherever possible, with borrowers in difficulties. However, the situation has now been reached where building societies' funds are being threatened by the low rate of interest they can offer to investors.

There is no way the Government can allow building societies to be brought to their knees, and a great number of people to lose their homes. We now have no option but to concur with suggestions by the building societies that they should finally follow other lending institutions which have already increased their rates.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: PETROL SUPPLIES

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Minister of Mines and Energy): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I will be making a statement later in the afternoon about the petrol situation following the meetings held today by members of the Australian Institute of Marine and Power Engineers. At present the outcome of those meetings is still not clear. Two minutes before walking into the Chamber I was told that the union members had voted to continue the strike, but when this statement was prepared and was checked five minutes before my coming into the Chamber that was not clear.

Once the situation is clear, and following meetings I have had this morning with representatives of the oil companies, I will be in a position to announce further decisions with regard to the current arrangements applying for the rationing of petrol in the metropolitan area and the restrictions on sales in the country. In the meantime, however, it is important that honourable members are aware of recent developments in this matter since I reported to the House last Thursday.

Honourable members will be aware that the cause of this disruption and inconvenience in South Australia was the strike action taken by members of the Australian Institute of Marine and Power Engineers on 3 September over a log of claims. I understand that the institute has about 30 members in this State who have been involved in the dispute.

The first result of their strike was the closure of the Port Stanvac oil refinery on 13 September. This was forced by storages of fuel oil, a by-product of refining, which had filled to capacity. Until shipping again became available to take the fuel oil to interstate markets, no further refining of petrol at the refinery could be undertaken.

By Tuesday of last week, when it became apparent that there would be no early end to the strike, the Government was forced to take action to restrict sales of petrol in the metropolitan area to ensure that, if the dispute was a prolonged one, sufficient fuel would be kept available for essential services. Accordingly, restrictions on the odds and evens system were applied from Wednesday to Saturday inclusive.

During this period, I and officers of the Department of Mines and Energy had regular discussions with representatives of the oil industry and the Automobile Chamber of Commerce and canvassed with them various options which had to be considered in view of the continuing uncertainty about the duration of the dispute. At the same time, on Thursday, I contacted the union to seek some dispensation for shipments of petroleum products to Adelaide, because by that time the oil industry had informed me that Adelaide was the worst affected area in the nation for petrol supplies.

The union rejected my proposal on Friday, when I contacted it again for an answer, and, in light of this decision and the fact that I could not be certain when next South Australia would receive a shipment of petroleum products, it became necessary to consider further action to conserve the supplies still left in service stations and oil company terminals. As honourable members are aware, the Government imposed further restrictions on Saturday afternoon

and introduced rationing in the designated metropolitan area from Monday morning.

The timing of this decision was based on advice from the oil industry about the supply situation, and my view that it was necessary to reduce consumption to ensure that essential services could continue to receive supplies for the next three weeks.

Mr Bannon: This has nothing to do—

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is a matter of considerable public interest, while at the same time allowing the public a fair opportunity to have access to the remaining supplies. That is why sales to the general public were stopped—

Mr Bannon interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: If the Leader has no interest, the public certainly has. That is why sales to the general public were stopped on Saturday afternoon after there had been two days each of odds and even sales. The Government took the view that, while the cause and duration of this dispute was totally beyond its control, it should do all within its power to minimise inconvenience and disruption to South Australians.

Uncertainty about petrol supplies inevitably brings with it uncertainty about employment, and the ability of industry and commerce to continue to function. This in turn leads to severe dislocation to the lives of many thousands of people. This is the aim of strikes by key workers in essential services, and this is what the union involved in this dispute has achieved successfully, certainly in South Australia. To the maximum extent possible, the actions of the South Australian Government have been aimed at reducing this dislocation, and to at least keep everyone in work.

Our actions in this respect have been in marked contrast to those undertaken by the former Government when it faced similar situations in 1972 and 1973. On both those occasions, no consideration was given to those who, while not working in industries or involved in activities which could be classed as strictly essential, nevertheless had a right to expect that their employment would not be jeopardised by a very small number of trade unionists. This is a fact I had hoped the Opposition would consider before it made any comment about the present situation.

Mr BANNON: On a point of order, Mr Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BANNON: I have had the advantage of a copy of the statement, for which I thank the Minister who is reading it. The rest of the statement deals purely with an attack and a total misrepresentation of statements I have made, and I do not think that permission was granted for the Deputy Premier to use his position in this way in this form of statement. I ask him to desist from continuing with the statement at this time, and I take the point of order that it is not within the terms of the leave granted.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The honourable Leader has indicated quite clearly that leave was granted to make a Ministerial statement. Neither the Chair nor any member in the House, other than the Minister to whom leave was given at that point, was aware of what the statement contained. As I have indicated on previous occasions, the statement which is made once leave is given will be viewed by the public and the House alike according to the merit of its case.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Thank you, Mr Speaker. On both those occasions, no consideration was given to those who, while not working in industries or involved in activities which could be classed as strictly essential, nevertheless had a right to expect that their employment would not be jeopardised by a very small number of trade unionists. This is a fact I had hoped the

Opposition would consider before it made any comment about the present situation.

Mr O'Neill: What about the irresponsible employers?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I suggest that the honourable member should look at the comments of the umpire, the Arbitration Commissioner. Instead, however, the Leader of the Opposition has chosen to criticise the work of a great number of public servants who have worked very long hours under very extreme pressure, in recent days, to assist the public in difficulties which have been caused solely by a trade union.

Mr Bannon: It is an abuse of the procedures.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: What the Leader said was an abuse. The facts therefore must be placed before the House. It is inevitable, in situations in which a vital commodity is rationed, that there will be long queues by the public for permits allowing access to that commodity. This happened in 1972, when the former Government arranged one distribution centre for petrol permits, and again the following year, when there were five distribution centres. In this context, it is interesting to quote from the *Advertiser* of 31 October 1973, as follows:

Thousands of people crammed the five Government permit issuing centres yesterday as Adelaide had its first day of the current rationing. Several women fainted as hundreds of permit seekers jostled at the main centre of the old C.B.A. Building in King William Street. By 4 p.m. closing time, most of the staff of 60 men and women in the building were exhausted, because of the oppressive conditions. They were unable to handle all the inquiries and some people were turned away.

The position yesterday was as follows. No-one was turned away at the announced closing time of 4.30 p.m. In fact, the public-spirited attitude of those public servants—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Well in excess of the number you had. The public-spirited attitude of those public servants who worked there yesterday was such that some were at their desks for 12 hours to help the public. The centre did not close until 9 p.m., and at the other distribution centres closure was also—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable Deputy Premier please resume his seat? The honourable member for Ascot Park has heard the Chair call for order on more than one occasion. I do not want to hear from the honourable member for Ascot Park again.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The centre did not close until 9 p.m. and, at the other distribution centres closure was also delayed to cope, as much as possible, with the demand. So, when the Leader criticises the rationing system, he is criticising men and women, and especially those in the Energy Division and other divisions of the Department of Mines and Energy, who have worked throughout the weekend, throughout yesterday and much of last night, and who are facing the same pressure again today to cope with a situation which, I emphasise again, is the making solely of a very small number of trade unionists.

The public should also recognise that, although the Leader has chosen to criticise public servants who have nothing at all to do with this situation, he has not, for obvious reasons, in any way criticised the unionists who are solely and totally responsible for the long queues that formed yesterday. The matter of rationing arrangements has been kept under close and constant review by the Government. It is essential, if the Government is to maintain effective control of the allocation of available petrol, that the number of permit and coupon distribution centres be strictly limited. To do otherwise would be to encourage an uncontrolled run on petrol stocks with the possibility that stocks, even for essential services, could be exhausted.

The Government's actions in this matter have attempted to strike a balance between minimising inconvenience caused by circumstances over which it has no control, and maintaining control over available supplies to ensure that this trade union action does not cause total dislocation to the South Australian economy and the daily lives of all South Australians. Again, this Government has sought to keep the people of this State in work to an extent that far exceeds anything that the Leader and his colleagues did when in Government.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (Hon. D. O. Tonkin):

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. State Government Insurance Commission—Auditor-General's Report on, 1980-81.
- ii. Superannuation Act, 1974-1980—Regulations—Superannuation Fund Taxation.

By the Minister of Mines and Energy (Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy):

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Pipelines Authority of South Australia—Report and Statement, 1980-81.

By the Minister of Industrial Affairs (Hon. D. C. Brown):

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Long Service Leave (Casual Employment) Board—Report, 1980-81.

By the Minister of Education (Hon. H. Allison):

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Education Act, 1972-1981—Regulations—Committee Fees.
- ii. Public Examinations Board of South Australia—Auditor-General's Report on, 1980-81.

By the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs (Hon. H. Allison):

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Aboriginal Lands Trust—Report, 1980-81.

By the Minister of Environment and Planning (Hon. D. C. Wotton):

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. South Australian Local Government Grants Commission—Report, 1981.

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. M. M. Wilson):

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Board—Report, 1980-81.

By the Minister of Health (Hon. Jennifer Adamson):

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Medical Practitioners Act, 1919-1976—Regulations—Fees.

By the Hon. P. B. Arnold, for the Minister of Fisheries (Hon. W. A. Rodda):

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Fisheries Act, 1971-1980—Managed Fisheries Regulations—Abalone Licence Fees.

By the Minister of Water Resources (Hon. P. B. Arnold):

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Sewerage Act, 1929-1981—Regulations—Fees.
- ii. Waterworks Act, 1932-1981—Regulations—Fees.

By the Minister of Lands (Hon. P. B. Arnold):

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Advances to Settlers Act—Report and Balance Sheet—1980-81.
- Crown Lands Act, 1929-1980—Closer Settlement—
- ii. Cancellation of Agreements—Return, 1980-81.
- iii. Return, 1980-81.
- iv. Pastoral Improvements—Return, 1980-81.
- v. Remissions Granted—Return, 1980-81.

- vi. Soldiers Settlement—Disposal of Surplus Lands—Return, 1980-81.
 vii. Surrenders Declined—Return, 1980-81.

QUESTION TIME

The SPEAKER: I have been advised that any questions directed to the Chief Secretary or Minister of Marine will be taken by the Minister of Water Resources.

INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION EVIDENCE

Mr BANNON: Why does the Premier believe that it is not in the public interest for him to give evidence before the Industrial Commission about the state of the South Australian economy? Did the Premier tell a licensed inquiry agent last night that he felt he was being set up in being so called, and does he intend to further amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act? The Government recently amended the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act to make evidence on the state of the economy vital in determining a pay claim. Consequently, a union has subpoenaed the Premier, as Treasurer of this State, to provide evidence on this very point. Last night a Mr Reginald Bertram, acting on behalf of the Shop Distributive and Allied Employees Union, served a legal subpoena on the Premier outside his home. He said in evidence this morning that the Premier told him after receiving it that 'They'll be going to get me to appear.' Mr Bertram said that the Premier, who did not attend the commission this morning, refused the legal tender of money to assist his transportation to attend the commission, because he thought he was being set up, and that to do so would mean that he would lose his seat in Parliament. However, on the general point, it is important that the Premier respond to the question of whether or not such evidence is properly tendered to the commission, and why he is refusing this subpoena.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am not too sure where the Leader of the Opposition got the thought that it is not in the public interest for me not to attend the Industrial Commission. I simply make the point that I had a summons apparently served on me while Cabinet was in session. I did not see the gentleman who served it; it was handed to me by one of the office staff. I think that even the Leader of the Opposition would know that that is not an adequate service of a summons.

The Hon. J. D. Wright interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Indeed, my children, who thought that someone was lurking out in the garden at about 9.30 last night, were terrified, and I must say that I was not very impressed with that either. Again, the summons was not correctly served, because 24 hours notice was not given. That fact has been conveyed to the court.

I cannot imagine that the union could have been really serious about it, or it would have made certain that at both attempts the summons was adequately and properly served. I just do not understand exactly what it has in mind. The whole point is that an appearance was put in this morning, and it was submitted that the summons be set aside for two reasons. One, of course, concerned the incorrect service and the other, which is more to the point, is that on Thursday there will be a case before the Industrial Commission at which the Government will be putting quite clearly, for the court's consideration, the ways and means by which it considers economic matters can best be conveyed to the court in pursuance of the legislation that was recently passed in this House. This is obviously the proper course of action to follow and the one which, no doubt, will be followed.

IRAQI TRADE

Mr RUSSACK: Is the Minister of Agriculture aware that the Iraqi Government has called tenders for the supply of a wide range of agricultural products?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: Yes, we have been informed of the receipt of invitations to tender for the supply of rural produce to the State Enterprise for Agricultural Products Trading, which is an arm of the Iraqi Government. That authority is seeking the South Australian private sector supply of large quantities of meat, fish and fruit over the next 12 months. It has invited tenders for the supply of 16 000 tons of lean lamb meat, 36 000 tons of young boneless beef and 18 000 tons of young bone-in beef, all to be slaughtered in accordance with Islamic rites.

Mr Millhouse: No kangaroo allowed?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I should like very much to deal with the interjection from the member for Mitcham. In this instance it might be appropriate simply to say that, despite a vast number of tests conducted on meat processed within South Australia recently, no kangaroo or horse meat has been found to be substituted for our beef products.

Mr Millhouse: And there's more going to Iraq?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: None is proposed to go to Iraq.

Mr Millhouse: They'll be glad to hear that.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: This group has also called for the supply of 106 000 tons of apples, 50 000 tons of oranges, 5 500 tons of lemons, and 7 000 tons of mandarins. This quantity of fruit is obviously beyond the scope of any one supplier in Australia, and probably elsewhere. Its supply, therefore, would need to be considered on a joint tender basis. In addition, Iraq is seeking some 5 000 tons of fish. I have also had drawn to my attention similar invitations to tender for the supply to an interested party of large quantities of clothing, such as socks, pullovers and boots in particular.

I point out to the House, and particularly to the member for Goyder, that as a consequence of the signing of a contract to establish a demonstration farm at Erbil in the north of Iraq, the South Australian Government enjoys an extremely good relationship with the Government of that country. Invitations to tender for the supply of a wide range of products could be reflecting that relationship. I would certainly like to think that at least some element of established good relations between South Australia and Iraq is involved in this instance. Furthermore, it is appropriate to report that late next month the Minister of Agriculture for the Autonomous Region of Northern Iraq, His Excellency Muhamed Saddiq Mahmood, will be visiting South Australia to inspect dryland farming in this State. This visit will provide an opportunity to discuss progress of the demonstration farm to which I have referred at Erbil, as well as the possibility of additional involvement in agricultural projects in the area.

Mr Keneally interjecting:

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: Members opposite can add to the frivolous remarks made earlier by the member for Mitcham if they wish. We have cultivated and secured a very important relationship with that country, and I am delighted that interest in South Australian products should be shown to the degree demonstrated within these tender papers, especially keeping in mind that one of the main longer-term objects of our involvement in projects in Iraq, and indeed in other countries of the Arab region, is to establish sound mutually beneficial trading relations.

In accordance with the importance of this subject, I report further that the Foreign Affairs Department has

been made aware of the latest round of trading interest shown by Iraq.

ASBESTOS

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Will the Minister of Industrial Affairs give an assurance that the request by Mr Len Lean, Assistant Secretary of the Amalgamated Metal Workers and Shipwrights Union, and a member of the Asbestos Advisory Board, in his letter of 21 September to the Minister to make more funds available and to speed up the removal of asbestos from Government buildings, will be given top priority by the Government? Further, can the Minister obtain a report for the House on the progress of the removal of asbestos in the private sector as well as in public buildings? I have a copy of Mr Lean's letter to the Minister, which is as follows:

I have been on the Asbestos Advisory Board since 1979, and I am very concerned about the slow rate of progress in the removal of asbestos from public buildings, hospitals, etc. Asbestos is known as the silent killer, and a recent report indicates that 50 000 American workers who have had contact with asbestos will die each year of cancer. Adelaide is considered a nightmare, as the spraying of asbestos in buildings had been commonplace a few years ago before it was banned. Other cities in Australia did not go mad with the spraying of this killer material as did South Australia. The Government has the responsibility of providing more finance for the stripping of this material from public buildings, hospitals and any other area where the public may be at risk. The maintenance workers in these hospitals and buildings are put at greater risk as a result of maintenance work having to be carried out. These workers should not be condemned to the slow death caused by exposure to asbestos dust. If the experiences in America, the United Kingdom and Europe are any guide to the amount of deaths caused by exposure, then there could possibly be hundreds of deaths in South Australia each year, from exposure to asbestos 20 or 30 years earlier.

Our members working for the P.B.D. Hillcrest have been patient, waiting for more action in removing asbestos from the hospital complex; however, their patience is running out and if there is any industrial action taken through lack of progress in the removal of asbestos, the Government is to blame. I would remind you that industrial action had to be taken at the Modbury Hospital before the Government took action to remove asbestos. To date, not all the asbestos has been removed, but progress is continuing at a rather slow pace, now that the obvious danger to the public has been minimised. However, the risk of exposure still remains while asbestos is present in the hospital.

I enclose a copy of the report from the International Federation of Chemical Energy and General Workers Union, in which it states there has been a massive cover-up of the dangers of exposure to asbestos since the 1930s. When lives are at risk there should not be any cover-up, and I call on the South Australian Government to allocate much more finance for the stripping of asbestos.

An early reply would be appreciated.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: When was that letter dated?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: It was 21 September. I also ask the Minister whether it is possible to obtain a report on progress being made in the private sector, as well as in the public sector, because over the past three or four weeks representations have been made to me by two unions in the building industry about this matter. They are concerned not only about their members working and being put at some risk but also about the public being put at risk. This is, therefore, a very serious question, which I know the Minister will take seriously. Also, it has been pointed out to me that a senior member of the builders labourers organisation, who is, I understand, under 40 years of age, is currently in hospital dying from this disease. That is a tragedy, as I know everyone in the House will agree. I hope that the Minister can give some information on this serious question.

The SPEAKER: Order! Before calling on the Minister to respond to the question, I remind members, as has been done previously, that Question Time is for a question, not a series of questions, to be asked. Members have been asked

to construct their questions so as to give opportunity to every member to get a question as often and as quickly as possible.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I assure the House that this Government regards asbestosis as a very serious disease. Where a positive threat exists from asbestos in a building, the Government will take immediate action to solve that problem. I must point out that asbestos can exist in various forms in buildings, some of which forms are quite harmless; in others it poses some danger if due caution is not taken. In yet other cases the danger already exists. The Government has carefully monitored its own buildings and has a good assessment of the degree of danger posed by buildings. Buildings are used by public servants where asbestos exists but where, frankly, from evidence available, no threat whatsoever is posed to the health or safety of individuals working in those buildings.

I am sure that honourable members realise that at times asbestos has been sprayed into inaccessible areas of buildings that are not exposed, and, if ever there was a public risk or danger to an individual, it would come about when trying to remove the asbestos. The Government goes about tackling this problem in a number of ways, depending on the nature of the asbestos, its location and its ease of removal.

The Government seeks the guidance of the Asbestos Advisory Committee, on which there are four union members. Incidentally, one of those union members has told me that it is the best Government committee on which he has ever served. I therefore think that that reflects the high priority given to the problem by the Government and also the responsible way in which it has dealt with the problem.

In some locations (I think I am correct in saying certain locations at Modbury Hospital) it is regarded as almost impossible to remove the asbestos. If it was not completely removed, it was regarded that its removal would have created a greater danger than would have occurred by trying to seal in the asbestos. In certain cases the Government seals in asbestos and then erects appropriate warning signs advising that asbestos in the area has been sealed in and that no building action should take place in that area unless appropriate measuring and recording of asbestos fibres take place and unless the workers wear the appropriate protective clothing at all times.

I asked the honourable member to confirm the date of the letter to which he has referred, and he said that it was written yesterday. However, it has not yet reached me. I am somewhat concerned that it was apparently given to all the news media of Adelaide on the day on which it was written, and it was obviously given to the honourable member either yesterday or this morning, yet it still has not reached me. As an article appeared in the *Advertiser* yesterday based on the letter written only yesterday and apparently sent to me only yesterday, I believe that suggests that the whole purpose of the letter is to gain publicity rather than try in a sincere way to tackle this problem. I find it incredible that, as a member of that advisory committee, Mr Lean has not gone to the bother of making representations to me as Minister.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: I rang up this morning.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I am not accusing him of sending the Deputy Leader the letter. I am saying that I find it astounding that the news media was given a copy of the letter on the day on which it was written and before I even had a chance to receive it. I am also surprised that a member of that Asbestos Advisory Committee should go to the news media before approaching the Minister on the problem. I will now outline to the House the sort of priority that the Government has given to this matter. We all know that the Loan works programme is tight at present due to

the lack of available funds from the Loan Council in Canberra. Despite that, the Government has spent \$477 000 in removing asbestos from the State Library, \$51 000 removing asbestos from Modbury Hospital, and \$49 000 removing asbestos from Penola High School. In addition, the Government is continuing to monitor the situation. I believe that there is one other building on which urgent action needs to be taken, and the Government is proceeding to take action to remove the asbestos.

There are other areas where asbestos has been located and where monitoring has taken place by the Public Buildings Department. The results of that monitoring show that it is quite obvious that no public health risks whatsoever exist. It is known, for example, that asbestos does exist in the Citicorp building in Adelaide, but there is no danger to the occupants of that building or to the public from the existence of that asbestos, unless someone goes in and starts removing it. It could then become a danger. The Government has given the highest priority to the problem and it will continue to do so, because I believe that asbestosis is one industrial disease that should never occur in our modern society.

COUNTRY TEACHING

Mr GLAZBROOK: Will the Minister of Education inform the House whether, under the equitable country service scheme, consideration is given to those teachers who were required to serve their country under national service, and whether any conscientious objectors receive similar consideration? It has been suggested that some consideration should be given to those who have been required to complete a period of national service at a time when they normally would have done (or at least had the opportunity to do) some country service. As they were required to serve in the forces and lost two years of career opportunity, they believe that perhaps some consideration is warranted. There is also a belief that conscientious objectors have been given some consideration. Would the Minister clarify the true situation regarding these matters?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Members may not generally be aware that the provisions under the equitable country service scheme for national servicemen allow them to accrue three transfer points for each year that they served overseas and two transfer points for each year that they served within Australia. In this way, their service counts as though it had been service within the Education Department in the more remote parts of the State. That service counts only for the purposes of allocating a teacher to a specific place within the Education Department, and it has been (and still is) a considerable concession to national and other servicemen. However, they may still be required to serve in the country, and I remind the House that, under the policies adopted, not by this Government but by the Government of the day as long ago as in the immediate post-war years, conditions of employment were established for demobilised servicemen. At no time was it suggested even then that personnel should be exempt from the provisions of the Education Act or regulations, or indeed from any general departmental policy matter.

It should be noted, I think even more pertinently, that there was no intention then of extending a privilege to national servicemen that was not given to Second World War veterans, and I do not think there has ever been any consideration on the part of the Education Department, and certainly not on the part of the Minister, to giving national servicemen special conditions that did not apply to world war veterans.

On the specific question to which the honourable member has addressed himself, which is a new one to me, the question of conscientious objection, I would remind the House that a considerable number of conscientious objectors would have qualified as servicemen, on the grounds that many of them entered the armed services during war time in pacifist roles, in first aid, as stretcher parties, and so on, and served gallantly. However, I do not think it would be at all fair or proper if we were to extend privileges to conscientious objectors who simply objected and then in no way served in the Armed Forces.

CYSS FUNDING

Mr CRAFTER: Will the Minister of Industrial Affairs say what funds the State Government will make available in the current financial year to give effect to the pledge of commitment contained in the Minister's statement to the House on 27 August 1981 on the cessation of CYSS funding by the Commonwealth Government? In his Ministerial statement to the House, to which I have referred, the Minister said that some CYSS projects had been of only marginal value, and that the State Government believed that CITY and various Commonwealth employer subsidy schemes were far more effective than was CYSS, both in terms of their cost and in the attainment of their aims and objectives. The Minister did not substantiate those allegations, and no doubt they have been of great support to his Federal counterpart in cutting funds in this area. In his statement, the Minister made the following comment:

The reality is that there are a large number of young unemployed people within our community who need assistance and encouragement in their search for employment and in the maintenance and development of skills which will enhance their employability. Community support in this area is vital. The State Government will maintain its commitment to assist in this area.

Some 5 000 young unemployed persons in South Australia directly benefit from CYSS programmes, and 70 skilled project staff are about to be sacked. Many thousands of South Australians are waiting to see the reality of the commitment the Minister has given on behalf of the Government.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I am delighted that the honourable member has raised this matter on this, the first sitting day after Ministers of Labour met in Darwin on Friday of last week. In fact, if I wanted a Dorothy Dix question today, I suppose this would be it. I am prohibited from disclosing the exact nature of the discussions at the Ministers' conference. However, I indicated that early last week the South Australian Government sent the Federal Minister for Employment and Youth Affairs, Mr Neil Brown, a detailed letter and submission about what we believe should now happen with the CYSS programme here in South Australia.

Mr Crafter: Did you make it public?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I have made it public already. In fact, I released details of the letter to the press on Thursday of last week so that everyone would be quite clear about what it was that the South Australian Government was requesting. I put up a series of different options to the Federal Government. The main purpose of my request was to obtain funding to allow the CYSS programmes to continue, one way or the other. In fact, the preferred option I put to the Federal Government is that it allocate to the South Australian Government approximately \$1 000 000 for the current financial year on an on-going basis so that the CITY programme, which is run by the South Australian Government, can pick up the various programmes, perhaps in a modified form, which previously operated under CYSS.

If that is done, I believe that we will be able not only to maintain the service given by CYSS but, in fact, to improve upon it and integrate it closely with the CITY programme here. By doing that, we should be able more effectively to cover an even larger number of unemployed people and be able to make sure that there is no conflict between the various programmes offered by the Federal Government and the State Government. I can indicate that the Minister appreciated the points I put forward. I think I am fair in saying that he acknowledged the pertinent aspects, especially that there could be a number of unemployed people who have been unemployed for some time and who, for various reasons, would not be eligible to participate in various training programmes made available by the Federal Government.

The point is that the Federal Government has increased its financial allocation for these other training programmes. I do not dispute that, or criticise it—in fact, I congratulate it for doing so. The important thing is that those who cannot gain access to those other types of programmes need access to a CITY or CYSS-type programme. That is why we have argued strongly for a continuation of that funding, but for it to be administered by the South Australian Government. The Minister could give no indication about what his reply would be, because it is a matter for Cabinet consideration. However, I expect, as a matter of urgency, a reply from the Federal Minister, especially as the termination of the programme occurs shortly.

I also indicate that the other States back the stand taken by South Australia, and particularly that by the Victorian Government. We had consultations before going to Darwin, and both Governments argued along similar lines. Both Governments argued that the State Government should become involved in any continued programme. The Victorian Government put forward a different type of programme called YES, in which it wanted youth enterprise schemes established throughout the Victorian community. I think (and I stressed this point at the Ministers' meeting) that what is suitable for one State might not fit into the structure already established in other States. I would like to congratulate the Federal Minister for acknowledging that perhaps some variation might be necessary between the States. The ultimate decision depends on the Federal Government. I take this opportunity to urge the Federal Government once again to make funds available so that programmes like CYSS and CITY can continue and so that the large number of unemployed people in this State who do not have access to training programmes can at least have access to those programmes in their attempts to gain employment.

DENTAL SERVICES

Mr OSWALD: Has the Minister of Health seen the letter to the Editor in this morning's *Advertiser* signed by a David Martin, Chairman of the Committee of Inquiry into Dental Services in South Australia, responding to a report in last week's *Advertiser* which stated that the Australian Dental Association, South Australian Branch, does not support the findings of the committee, and can the Minister inform the House what action has been taken by the Government to implement the committee's recommendations?

Mr Martin's letter refers to the fact that we have been training about twice as many dentists as we need, or can afford, and it also refers to the outstanding success of two preventive programmes, one for fluoridation and the other for the establishment of dental services for children, both of which have resulted in improved dental health and a decline in the demand for dental services from private practitioners.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Yes, I have seen the letter from Mr Martin, and I thought it was a most perceptive assessment of the situation which is causing dentists in South Australia considerable concern at the moment. Mr Martin referred to the effects of fluoridation and the establishment of the school dental scheme, combined with the continued training of numbers of dental graduates who cannot find sufficient employment to enable them to earn the kind of professional income that dentists have grown to expect. I think it needs to be said that the dental profession deserves every commendation for taking decisions a decade or more ago which were soundly based preventive health decisions, taken in the interests of the dental health of South Australians and Australians, which decisions have resulted in vastly improved dental health, particularly for children, but which, of course, have had the inevitable effect of reducing public demand for dental services from private practitioners.

Notwithstanding the difficulties that are presently being experienced by private practitioners, every commendation should be extended to the profession for the public-spirited attitude that it took in the 1960s and early 1970s in order to achieve preventive measures which would, in fact, have the effect of doing dentists out of jobs. That, of course, is what has happened. I am surprised and disappointed that those members of the Australian Dental Association who voted in support of a resolution indicating a lack of confidence in the recommendations of the committee should have done so, particularly in the light of the fact that, when I released for public comment the report of the Committee of Inquiry into Dental Services in South Australia, the very same association (the Australian Dental Association) indicated in its response to the committee its support for the majority of the committee's recommendations. It seems to me that there has been a very strange turnaround during the year by some members of the A.D.A.

I should also state that I have very great confidence in the members of that committee who performed an extremely difficult job very well indeed. The Chairman, Mr David Martin, is a highly respected management consultant whose services have been engaged by the previous Government and also by the present Government, and he is very highly regarded throughout South Australia in his capacity as a management consultant. Another member of the committee was Dr John Bloomfield, pre-eminent in his profession, a dentist who was highly respected, who died tragically some weeks ago, and who I would have thought had the confidence of all of his colleagues. The third member of the committee was Mrs Marion Disney, who has been honoured by the Queen for her services to the community and who has very great insight into the needs of the disadvantaged in South Australia. It was for the disadvantaged in South Australia and their need for dental services that much of the committee of inquiry's time was directed, and many of its recommendations were designed to assist the plight of these people.

Many of the recommendations have either been adopted or set in train, or are currently matters for consultation between the Health Commission and the Royal Adelaide Hospital Board, in respect of the dental hospital. One recommendation, namely, the deferral of registration for dental technicians, was adopted. I would have thought that the Australian Dental Association, which campaigned strongly against registration for dental technicians, would give the Government some credit for its decision in that regard. If those members of the association who voted in favour of the resolution put at the association's meeting had been in full possession of the facts, and had those facts been put effectively to them at the meeting, they might have thought twice before they voted to express a lack of confidence in

a committee of inquiry which has performed a great service to South Australia and whose recommendations are progressively implemented by the Government.

WAGE AND SALARY COMPONENT

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: Has the Minister of Education, on behalf of the teachers of this State, pointed out to the Premier the mistake that the Premier made in analysing increases in the wage and salary components of the Education Department last year? In presenting the Budget last week, the Premier referred to wage and salary increases of, among others, the Education Department, stating that these exceeded the Budget estimate for last year. In his speech to Parliament, the Premier, in relation to all Government wages and salaries, said:

With large indexation and so-called 'work-value' increases the actual cost [of wages and salaries] turned out to be \$92 000 000, despite the Government's best efforts to contain it.

In his statement issued to the media, the Premier said:

In the case of the Education Department alone, total spending exceeded original estimates by \$29 500 000, of which \$26 900 000 was the direct result of additional wage and salary payments to those estimated when the Budget was presented to Parliament.

The Premier also referred to the increased spending as excessive wage increases and cited no other causes. The interpretation is then obvious that the Premier believes that the extra amount spent within the Education budget, over and above the round sum allowance for increases, was the result of excessive wage increases. The Auditor-General's Report tabled last week, in relation to wage and salary increases within the Education Department budget, states:

The increase . . . was due mainly to national wage increases and an additional pay period for teachers.

Due to the nature of the calendar and its correlation with pay days, the 1980-81 financial year consisted of 27 pay periods instead of the usual 26. In fact, the 1980-81 Budget forgot about the extra pay period and, had it included it, the proposed vote would have been about \$347 000 000, an increase of \$13 000 000.

The extra amount paid in last years payments over and above budget was therefore not the result of 'excessive wage demands' but arose because of an oversight, if not a bungle by the Premier.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: As the Premier has sought to base much of his Budget approach upon a teacher bashing line, the Minister of Education should point out, if he has not done so already—

The SPEAKER: Order! I gave the member for Salisbury a warning when he used the word 'bungle'. He failed to respond. I ask him to give fact and not comment, or cease to comment at all.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I would like to dispel one misunderstanding on the part of the honourable member.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Well, it is probably the major one. He mentioned that there were 27 pay periods last year rather than the usual 26. The Government has been at pains repeatedly to point out that in its calculations and statements to the House, including those made before the Estimates Committees last year, we were already at that stage well aware of the extra pay period and at no stage did we choose to let that reflect upon an additional amount being present in the Budget. There were two amounts in education which were allocated: one was a round sum which was included last year and was not included this year as part of the Education budget; the other was a much larger round sum which normally sits in Treasury and is available

for the whole of the Public Service. To the best of my memory, we allocated \$471 000 000 in education at the beginning of the last financial year and spent well over \$490 000 000, plus the round sum allowance which was already included in the earlier sum. This is really where the red herring in the question comes in. The honourable member is trying to detract from the point that the President of the Institute of Teachers, the Secretary of the Institute of Teachers, the advocates representing the institute, and others before the industrial tribunals are all on record in writing, either in the news media or on transcript within the Industrial Court, as saying that one tactic which they could try was to ask for 25 per cent (not the 20 per cent).

The President and Secretary of the institute, in the everyday published press, at various times have been quoted as saying that they would be trying for somewhere between 12 and 20 per cent. Earlier this month we offered an interim payment of 4 per cent, and were told that the real interim payment required was 10 per cent, which really does beg the question as to just how high the actual increase was. My real point, which I have made to the press, is that the amount required by the Institute of Teachers has never really been put firmly and forcibly before the courts. Various amounts have been quoted.

The question was whether I will chastise the Premier for mentioning the figure of 20 per cent and for saying that the Government is not very happy about unrealistic wage increases. We are not: I do not think any Government is. New South Wales, Western Australia, Victoria and Tasmania have all made the same statement as the South Australian Treasurer has made, but the House must surely recognise it as a tremendous act of good faith that this Government, in the budgetary papers, has set aside \$78 000 000 in round sum allowances for salary and wage increases throughout the Public Service, which are reasonable. We anticipate those. Of course, we are going to pay them. There is also another \$15 000 000 for various cost increases. We anticipate those, too. We are not putting them within the departmental budget to inflate it falsely. We are leaving them in round sum allowances. How the Premier can be criticised for behaving in a perfectly normal, realistic manner in making generous allowances for normal salary increases, and how he can be criticised for saying that he does not want abnormal salary increases, made me wonder what the honourable member is all about, apart from stirring trouble. I am sure that all my comments can be substantiated by reference to the daily press.

LYNDHURST STREETS

Mr GUNN: Can the Minister of Transport say whether there is any likelihood of funds being available to seal the streets of the township of Lyndhurst? I have been informed by my constituents in that part of the State that the Highways Department indicated some time ago that it would be likely to get funds this year for the construction of those streets. A schedule was forwarded to them by the Highways Department. However, they now believe that it is unlikely that any funds will be made available, and they have expressed some concern about that. Could the Minister inform the House about the exact position so that there is no misunderstanding?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The member for Eyre is right in bringing the question to the House's notice. Sealing of roads and streets in northern areas has been under deep consideration by me over the past few weeks. In fact, the member for Eyre will know that I was in the area only four weeks ago looking at potential work that needs to be done

by the Highways Department in northern areas, and at work being done now. I particularly refer to the construction of the Leigh Creek road, which is continuing at a very satisfactory rate. A short answer to the honourable member's request is 'Yes', the sealing of streets in that section of Lyndhurst is a high priority in the Highways Department works programme, and the work will be done as soon as funds are available.

PRESS ADVERTISEMENT

Mr TRAINER: Will the Premier institute proceedings, or ensure that his Attorney-General institutes proceedings, under the Unauthorised Documents Act, 1916-1979, against that 'large group of proud confident South Australians' who advertised in the *Advertiser* and the *News* last Friday and who appear, on the face of it, to have breached section 3 (a) of that Act? Also, will the Premier explain the circumstances of the photograph of himself that appears on the top of those advertisements, despite the fact that he later claimed that he knew nothing whatsoever about the advertisements?

The legal background is clear and quite unambiguous. It stems from the passage in 1916 of the Unauthorised Documents Act, as amended early in 1979 to include reference to the State badge and the State emblem. A regulation subsequently gazetted on 19 April 1979 declared the piping shrike to be an official emblem of the State, even though there could be some ornithological argument about the continued use of the term 'piping shrike', when the bird in question is undeniably the white-backed magpie. The shrike, or magpie, was used on the advertisements to which I have referred. It could suggest official approval for these actions by those proud but anonymous South Australians. The Act provides that a prescribed emblem cannot be used without Ministerial permission. The maximum penalty is \$500.

Last Saturday the *Advertiser* reported that nobody had sought permission to use the emblem. The Premier also said that he did not know who paid for the advertisement. I understand that the news media did a little research and discovered that, whoever had prepared the material and whoever had taken the Premier's photograph, several local businessmen, including Mr Graeme Heard of Hawthorn, who manages the firm known as Chief Kitchenware of Cavan, did pay for the advertisement. Presumably he wishes the advertisement to be seen but not 'Heard'.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Millhouse: I'll have a word with him tomorrow morning. We run together.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Ascot Park to come back to factual detail and not to comment.

Mr TRAINER: Is there any reason why Mr Heard should escape the consequences of his action?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: It was, of course, predictable that the matter would be raised in the House today after the Leader of the Opposition's rather green and jaundiced outburst following the advertisement last Friday. Let me take them in order, from the top. As to the photograph, photographs are taken periodically and are used by members of the press staff, and they are handed out as matters of publicity. I suggest that it was following exactly the same procedures as that adopted when my predecessors were in office, although I do suspect that the member for Hartley was not quite so prolific in his photographic excursions as was his predecessor. I think it was the Hon. Dr Cornwall who incurred a great deal of expense on photographs. I cannot remember the exact figure, but perhaps the member for Hartley could expand on that. It was quite

a good deal more than any other Minister, and probably got very close to the sum total of all other Ministers.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: They had \$16 000 on working lunches one year.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am not getting into the area of white-backed magpies or piping shrikes. As far as I am concerned, I have always termed the State's emblem a piping shrike, I think it always has been so termed, and I do not intend to make any change in that. As to who was responsible for the advertisement, frankly, I am not in a position to say. I do not know. The name quoted across the Chamber today is news to me. I have followed the same procedure that has been adopted ever since this Government came to office, and as the same as was adopted by my predecessor. Where there has been any unauthorised use of the piping shrike, the person responsible for publishing or using it, wherever identified, is communicated with and advised that he is in breach of that Act.

Mr Millhouse: I'll tell him tomorrow morning.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I would be very careful if I were the member for Mitcham, as should the member for Ascot Park be careful. I am sure that, if he was responsible for part of it, he would be very proud of it.

Mr Millhouse: He didn't mention it to me.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: One could hazard a guess as to why that would be so, but I do not intend to do so.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I can vividly recall a number of cases where people have used the piping shrike without authorisation. They have all been notified directly or indirectly by letter. I can recall the Riverland Fruit Products at one stage using the piping shrike on its label, and I think that it now uses the outline of South Australia.

Be that as it may, to put the record straight, I have written to the Marketing Manager and the people responsible for both the morning and afternoon newspapers as follows:

My attention has been drawn to an advertisement which appeared on page 9 in the *Advertiser* on Friday 18 September 1981. The State badge (comprising the piping shrike) was included in the advertisement, giving the appearance of an official South Australian Government advertisement although this was not so.

Unauthorised use of the State badge is precluded under the provisions of the Unauthorised Documents Act, 1916-1979, and it would be appreciated if you would note this and inform your advertisers, also.

Some organisations representing sporting, recreational or cultural bodies in the main, are given permission to use the State badge in certain circumstances: permission had not been sought or given, however, in relation to Friday's advertisement.

Your co-operation in monitoring this aspect of advertisements lodged other than by Government departments and instrumentalities would be appreciated.

PETROL SUPPLIES

Mr BLACKER: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy state what action the Government has taken to ensure that adequate supplies of petrol are available for country areas and to ensure that those people who do not have access to public transport can maintain a reasonable degree of mobility? The majority of country people do not have access to public transport and are therefore dependent on fuel supplies for even minimal mobility and the maintenance of essential services. Furthermore, I am advised that metropolitan users are travelling into country areas to avail themselves of the \$7 quota, thus negating the principle of general restrictions.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: As I indicated in my Ministerial statement, I met with all the oil companies this morning. During that meeting, which lasted for probably 1½ hours, we canvassed the whole of the State—

Mr Keneally: They must be masochists.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: There were a number of matters to cover, and the fact is that the present situation in the country is reasonably satisfactory. To mount a full rationing campaign throughout the whole State would be a large exercise. I heard one comment, I think last evening, on the air where it was suggested that in previous years something like this had been done. My memory tells me that that was during the war years. The gentleman being interviewed seemed to be elderly. To mount a full-scale rationing period throughout the whole State would be a fairly major exercise, certainly at short notice. We will have to institute tighter controls in country areas, and we will have to see that essential services in country areas are maintained.

I am advised by the companies concerned that the present situation in the country is not desperate. For instance, Mount Gambier is getting most of its supplies at the moment from Victoria. An announcement will be made later today when we have clear confirmation of the situation in relation to this disgraceful union dispute and when we ascertain that there is no exemption. During the numerous consultations I have had since the end of last week, I have been told that there were to be no exemptions. When that sort of thing has been confirmed, I will announce quite clearly before the end of the day what will apply throughout South Australia in relation to this difficult situation, which is becoming more difficult daily.

As I have said, I have checked with the resellers, regarding the country situation. Of course, country people will be affected, as is everyone else, and they will be affected to an increasing extent if this dispute continues.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: PETROL SUPPLIES

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

Leave granted.

Mr BANNON: In the course of the Ministerial statement made by the Minister of Mines and Energy today on the petrol dispute (I might say that I have no objection to the first half of that statement recounting the circumstances and the Government's action in relation to it), the Minister said:

The Leader of the Opposition has chosen to criticise the work of a great number of public servants who have worked very long hours under very extreme pressure in recent days to assist the public in difficulties which have been caused solely by a trade union . . . So when the Leader criticises the rationing system he is criticising men and women, especially those in the Energy Division and other divisions of the Department of Mines and Energy, who have worked throughout the weekend, throughout yesterday and much of last night, and are facing the same pressure again today.

I should like to make quite clear, as the Minister of Mines and Energy full well knows, that I am not criticising and have not criticised those public servants who have indeed worked extremely hard and long hours to try to assist the situation. What I have criticised are the arrangements that the Government has brought in and the way in which it has operated them, and that criticism lies squarely on the shoulders of the Minister. They are directed against him and not against his public servants. It is about time that the Minister stood up and took responsibility for it.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: JUDICIAL APPOINTMENT

Mr MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr MILLHOUSE: My explanation concerns remarks made publicly by the Premier about me and appointment to judicial office. I can best give the explanation by quoting from letters between him and me. The first is a letter dated 14 September which I wrote to him and which states:

Dear Premier,

I was annoyed and upset to hear of the report on the A.B.C. news early on Saturday morning (I believe now it was broadcast also on Friday) of your discussion about me on air with Phillip Satchell on Friday. The first I knew of it was when some of my running companions, travelling in another car to me, heard it about 7 a.m. as we were driving out to have our run. Others have since told me of it, which is not surprising in view of its wide publication. The report on the news was as follows:

The Premier says he won't be recommending that Australian Democrat Leader, Mr Millhouse, be appointed to the Judiciary. Mr Tonkin was asked on A.B.C. radio about reports that Mr Millhouse was to be appointed to the Judiciary. Mr Tonkin said the reports were rumours which he'd heard for two years and believed they had been started by Mr Millhouse.

No doubt when you were asked about the matter your first reaction was to reply in such a way as to cause embarrassment and humiliation to a political adversary. You have succeeded. However, you know, as I do, how misleading, to the extent of being deliberately inaccurate, what you said is.

I categorically deny having started the rumours about my possible appointment to the bench. Indeed, they have been an embarrassment to me ever since they began soon after the last election. Ironically, they were mentioned to me most strongly (I think I am right in this) after the Liberal Party Christmas party for the press in either 1979 or last year. Several of my friends in the media told me that Liberal back-benchers assured them I was soon to be appointed!

You have now suggested that I started these rumours myself. That is probably defamatory: the innuendo must be that I started them with a view to putting pressure on the Government to appoint me: that infers that I have been touting for appointment and is likely to bring me into ridicule and contempt, especially with other members of the legal profession. For that reason I shall send a copy of this letter to Graham Taylor, the Manager of the A.B.C. here, and ask him, pursuant to section 117A of the Broadcasting and Television Act, to keep all transcripts of your conversation with Phillip Satchell and the subsequent news reports.

I did that, and I have had an acknowledgment from him. My letter continues:

I invite your attention to the fact, which must be well known to you, and which surely you could not have forgotten even during the interview with Phillip Satchell, that only a few weeks ago (indeed on Friday 24 July at 4 p.m., according to my diary) Lew Barrett, apparently on behalf of the Government and at the request of Cabinet, came to see me at Bar Chambers to ask if I would consider accepting appointment as a judge of the Local and District Criminal Court. As you must know I immediately refused that offer.

Lew Barret, of course, is Mr Lewis Barrett, Chairman of Trustees of the Savings Bank. The letter continues:

Up to now I have kept that approach pretty well to myself. Now you go and say what you have! I regard what you have done as a very bad action and unworthy of you.

You probably also know that I was approached (one such approach being by a Liberal back-bencher in the Legislative Council) to consider appointment to the Family Court. I refused to consider that, either.

I write therefore now to ask for a public withdrawal of the suggestion that I started the rumours and an apology for what you have said and explanation of why you said it. If such be not forthcoming by Tuesday of next week (the 22nd) I propose to seek leave to make a personal explanation in the House and to quote this letter in it.

I said that I would send a copy of the letter to Lew Barrett. On the next day, the 15th, I got a reply from the Premier which originally started, 'Dear Mr Millhouse', but 'Mr Millhouse' had been crossed out and 'Robin' written in. The letter states:

I'm sorry if my reported comments on the A.B.C. have caused you concern. In reply to Phillip Satchell I simply indicated that I have no intention of making any recommendation as far as an appointment to the bench was concerned.

As you agree, rumours about your possible appointment to the bench have been current since the last election. I'm sure you will agree too that they gained prominence following media interviews in which you commented on your reaction to the possibility. It was that to which my further passing comment referred.

It was not, of course. It was to the origination of the thing. The letter continues:

I reject entirely the innuendo you suggest. As to approaches which may have been made to you, I cannot comment other than to say that no approaches were made on behalf of Cabinet.

During the last two years some people have suggested that you should be approached for your reaction, and I have no doubt they may have canvassed the possibility with you, too.

Yours sincerely,

David
PREMIER

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MILLHOUSE: I replied on 17 September—and this is the last of the letters—as follows:

Dear Premier,

I am not mollified by your letter of 15 September.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Did you rub it out and put 'Dear David'?

Mr MILLHOUSE: No, I did not. My letter states:

Since receiving it I have spoken again to Lew Barrett and confirmed with him what occurred. He told me when he came to see me, and has now confirmed it, that after a conference on amendments to the Savings Bank Act at which two members of Cabinet were present one of them said to him, 'How well do you know Robin Millhouse?'. The question led to a request to him to approach me to sound me out as to appointment to the Local and District Criminal Court. When he called I certainly gained from him the impression that it was an approach from Cabinet. He said that the Government was anxious to raise the standard of appointments to the court.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MILLHOUSE: My letter continues:

He mentioned the accommodation to be available in the Moore's building: he also said that subsequent appointment to the Supreme Court was a matter for the future. I have no doubt that the discussion I had with him was relayed to you so that you must have been aware when you spoke to Phillip Satchell of my refusal. I renew the request in the second to last paragraph of my letter of 14 September.

I added a postscript before I sent the letter the following morning. Dated 18 September 1981, it states:

I sent a copy of this letter last night to Lew Barrett. This morning he telephoned me to say that it is accurate except that the Cabinet member concerned spoke to him on the telephone soon after the conference and not at it.

Certainly therefore—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired unless an extension is granted.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Extension!

The SPEAKER: Will the honourable member please seek leave?

Mr MILLHOUSE: I seek leave just to finish it off.

Leave granted.

Mr MILLHOUSE: I am indebted to the member for Hartley for that. I have almost finished.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: There is one thing I want to know before you sit down. If they had offered you the Supreme Court first, what would you have done?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MILLHOUSE: You see, Sir, they are so stupid that they thought they could get me with a smaller bait.

Members interjecting:

Mr MILLHOUSE: I conclude my personal explanation by saying this. Certainly, therefore, what the Premier said

was literally correct, but I believe to his knowledge it was completely misleading in that I had already rejected the offers of appointment made to me. It is beyond my belief that an approach initiated by a member of Cabinet on such a matter would not have been relayed to the Premier after I had refused it. That is why I have written what I have and why I believe that what he did was a despicable thing to do.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: PETROL RATIONING

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Minister of Mines and Energy): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Leader of the Opposition suggested in his personal explanation that I was not prepared to accept Ministerial responsibility for the arrangements made for petrol rationing. I accept them fully. The Leader said in his public statement, among other things, that he believed that the matter could have been handled better by the Department of Trade and Industry because it had resources available, including industrial inspectors, that were not available in the Energy Division of my department. I might say that the personnel in the Energy Division and others who have been co-opted from other departments to handle the rationing bitterly resent the imputation from the Leader of the Opposition that they were less capable than were the people he named of handling the rationing.

I have made abundantly clear that they they have handled the matter extremely well. I do not believe there were other people capable of handling it better. For the Leader of the Opposition to suggest that I am trying to escape Ministerial responsibility and that the job could have been better done by people other than those in the Energy Division and the numerous people who have been co-opted is a misrepresentation.

The other point I make is that more resources have been made available by this Government to do this job, because it was seeking to do a bigger job in keeping people in work than the Labor Party even attempted.

At 3.27 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 15 September. Page 856.)

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): This Budget was brought down on the second anniversary of the election of the Government. That was an election at which the Premier and his Party made many promises to the people of South Australia. Firm and specific commitments were made in relation to education, health, community welfare, and the economy. The Government has now had two full years in office, and the Premier has presented three Budgets. His Government had had sufficient time and sufficient opportunities to keep its promises and to produce some results. Now that the Government has had two years in office, I think it is reasonable to expect that the Budget and its associated papers should outline those results, that it should show how the Government plans to fulfil the commitments it has made to the people. Instead, we have

before us a Budget full of excuses for mismanagement and incompetence. It stands not as a record of progress made under the Government but as an account of its failures.

The Budget confirms that after only two years of Liberal Government South Australia faces the most grave financial crisis in its history. We face the second successive deficit on the Consolidated Accounts and a further massive deficit in our recurrent expenditure, a new record over last year's figures. We face another record transfer of capital funds. We face another year of squandering money which is vital for capital works to prop up the Government's recurrent accounts. We also face an accumulated deficit which stands as a record for this State. This Budget represents a total repudiation of the promises that the Government made two years ago. As a statement of economic policy, it demonstrates how little the Government understands the relationship between Government activity and private sector growth.

Its basic strategy is irrelevant to the problems which this State is facing, and certainly offers almost nothing to the industries which create jobs. It virtually declares war on building and construction. It is the Budget of a Government which has turned its back on the unemployed, and the totality of this is called 'getting out of the way of business'—that is what that phrase really means.

The Premier has been at great pains to tell us in advance what a tough Budget this would be. What it really will be remembered for, I believe, is that it is a grossly and cynically dishonest document, and nowhere is this more apparent than in the area of taxation. The Government claims a commitment to a policy of lower taxation. The Premier, in his Financial Statement, says that this will be maintained without qualification, but the Budget totally contradicts that boast. It contains eight separate increases listed under 'Taxation' which will take in an additional \$15 100 000 in 1981-82—this from a Premier who in his 1979 election speech said: I am totally opposed to higher taxes.

Eight separate increases! The Budget is also the culmination of a process of back door taxation by increasing State charges, which will see an extra \$23 200 000 go to the Government in 1981-82. No sooner is the Budget presented than more increases are announced—and there are more to come. These charge increases, this back door taxation, are indirect and regressive taxes which are being paid by all South Australians. Their burden far outweighs any so-called relief from the much publicised cuts in earlier Budgets. Those cuts that the Premier talks about returned \$30 000 000 to some, but not to every section of the community. The Premier's back door taxation, plus the tax increases in the Budget, will take \$38 300 000, which everyone will pay, and proportionately more will be paid by those least able to afford it. That is the tax relief that the Premier has given: it is laughable.

The Premier has also claimed that the Budget will assist small business. It does just the opposite. Under this Budget, many more small businesses will be liable for pay-roll tax for the first time. For the first time in a number of years the South Australian Government has not acted to increase exemption levels so that business was not slugged by the hidden tax of inflation. Under this Government the exemption level is now lower than the levels in New South Wales and Victoria. Under this Government a small enterprise will pay more tax at every level up to an annual pay-roll of around \$250 000 than its competitors in Victoria pay. The tax slug will hit approximately 2 400 businesses in South Australia which employ around 36 000 people.

I am glad to see that the member for Rocky River is listening, because last Wednesday, just one day after the Premier imposed this new tax on a large sector of our small business community, the member for Rocky River told the

House that over past years we have seen pay-roll tax growing by stealth (those were his words), and he went on to say that as wages have increased so has pay-roll tax increased. He described it as a 'cancerous growth' and (this is the interesting thing) congratulated the Premier for taking initiatives to reduce the pressure on small business. I would like him to look closely indeed at those figures and at those exemption levels. I do not know what document he was looking at. It may well have been Liberal propaganda supplied to those proud, confident South Australians who advertised last week in the paper. Let him look at the Budget papers and at what has happened. The Premier has done nothing of the kind. There has been no form of relief. The Premier has done exactly the opposite.

In the debate on the Pay-roll Tax Act Amendment Bill in 1978 (this was the last amendment to pay-roll tax before the change of Government), this same Premier argued for an increase in the exemption rate over that proposed, an exemption that would then have brought us into line with Victoria. Now he has let the rate slip way below that. The dishonesty does not end there. It is quite clear that, for all the Premier's warnings about inflationary wage demands, his Budget is designed to capitalise as much as possible on inflation. The papers accompanying the Budget make no firm prediction about increased employment into 1981-82 beyond referring to 'the possibility of some modest growth'. But, despite this, total pay-roll tax receipts will rise by \$27 000 000, an increase of 14.7 per cent, and small businesses paying the tax for the first time will make a significant contribution to that increase.

When the Premier presented his Budget he referred to the economic background against which it had been framed. His analysis was shoddy and misleading. As a new variation on his theme of placing responsibility for our problem anywhere but at his own door, he ventured on to a superficial and largely irrelevant appraisal of the world problem and glossed over the disastrous level of unemployment in this State. He then proceeded to claim a growth in employment levels in the past few years and to take credit for that growth. What he did not do was detail how the economic situation in this State stands in relation to the rest of Australia. Indeed, it should be a matter of great concern to the Government that South Australia appears to have missed out on the resurgence of activity which was apparent in the national economy earlier this year.

When he delivered the Federal Budget, the Federal Treasurer, Mr Howard, said that 1980-81 was a year of solid growth and achievement for the Australian economy. The whole of Mr Howard's proposals and his economic predictions were postulated on that year, as he put it, 'of solid growth and achievement'. That statement certainly bears a lot of dissection and a lot of examination. If one looks at South Australia, there is no way in the world, by whatever gloss Mr Howard or the Premier seeks to put on it, that can describe what is happening in South Australia. On all the major economic indicators we are lagging behind.

Let us look at a few of the indicators. Employment growth for the 12 months to July was 1 per cent in South Australia, compared to a national average of 1.7 per cent. A large part of our growth was due to good performance in the agricultural sector resulting from seasonal reasons rather than Government initiatives. Unemployment, as at August, was 8 per cent in South Australia and 5.6 per cent nationally. New motor vehicle registrations increased by 6.5 per cent in South Australia and by 10.7 per cent nationally over the June quarter of 1980. Retail sales (an area often referred to by the Premier) experienced negative growth in the June quarter compared to March and, in the year to June, they rose by 10.9 per cent, well below Australia's

average of 12.6 per cent, and the worst performance of any State except Tasmania.

Of course, there is the grim fact that a record number of South Australians have left the State since September 1979. To compound this dismal economic performance, there is the Government's appalling financial record—a soaring deficit on recurrent expenditure of \$43 800 000 last year before the transfer of Loan funds, and a further shortfall of \$47 000 000 expected this year as well. There was a growing accumulated deficit—\$6 600 000 last year has grown to \$9 600 000 as at June 1982. That is another dubious record for the Tonkin Government. In other words, it is a developing hard-core debt with apparently no means of turning the situation around beyond siphoning off more and more capital works funds.

What of the promises this Government made two years ago? What of the Premier's promise to create jobs through a system of pay-roll tax rebates and exemptions? They were the centrepiece of his election polity speech—he called it 'a bold new initiative' which was going to produce, at first, 7 000, and then, as the euphoria of being elected struck home, 10 000 new jobs. The facts are that, after only two years, the so-called 'bold initiative' is virtually being phased out. For the last nine months of 1979-80, the Government allocated \$2 000 000 to pay-roll tax rebates for youth employment, but only \$129 000 was spent. Then, in 1980-81, the allocation was halved—not \$2 000 000 that year but \$1 000 000 and, again, not fully spent; only \$371 000 was paid out. This year, it appears that only approximately \$400 000 has been allocated, hardly evidence that this scheme occupied any central place in the Government's priorities. So, that promise is out the window.

Obviously, the results of that scheme fell a long way short of the Premier's claims. Incidentally, we have never had clear figures from the Government on the scheme, but the best possible result that could have been achieved for the payment of rebates would be barely 1 000 people employed. That is a far cry from 10 000.

That is not the only area in which a much trumpeted initiative has failed to be maintained. In last year's Budget, the Home Handyman Scheme was especially identified as a priority. Incidentally, it was a scheme established by the previous Government; nevertheless, it was a useful and important scheme. It had an allocation of \$350 000 then, but now it has been cut back to a mere \$15 000. So much for the scheme as a priority!

It is not only on the economic front that this Government has failed to deliver. Teachers and parents are one group who will not easily forget the firm and unequivocal comments and commitments made in September 1979 concerning education. We have heard a lot from the Premier and from his Minister about declining enrolments. We have been told that, by exploiting this, class sizes can be maintained at their present levels. We have been told that over 300 teaching jobs will go, together with 60 ancillary staff positions. However, we have not been reminded recently of the Government's clear commitment 'to reduce class sizes as a matter of priority by progressively appointing additional staff'. The Government is doing the opposite. So, how does the Premier explain his failure to deliver on key promises?

There are many other areas which will be canvassed during the course of this debate. How does the Premier account for our shattered finances, our stagnant economy? The answer is simple: he looks for scapegoats or for somebody else to blame. I have already mentioned his reference to world economic conditions, but there are others to blame as well—the Commonwealth Government, the pay claims of wage and salary earners, and, of course, the previous Labor Government. Let me deal with each of those. I think

that his complaint against the Fraser Government has a particularly hollow ring. After all, this is the Premier who soundly urged us during the Federal election last year to vote for Malcolm Fraser. Last year, in his Financial Statement accompanying the Budget, he detailed his support for Fraser's new federalism, of which this State is now the victim, in part. So, he simply cannot sustain his anti-Canberra tactics—he aided, abetted and developed those policies all along the way. But he is now changing his tack, and in attempting to do so is going to some quite extraordinary lengths. Certainly, all the States are suffering from the policies of the Federal Government, but it is ironic that, for all the slander we hear from members opposite about the last Federal Labor Government, it was the end of the Whitlam guarantee established by that Labor Government federally which marked the beginning of the current squeeze on States' funds.

Let us put that aside, and look at the situation today. The Premier simply cannot support his claim that South Australia fared worse than did the other States. The Federal Budget papers show that total payments from Canberra to the States will rise by 8.1 per cent. They also show that South Australia will do slightly better than this. Our total funds will increase by 8.7 per cent. That is certainly below the rate of inflation, but it is markedly better than the New South Wales amount of 5.6 per cent, and Victoria's 8.6 per cent is only slightly below it. Both those States have been able to produce positive Budgets aimed at growth, whereas all the Premier can produce are excuses and this sorry financial record.

At the centre of the Premier's financial problem is the recurrent component of the consolidated account. Put simply, he is unable to finance his payments of a recurrent nature, and he is transferring capital funds at a record rate to prop himself up. Equally simply, he wants us to believe that Canberra is to blame. It has even been said again today in this Chamber. Receipts from the Loan Council are blamed, but the argument just does not hold up. We have received both recurrent and capital funds from the Commonwealth. As I have said, the total increase was 8.7 per cent. That covers all moneys in all categories. In some senses it is an average: we have gained in some areas and lost in others. For example, the Commonwealth contribution to South Australia's recurrent expenditure will rise by almost 12 per cent. In contrast, the contribution from South Australian sources will improve by only 10 per cent. That clearly demonstrates that the core of the Government's problem is the sluggish State economy and not the parsimony of the Federal Government. That is affecting us certainly, but affecting us far more drastically is the Government's economic performance and our economy in this State.

Once one reads past the highly political Financial Statement of the Premier and moves into the area into which he is trying to put the facts of the situation, the answer is there in black and white. If we go further into the attachments prepared by the Treasury, we find numerous references to receipts improving only because of inflation and not because of any upturn in economic activity. If the Premier really wants to understand the problem, he should begin by looking in his own backyard—something he is just not prepared to do.

Another scapegoat is the wage and salary earner. The Premier's attack, particularly on those in the public sector, is equally dishonest. They have been consistently singled out despite the fact that all the increases they have received have been the result of awards made by the commission. To hear the Premier speak, one would think that somehow they had won special agreements, that they had had special treatment—not a bit of it. They have had to negotiate and

present evidence in order to sustain those claims. Throughout last year, all we got in every monthly financial statement was an attack by the Premier on public sector employees. Some interesting figures on this were produced by the Public Service Association last week. The Government wages bill, it pointed out, had risen by 9 per cent, which was 4 per cent less than the increase in average weekly earnings for the rest of the community. So much for the Premier's arguments there.

This year the public sector is to be held responsible for the massive diversion of capital funds to recurrent expenditure. That tactic is as destructive as it is dishonest. Similarly, the Premier's misrepresentation of ambit claims is doing permanent damage to the relationship between the Government and its employees. Again, we heard an example today from the Minister of Education of the failure to understand the nature of the way in which claims are drawn and argued at an industrial tribunal, and his constant tout-ing of figures, which do not line up with reality. Why is it done? It could be either through ignorance or perhaps a deliberate attempt to make this scapegoat of public sector employment credible in the eyes of the public. Anyone with a rudimentary knowledge of the way the system works and the way wages are fixed could not accept the arguments that are being used. But that does not stop the Premier. He cynically uses them to whip up some anti-union hysteria and thus transfer responsibility from himself.

It is not surprising that the Premier's list of others to blame for his own mistakes includes the former Government. Such a list would be incomplete without it. It is an underlying theme of his Financial Statement, and on other occasions he has made more direct accusations, but that does not stand up. No amount of distortion can alter the fact that the Labor Government left office with the combined accounts in surplus and with the reserves in good shape, so much so, in fact, that the Liberal Government was able to claim a \$37 400 000 surplus in its first year. What has happened to that? In 1981-82 we are facing the second successive accumulated deficit. This is not 1978-79, but in 1981-82 we are facing that record diversion of capital funds. It is this financial year, not under the previous Government, which will see the accumulated deficit reach record levels. This is the Premier's record. He inherited a strong financial base, and in two years he has thrown it away.

It is quite worrying, when it comes to the reasons for South Australia's current problems, to realise that in fact the Premier actually sustains his own propaganda. He thinks there is some truth in it. It might be better for the State if we could be assured that the list of excuses that the Premier regularly produces was in fact part of a cynical political exercise.

If the Government is really basing its planning on these fantasies, we are in more trouble than we imagined. Let me stress again that the Premier's problems in his Budget are of his own making. The Treasurer's own Budget confirms how shoddy and superficial his campaign arithmetic was when it came to costing promises. His own Budget confirms that a poor economic performance is holding down revenue generation. For example, in relation to receipts from stamp duties we read that the Treasurer anticipates that receipts from property and motor vehicle transactions will increase with inflation rather than through any up-turn in the market. In relation to pay-roll tax the Treasurer refers only to the possibility of some modest increase in employment during the year. Regarding collections from stamp duties, he refers only to an increase in the average value of dutiable transactions rather than a general increase in the level of activity.

These statements are very much at odds with the Treasurer's boastings earlier about the predictions for the economy. Where else has the Treasurer created problems for himself? He has created problems through the early retirement scheme for Government employees. Early retirement for those who want it might be a good thing, but the Government's eagerness to get people out as quickly as possible has compressed labour costs into one or two financial years, instead of spreading them over a period of time.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: You are upsetting the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr BANNON: I am aware that the Minister of Agriculture is upset, as well he might be. He is, in a way, the helpless victim of the Treasurer, who is ensuring quickly that they will be out of Government the next time they go to the people. Let us look at the early retirement scheme. One can certainly encourage such schemes and promote them in times of buoyant revenues. However, that is not the situation that we now face. That scheme cost around \$4 000 000 last year, and it has been singled out by the Treasurer on a number of occasions as one of the reasons for his financial plight. This problem is entirely of his own design, and we should not forget that.

The Treasurer has also created problems in his rush to dismantle the South Australian Land Commission. The Opposition warned that this might result in the Commonwealth Treasury calling back funds that had been lent to the commission, if there was any interference with its Act and with its method of operation. The commission stands apart as a remarkably successful land developer in Australia, and is one that other States have attempted to emulate and copy. This Government, for ideological reasons, determined to dismantle and destroy it, and it set about doing so. One of the side effects of that is to open up the whole Land Commission agreement to the predatory Commonwealth Treasury and the Fraser Government. They have not been too slow off the mark. In the 1981 Federal Budget there is a reference to \$36 000 000 expected from South Australia in respect of earlier advances for the Land Commission. That statement is there despite the fact that repayments to Canberra were not due to begin until 1983-84. As with the hospitals agreement, it looks as though we have torn up a cast-iron situation with the Commonwealth and, as a result, put our finances at risk. In the tight financial situation, the Treasurer has put himself in the position of having to pay two years early.

The effect of this Budget will be severe on the economy and on ordinary South Australians. It cuts Government expenditure by 3 per cent in real terms, although some areas, notably health, education, community welfare, the Prices Division of the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs, and public works, have all fared much worse than that. To be fair, some areas have gained. Although the State system has been cut, private schools, especially at the top end of the spectrum, will benefit. Per capita grants to independent schools will increase by 21.7 per cent in monetary terms. Ironically, the big winners are the departments headed by the razor gang Ministers, with the exception of public works, where dogma has won over avarice.

I am sure that the Minister of Agriculture regrets that he was not a member of that razor gang, because to be on it certainly guaranteed a pretty good run for the departmental responsibilities that one has. It is worth remembering in this context that in July the Premier warned:

There will certainly be cuts in real terms in every area of the State Budget. It is fairer that everyone misses out rather than one section missing out on a lot.

That did not happen. The razor gang (the Deputy Premier, the Minister of Industrial Affairs and the Attorney-General) looked after themselves very nicely. However, for the aver-

age South Australian the effects of this Government's financial policies can only be bad. The Premier has tried hard to minimise criticism by claiming that the Budget has little impact on Mr and Mrs Average, presumably because the Budget document itself does not announce a wide range of increases in taxes and charges. The increases have all been announced in previous weeks under different guises. Sometimes they have not been announced at all. It is only because of the Opposition's perusal of the *Government Gazette* that it was made clear to the public that the charge had been levied.

The Budget document is the culmination of a financial strategy in which Mr and Mrs Average have been lumbered with rises in 60 separate State charges. If people use electricity, this Budget affects them. If people pay water and sewerage rates it affects them, and if they catch a train or bus it affects them. So it goes on, right through the whole range of Government charges.

What of the actual Budget itself? If one's children go to an Education Department school, they will be affected. If they live in a suburb that needs a new school or has a school that needs renovation, they can forget about that. If they get sick and want to make use of the public hospital system, they had better be prepared to pay, and to pay for less service. If they want to make use of Government departments that provide advice and assistance, people had better be prepared to find that the officers will not be able to give them the time that their problems need. I suspect that some of the problems arising over the past few days in relation to fuel rationing stem from that problem. If people work in the public sector, as 20 per cent of our work force does, they had better be prepared to hear the Treasurer blaming them for this financial mess. If people work in an industry that relies on Government activity, they had better be prepared to find that their jobs are being threatened.

This Government refuses to realise the impact of its own actions on the private sector. In some cases the effect is direct, such as in the case of the building and construction industry. In other sectors that depend on the demand by the Government for goods and services, it is less so. Whether the relationship is direct or indirect, one of the Government's assaults on public sector jobs in any sense will not help the economy in the long run. No other Government in South Australia's history has exhibited such dogmatic and ideological attitudes to public sector employment. The Budget confirms that the attack on the public sector is continuing: from Water Resources 704 jobs and in Public Buildings 323 jobs. That involves 1 000 jobs in just two portfolios. In future this will be recognised as a very dubious record to stand alongside the deficits and transfers of Loan funds.

Government activity accounts for approximately 20 per cent of our economy. This Budget cut of 3 per cent in real terms means a big slice out of that 20 per cent. There is no evidence that the reductions in demand will be taken up by the private sector. In fact, all evidence of the past two years is to the contrary. The linkages between the two sectors mean that a reduction in the demand of one will lead to a reduction in the other. It could also lead to more unemployment and further economic stagnation in those indirect areas.

Certainly, the most direct and dramatic consequence of the Budget for the economy stems from the cut-backs in public works expenditure. Each successive Tonkin Government Budget has cut further into our capital works programme. In 1979-80, \$226 100 000 was paid out from Loan funds for capital works. In 1980-81, it dropped to \$196 900 000. It is now proposed to spend only \$186 100 000 in 1981-82. With inflation running at around 12 per cent,

the Premier would have needed to allocate \$220 000 000 this year just to maintain capital works at last year's depressed level.

The Opposition has consistently warned the Government that, by cutting into the public works programme, by using capital funds to prop up recurrent expenditure, it is putting at risk South Australia's potential for long-term growth and development. Last year, when we were considering a transfer of \$16 000 000, which, by this year's standards, is relatively small, I told the Premier that his action would stand as the legacy for the Tonkin years for any future Government. To put it in terms that members opposite would understand, I pointed out that we were using the rent money to buy the groceries. Our long-term capital was being frittered away to pay for recurrent expenditure. The Deputy Premier took great exception to this and, by replying on behalf of the Government, he defended its diversion of capital work funds to recurrent expenditure, and said:

It is clear that there is nothing intrinsically wrong with this accounting device.

By the end of that financial year, the \$16 000 000 had blown out to \$37 300 000, and even the Premier was forced to admit the risks. On 2 June, introducing the supplementary Appropriation Bill, he said:

We cannot afford to continue to finance our recurrent operations from capital funds indefinitely. To continue to do so for a long period would be detrimental to the economy, particularly to the building and construction industry and to employment.

That sat very oddly on the Deputy Premier's saying that there was nothing intrinsically wrong with this accounting device. In this Budget, the Deputy Premier's accounting device receives a page of justification, and none of it, I might add, is particularly convincing. Last year, the Treasurer euphemistically talked of savings on the Loan Account. This year, he describes his record diversion of capital funds in terms of a surplus. In fact, that \$37 300 000 last year and the \$44 000 000 planned for this year represent community facilities that will now not be provided. It represents jobs in the building and construction industry that will not now be created. Perhaps most important, given our poor economic outlook, it represents vital infrastructure for the future development of the State that will now be delayed.

The building and construction industry has made quite clear that the Budget was a disaster. Let me read what the industry is saying about the Government's economic strategy. On the day after the Budget, the State Director of the Australian Federation of Construction Contractors issued a statement to the media expressing the grave concern with which the federation viewed the cut-backs in capital works. The statement continued:

The engineering construction industry is again bearing the brunt of Government cut-backs, and many members have expressed the view that the industry in this State is experiencing a severe downturn. At present the ratio of work prospects from both public and private sectors is approximately 80 per cent to 20 per cent, and consequently the industry is dependent on work opportunities from the Government.

With this further reduction in capital works expenditure, the situation appears grim, with little prospect of improvement in the short term, and it is likely that contractors will have difficulty in maintaining employment levels.

That statement by the federation was later backed up by the Executive Director of the Master Builders Association. Then, Mr Alan Hickinbotham of Hickinbotham Homes, one of the State's major home builders, also said that more job losses could be expected in his sector of the industry following the Budget. Most of these groups, as you, Sir, will recall, were very keen, indeed fervent, supporters of this Government before the last election. They were instrumental in helping this Government get elected. Look how severely they have been disappointed.

Clearly, it is difficult enough, given the Federal Government's policies, to gain an increase in our allocation of Loan funds without weakening our case by using those funds on recurrent costs. We must argue strongly and loudly in Canberra for what we can get, but the Treasurer's accounting device has seriously weakened the State's bargaining position at Loan Council. How is the Government going to argue for extra funds for infrastructure, for job-creating public works, for the development of the State, when any surplus, to use its terms, is clearly being diverted to pay its day-to-day costs? It was an additional comment by the construction contractors and the M.B.A. that highlighted the bankruptcy of the Government's economic strategy. On 18 September, in the *News*, under the headline 'Builders "fight for life" after Budget' we read:

The State Director of the Australian Federation of Construction Contractors, Miss Margaret Curry, said the heavy sector of the building industry might not survive to take part in the resources boom.

Later, the same article stated:

The Master Builders Association Executive Director, Mr Peter Gasteen, agreed with Miss Curry. 'We may not have a viable building and construction industry for development of resource projects in the middle of the decade,' he said.

The Treasurer has made clear that he expects that royalties from resource development will rescue his Budgets in the future, if he is around to form them. But, he has been very vague about exactly when he expects these royalties to match the \$44 000 000 that he is currently diverting from capital funds. Obviously, it will not materialise next year. Indeed, the companies involved in the projects on which the Treasurer is pinning his hopes are very careful to stress that it will be the end of this decade, or even the 1990s, before large-scale production, and hence large royalties, will begin.

Mr Mathwin: Under your policies they wouldn't have developed at all, would they?

Mr BANNON: Assuming that these projects will go ahead, as I am sure the member for Glenelg would hope, in the terms that the Treasurer has suggested, his problem remains (and so does the problem for all the States): what to do in the meantime. The construction contractors and the master builders are saying they may not last the distance because of the Government's short-sighted cuts in capital works programmes. So, the Premier is digging the Government into a hole. By his own admission, on 2 June, the continued use of capital funds for recurrent operations will 'jeopardise major development projects envisaged for the northern part of the State'. That long-term strategy, as problematic as it is, is already being scuttled by his short-term expediency.

One of the most alarming aspects of this Budget is its total lack of vision. It presents no blueprint for the development of the State as a whole, and no indication of how the people of South Australia might contribute to, and benefit from, the State's progress. It is not surprising that it has now become clear from the survey work of the Bureau of Statistics that young people in particular are leaving the State in increasingly large numbers. They are vital to our economic prosperity, and this Government has nothing to offer them beyond meaningless platitudes. We cannot expect people to have much confidence when the Treasurer, in answer to a question about the State's future on the now famous radio interview with Kevin Crease, said:

Constantly I have said the future is there... if we are all prepared to settle down and work steadily towards it, that is where we will get.

That is the solution that the Premier has provided for the people of this State. Two years of the Tonkin Government has put a cloud over the financial position of South Australia, so much so that the ability of any future Government

to act will be severely restricted by the legacy of the present years.

It is the Government's responsibility to outline how the State is going to work its way out of the present slump. The Government is only a little over half way through its term, and to throw up its hands and say, 'What would you do?' is an astonishing admission of failure. To mouth the platitudes we heard from the Treasurer a week or so ago is an indication of the total bankruptcy of the Government's arguments.

Labor's alternative strategy will be presented to the people next year, so that, when the time comes for this Government to give an account of its administration, the choice will be clearly outlined. One thing is certain, a Labor Administration would not have made the same errors that have characterised this Government's term on the Treasury benches. Those errors have been made, and the financial problems have been built in as a result. We have all somehow got to live with it, but not with this Government.

Consequently, a future Government will need a good deal more innovation and imagination when it comes to framing a Budget. It will carefully have to examine the operations of the State's financial institutions and marshal their financial resources to give us the muscle to get development moving. It will have to look closely at the capital works programme and ensure that projects that will create jobs have a high priority. It will have to monitor Government activity to ensure that the linkages between Government expenditure and the growth of demand in the private sector are strengthened, and not reduced, as has happened. It will have to look again at direct job creation, perhaps in a different form, perhaps as a joint programme with local government or the private sector. Also, it will have to be a Government that can go to Canberra with more in mind than excuses for its own poor performance. It will have to aim for urgent specific programme funding to get money into the State.

This Government has shown by its attitude to the public sector's partnership with private enterprise that it is incapable of generating growth. This Budget has demonstrated that the Government is unable to think beyond blaming others for its own problems. All it can do is wait, Micawber like, for something to turn up. All South Australians can do is hope that the occupation of the Premier and his Party on the Government benches is terminated as soon as possible.

Mr SLATER secured the adjournment of the debate.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARIES OF THE CITY OF PORT PIRIE

Consideration of message from the Legislative Council intimating that it had agreed to the joint address recommended by the Select Committee on Local Government Boundaries of the City of Port Pirie, to which it requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON (Minister of Environment and Planning): On 5 March 1981 the Legislative Council appointed a Select Committee comprising the Hon. C. M. Hill, M.L.C. Minister of Local Government, as Chairman, and the Hons. C. W. Creedon, M.L.C., L. H. Davis, M.L.C., M. B. Dawkins, M.L.C., J. E. Dunford, M.L.C., and J. A. W. Levy, M.L.C., as members, to inquire into the boundaries of the city of Port Pirie.

The Select Committee was directed to examine whether the present boundaries of the city of Port Pirie adequately encompassed the present and potential residential, com-

mercial and industrial development of the Port Pirie urban area, and was to assess their effect on the planning, management and provision of works and services and community facilities for the urban area. In carrying out this examination the Select Committee was to take into account any operational, financial and management issues that it considered appropriate, as well as a community of interest in its determination of the question.

If the Select Committee considered any adjustment to the present boundary between the city of Port Pirie and the district council was deemed necessary, it was to prepare a joint address to His Excellency the Governor, pursuant to section 23 of the Local Government Act, 1934-1981, as amended, identifying the area, or areas, to be annexed to and severed from either council, the necessary adjustment between the city and district council of liabilities and assets, the disposition of staff affected by any change, and all other matters pursuant to the Local Government Act, 1934-1981. In pursuing its inquiry, the committee received considerable evidence from residents of the Port Pirie area. This necessitated the committee's seeking extensions of time to report. These extensions were granted on 2 June 1981, 16 July 1981 and 25 August 1981.

On 15 September in the other place, the Chairman brought down the committee's report and tabled the address. The Council agreed to the address, with all committee members speaking and supporting the motion. The committee noted that Port Pirie was one of the State's most important regional cities. With Whyalla and Port Augusta, Port Pirie forms the industrial region known as the Iron Triangle. The city of Port Pirie is also a member of the Spencer Gulf Cities Association, the other members being Port Augusta, Whyalla and Port Lincoln.

The committee also noted that council boundaries of Port Augusta, Whyalla and Port Lincoln had been altered and expanded to allow for residential, commercial and industrial growth to occur within single local government administrations of those cities. The committee was of the strong view that dual local government control within regional cities was not in the best interest of those cities or their citizens.

After careful examination of all the evidence, the committee resolved that the boundaries of the city of Port Pirie should be extended to encompass existing urban and industrial development and areas most likely to be affected by future growth. Some adjustments are recommended to the north-eastern and north-western boundaries of the city to bring areas of future and present recreation use wholly within the one council. On the western side the proposal extends the boundary to include the sewage treatment works and other land upon which residential building has occurred. On the southern side of the city, the committee recommends that the boundary be extended in a manner to encompass land suitable for future residential and commercial growth and, at the same time, to include the Port Pirie aerodrome. The major extension to the boundaries is in this southern area, where considerable residential growth is expected.

The committee considered that the changes were in the best interests of the entire Port Pirie area. The district council of Port Pirie expressed its concern to the Select Committee that a change in boundaries might result in the new district council being unable to continue owing to its new financial position. However, the new district council area should have a rate revenue in the order of \$124 500 for the 1981-82 financial year after taking into account the recently declared 10.2 per cent increase in rates. There are indications of continuing growth in the Napperby and Nelshaby areas of the new district council and this should assist future revenue.

The district council has also received \$128 000 in local government grant money for the 1981-82 year. This is an increase of 14.2 per cent over the previous year. This 1981-82 grant will be spent by the new district council on its smaller area, and this, together with the fact that the Federal Treasurer has forecast an increase of 18.9 per cent in grants for 1982-83 over 1981-82, should also be a help to the new district council. In addition, the district council's liabilities will decrease, and reduced staff numbers will apply as part of the proposal.

The committee encouraged the district council to discuss the possibility of amalgamation with the adjacent district council of Crystal Brook. The committee noted during its hearings that the district council of Crystal Brook had written to the District Council of Pirie seeking discussion on a merger. Unfortunately, this advance was rejected, and the committee expressed disappointment at this decision because it felt that a new district council, consolidating these two areas and based at Crystal Brook, would be a strong and very successful new council in the North of the State.

Concerning the areas to be annexed to the city, the committee recommended that the additional western and southern areas be designated as a separate ward, to be called Spencer Ward, and the addition in the north-east should be added to the existing adjacent Solomontown Ward. The committee recommended that two new councillors be appointed to the new Spencer Ward and the corporation has agreed to petition for an additional aldermanic position to be created.

The city has undertaken that a differential minimum rate will be struck for the Spencer Ward for the financial year 1982-83. This will be the minimum rate struck for 1981-82 by the district council, plus the value of the garbage collection charge made separately by the district. The city also undertakes for the next two financial years to move the differential minimum rate upwards only at a rate not in excess of the consumer price index.

Although a separate proclamation will be made on the distribution of assets and liabilities, the committee received the following undertakings from the city in relation to the new area:

1. All staff surplus to the requirements of the new district council will be employed by the city without any reduction in benefits or entitlements.
2. The city will negotiate to acquire the rubbish dump with associated plant.
3. The names of the reserves (Ferre and Plenty Oval) established by the district council in the affected area will maintain their names in perpetuity.

The value of assets involved in the transfer of area is to be negotiated by officers of the Department of Local Government with the two councils, but, if agreement cannot be reached, these will be transferred at a value established by an arbitrator appointed by the Minister.

Accordingly, I recommend that the joint address as circularised to honourable members be presented to His Excellency the Governor. I move:

That the address be agreed to.

Mr HEMMINGS (Napier): We support the motion. From the way in which the Minister of Environment and Planning came in, I thought he had just come down from Port Pirie with all the hot news. The Select Committee which has reported on the boundaries of the city of Port Pirie created much interest in the area. I understand that the residents, the community, were actively involved, and the Minister, in his speech, said that the committee had received considerable evidence from residents of the Port Pirie area. It is interesting to note that some 120 people appeared before

the Select Committee. I understand that my colleague, the member for Stuart, appeared before it, that his experience and knowledge of the area were taken into account, and that many of the opinions that he suggested to the committee were accepted and adopted. I congratulate the Select Committee on its good sense in listening to the member for Stuart. I understand that the honourable member's recommendations in relation to other matters were also taken into account, and I hope that, if at any time a Select Committee looks into the boundaries of my area, I will be able to give evidence that it will take into account.

The Minister's speech referred to the council boundaries of Port Augusta, Whyalla and Port Lincoln having been altered and expanded to allow for residential, commercial and industrial growth to occur within a single local government administration in those cities. It is a good point in the committee's favour that it considered this matter in dealing with Port Pirie. We on this side believe that it is not in the best interests of strong and viable local government if commercial interests are separated outside of the one single local government boundary.

The District Council of Port Pirie expressed its concern that any change in boundaries would affect its financial position. I think that concern has been laid to rest in the report of the Select Committee in that that body will receive \$124 500 in the 1981-82 financial year and, even more important, it will receive \$128 000 in local government grants, which is not a small sum for a district council. I have some doubt about the Federal Treasurer's forecast of an increase of 18.9 per cent in grants in the 1982-83 financial year. I think local government has learnt, to its cost, to treat forecasts from Federal Treasurers with some scepticism when they relate to local government grants.

One reason why I think we should support this measure is that it will give the two new councils a chance to get things moving as from the local government elections in October. If we support the motion, the two new councillors will be able to take their place as soon as possible at the start of the current financial local government year.

The reference in the final paragraph of the Minister's speech to the transfer of assets concerns me. I understand that this matter is to be negotiated by officers of the Department of Local Government, and I implore both local members—my colleague, the member for Stuart, and the member for Rocky River—to use some influence on those two councils so that the transfer can be negotiated as soon as possible and so that everyone will know where they are going.

Mr OLSEN (Rocky River): The report of the Select Committee, upon implementation, will significantly alter the boundaries of the City and the District Council of Port Pirie. I say 'upon implementation' because I believe, as the previous speaker has just indicated, that the measures have the majority support of the major Parties and therefore will pass both Houses of Parliament and be enacted. To many, that will herald an end to the injustice of the former boundaries whereby city ratepayers pay, by rates, for the provision of community services and facilities enjoyed by non-contributing district council ratepayers, and allow expansion of the city under a single local government administration.

Alternatively, to many district council ratepayers it will mean a period of uncertainty and deep concern for them to be transferred from an administration that they respect and have come to know would provide a basic service at reasonable rates, coupled with financial conservatism. Indeed, at public meetings, and in response to a questionnaire undertaken by John P. Young and Associates, they clearly expressed the view that they would prefer no change at all.

As the majority of my constituents live in the district council area, it is my responsibility to report their views to the Parliament.

The district council, for its part, steadfastly represented the views of its ratepayers to the Select Committee, as indeed the record shows. Many individuals supported the district council by giving evidence to the Select Committee. The public meetings and evidence tendered to the committee clearly indicated that district council ratepayers were concerned that their rates would escalate alarmingly if they were transferred to the city administration. I acknowledge, in that respect, that the Select Committee has heeded the concern of those ratepayers and has negotiated an agreement with the city council whereby the rate increases for the next two financial years upon the differential minimum rate upwards will not be in excess of the consumer price index. This is in addition to a differential minimum rate being struck for the 1982-83 financial year.

That issue is one that I openly canvassed individual members of the Select Committee to take into account in comments I made to them. During several detailed discussions I had with the district council, I became acutely aware of its desire to remain as a viable local government unit and its wish not to be forced into amalgamation with another local government body. To that end, on several occasions, together with the clerk and councillors, I viewed possible boundary alterations in an effort to clearly understand their concern. I therefore stressed to members of the Select Committee at every opportunity the need to ensure that a viable unit was left, accepting that there was the basis for some change to be undertaken.

The Government's policy, enunciated at the last election, was not to force amalgamation of local government areas, and I am pleased that the policy has been upheld while achieving a restructuring of boundaries as requested by the city council; that is, that any future merger or amalgamation between the District Council of Pirie and Crystal Brook will be done on a voluntary basis between the two parties involved. It may well be that they have a common community interest and that savings will emanate from such an amalgamation. However, that should be a matter for the two parties to determine. Perhaps as a result of the Select Committee's report the parties may commence those discussions.

The district council rate revenue of approximately \$124 500 this year, taking into account the rate rise of 10.2 per cent, will allow the base for an individual, viable unit to be maintained. The concession of the committee in allowing the total grant of \$128 000 to remain with the district council and income to be derived from the sale of the rubbish dump will give the district council financial independence. In addition, I note that the report draws attention to expansion in the Nelshaby and Napperby areas of the new district council, which should assist future revenue growth. The capacity to provide increased services to Nelshaby, Napperby and rural areas will result from availability of grant moneys (that is, \$128 000) to be expended in the smaller council area.

I would like to place on record my thanks to the District Clerk and individual councillors who made time available to me to discuss aspects of this situation which I believe assisted in obtaining the result whereby the two predominant fears of rate increases and a viable council unit have been, in most parts, allayed by the findings of the committee. I would take issue with the committee on several factors, the most predominant of which is the reference in the report to the fact that the committee was disappointed that the district council did not discuss the possibility of amalgamation with the District Council of Crystal Brook. I believe this criticism to be unfair, as the District Council

of Pirie had received a charter from its ratepayers. To its credit, it steadfastly held that view consistently. To do otherwise, in its view, would have compromised its original submission and been a direct rebuff to the clear message from its ratepayers.

Now that the matter has been determined, the view of Councillor Ferme, I believe, deserves long consideration; that is, that the District Council of Pirie be not subject to any further alteration for a minimum of five years so that there can be a consolidation for the future of the boundaries as indicated to the House. I believe that many people will be pleased that the matter has been finally resolved and that the respective councils can now proceed to plan for the future. The uncertainty of the past has inhibited that planning. I call on the Department of Local Government to (as I know it will) offer every assistance to the councils to ensure that the transition can be undertaken smoothly and so that they can establish a solid foundation upon which both councils can build for the future.

Mr KENEALLY (Stuart): I thank my colleague, the member for Napier, for the comments he made about me. I also commend the member for Rocky River on his contribution to this debate. I have been in this situation before, and I can recall when the honourable member for Flinders spoke in this House the difficulty he faced as the local member. I am well aware of the pressure that the member for Rocky River was under on this occasion. I am somewhat more fortunate in my representation of Port Pirie in that very few of my direct electors were involved. However, some were, and I have had some commentary from them that I would like to refer to later. In the two years since this Government has been in office, this is the third occasion that we have had to look at changes in local government boundaries. The first occasion was in relation to the Kanyaka/Quorn/Wilmington/Port Augusta District Council boundaries. The second occasion was in relation to the Port Lincoln City and Port Lincoln District Council boundaries. Now we are dealing with the Port Pirie City/Port Pirie District Council boundaries.

As two of those changes took place in the electorate that I represent, I am well aware of the depth of feeling that is engendered by the change in boundaries which people have become used to over a great number of years. The feeling in Port Pirie is no different from that which I experienced in the Port Augusta/Wilmington/Quorn area. On those two other occasions I complimented the Minister and the Select Committee for being prepared to grapple with what is a very contentious area and for seeking to resolve the matters. I do so again today. I think that the Minister, his officers and the Select Committee ought to be complimented on the courage that they showed in addressing themselves to these difficult matters.

We know that, had the Parliament been sensible a few years ago, it would have given effect to the findings of the Ward Royal Commission into Local Government Boundaries but, for political reasons, both on the part of the then Government and the Opposition, the Parliament did not see its way clear to accept that report, which would have done so much for local government in South Australia. Because that report was not accepted at that time, we are faced with having to do what the Royal Commission recommended, but in a somewhat piecemeal fashion. Nevertheless, I am still of the opinion that I expressed then, that the Minister is to be complimented on bringing this matter before the House.

The Royal Commission report recommended that the City Council of Port Pirie's boundaries should be extended to incorporate most of the district council area and that part of the now Mount Remarkable council area to the

west of the Flinders Ranges which joins with the extended Port Augusta city council area. That was a sensible recommendation that should have been adopted. In fact, I am much more in favour of that original recommendation than I am in favour of the recommendation before us today. But, of course, that is not the subject of this report.

Because of my strong views in that regard, and because I have made these views public, I have received some very serious criticisms, and I would like to quote from a letter I received that I believe is an indication of what many people in my electorate felt about this issue. The letter states:

I am also given to understand when asked you were in agreement with the takeover. I think you would have done better to find out the voters' feelings on the matter first. We get the feeling you will be short of a good few votes by what the people were saying after the meeting last Tuesday.

That is not an unusual feeling for people who have had their local government boundaries changed. In fact, if that does happen in the Port Pirie City Council area I believe it is unfortunate. Nevertheless, there are times when members of Parliament are called upon to make decisions that they feel are in the best interests of their constituents. I am sure that the member for Rocky River has had cause to do this on this occasion. I have also, and if, as a result of that, some votes have been lost, then that is the price one must pay.

Mr Mathwin: It's a conscience matter, isn't it?

Mr KENEALLY: I do not know that it is exactly a conscience matter, but I think, on the extension of local government boundaries, that members of Parliament generally believe that the larger councils are more likely to be financially viable and so able to provide a better service to their electors than smaller councils are able to do. That might be a generalisation; one cannot say that it applies right across the board, but it would apply in the majority of cases.

It is my view that residents in towns such as Port Germein, on Weeroona Island, and in the towns of Nelshaby and Napperby would all be better served if they were in a greater Port Pirie City Council area. After all, it is the Port Pirie city that provides them with their basic needs so far as social, cultural, sporting and commercial activities are concerned. Because these people, in effect, are part of Port Pirie, they ought to be required to contribute to the cost of the town's facilities, and as a result ought to be party to decisions made. I believe that, whilst they ought to contribute to the facilities provided for them by the city, they ought also to be able to make decisions that affect those vital facilities.

There seem to be a number of objections to the report brought down by the Select Committee. I might say that the people who live in the district council area who objected to the change, and the people who live in the city council area who objected to the change, put up very good campaigns indeed. There were public meetings, demonstrations, letters to the editors, and representations to local members. I think it is fair to say that the opposition to the extension of the boundaries was very well presented. The fact that the campaign was not successful was no reflection upon those who put forward the case. It is true to say, as the member for Rocky River has told the House, that the objections within the district council were almost unanimous. I doubt that I spoke to anybody in the district council who was in favour of going into the Port Pirie city area. The reasons for this are many.

Summarising the situation, the major objection is that the district council has always provided a very good standard of service, so the electors felt that there was no need for a change. They also believed that the change of bound-

aries would affect the financial viability of the district council; they felt that rates would increase; they were concerned that land use regulations (for instance, the regulations concerning the right to keep horses) would change. Also, there was a strange but interesting objection to which a member in the other House addressed himself, namely, that there was a feeling among district council electors that they did not want to be controlled by the existing Port Pirie City Council. If that feeling, which was certainly the opinion expressed to me, prevails, that is unfortunate, and I think the city council will need to work to redress that feeling. From my point of view, I have always had a very good working relationship with members of the Port Pirie City Council, and more particularly with the staff of the city council, and I have also had good relationships with those people in the district council with whom I have had cause to be involved, particularly the staff. If there is a feeling among those people who will now be included in the city council, as a result of this measure, that they would not wish to be under the control of the city council, that is a serious matter to which I hope the new council addresses itself.

I congratulate the two members of the community of Port Pirie who have been appointed to the new council, namely, Mr Funke and Mr Van Gallen. I do not know Mr Funke, but from what I have heard of him I am absolutely certain that he will be an asset to the city council's deliberations and that he will certainly represent his electors very well. I know Mr Van Gallen, and I am happy that he has been appointed. He has previously contested the district council elections unsuccessfully; he has indicated an interest in district council matters. It is also interesting to note that he opposed the extension of the city council boundaries, and so, because of that fact before any other, he is more likely to represent the views of his electors than is someone who perhaps was in favour. That may not necessarily be the case, but I think it is something in favour of Mr Van Gallen. I would also like to take this opportunity to congratulate a retiring councillor of the Port Pirie City Council, Mr Gerald O'Brien, who has given significant service to the council over many years—I am not sure exactly how many years, but it is possibly more than 30. He has been a very good public servant to the people of Port Pirie, and I wish him well. He is not as young as he would like to be, so retirement will enable him to concentrate on the many other interests that he has.

I am confident that the new extended Port Pirie City Council will be effective and that these new boundaries will enable the Port Pirie council to grow as it undoubtedly will. There is always a sense of pessimism in Port Pirie, but funnily enough, when statistics are compiled, people concentrate on the Port Pirie City Council area and do not allow for the expansion that has taken place in the Port Pirie District Council area. Those areas will be as one, so the new situation so far as Port Pirie is concerned will be more readily available to those who seek to know the true position there. I am confident that the district council will remain viable. However, if it does run into difficulties, it has options available to it. I would sincerely hope that in the future it will look at joining the Port Pirie council; if it does not wish to do that, perhaps it can look at joining the Crystal Brook council, although not in the sense of a takeover by either of the councils. I believe that extended councils, the larger councils, are more viable and more able to provide the services that electors want. I commend the report to the House. I am confident that in the fullness of time the move will be seen by electors in the Port Pirie area as the correct thing for this Parliament to have done.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC PARKS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON (Minister of Environment and Planning): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

For many years it has been the policy of successive Governments to pay subsidies to councils in respect of the acquisition of land to be used and maintained as parks or recreational areas. These subsidies have been paid after investigation and report by the Public Parks Advisory Committee established under the Public Parks Act. It seems desirable for some formal statutory authorisation to be given for this practice and, accordingly, the present Bill empowers the Minister, on the recommendation of the advisory committee, to advance moneys to a council, by way of grant or loan, for the purpose of enabling or assisting the council to acquire land for the purpose of providing a public park, or to develop or improve land acquired for that purpose.

The disposal of land acquired by a council under the Public Parks Act is a subject that is attended by considerable doubt and uncertainty. Circumstances do arise in which it is desirable, in the interests of the overall development of an area, to exchange portion of a public park for some other land, or to dispose of portion of a park that can be more effectively utilised in some other manner. The Government takes the view that transactions of this nature should take place only after the most thorough scrutiny. Hence, while the present Bill does empower a council to dispose of park land that has been acquired or improved by subsidy under the principal Act, no such transaction is to take place except on the authorisation of the Governor. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 empowers the Minister to advance moneys to a council, by way of grant or loan, for the acquisition and development of park lands. Clause 3 empowers a council to dispose of land acquired under the principal Act, or in respect of which a subsidy has been paid under the principal Act. However, the authorisation of the Governor is required for any such transaction.

Mr HEMMINGS secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

(Second reading debate adjourned on motion).

(Continued from page 1062.)

Mr SLATER (Gilles): The Budget presented by the Premier last week gives little hope or enthusiasm to the ordinary citizens of this State. The Government publicly describes itself as a private enterprise oriented Government. It is not a people oriented Government, as this Budget so amply demonstrates. The Budget has been described in some circles as a record-breaking Budget, but the records spoken of are not records of which the Premier can be justifiably proud. As the Government has budgeted for a further \$3 000 000 deficit this year and a \$6 600 000 deficit last year, it will mean a cumulative deficit of \$9 600 000 in the two years, the highest in the State's history. On top of that, the Government has transferred funds from Loan Account, meant to be used in the public sector for public works, for the day-to-day expenditure for the running of this State. In 1980-81, a transfer of \$37 000 000 was made, and it is proposed that a transfer of \$40 000 000 will occur

in this coming year. The Government is mortgaging the house to pay for the greengrocer.

As my Leader this afternoon dealt with the transfer of funds, I do not want now to refer further to it. The Treasurer is seeking to blame the Public Service for what he claims are unreasonable wage demands. This is a red herring. The Public Service Association commented in this regard and pointed out that salaries over-run represented only 4.8 per cent of the total Budget expenditure and that wage increases to public servants had been awarded and approved by the appropriate tribunal, the State Industrial Commission.

The Government's wages bill has risen 9 per cent compared to the 13 per cent for the private sector wages bill, so it is 4 per cent less than the increase in the average weekly wages in the private sector. It would appear, therefore, that the Premier is trying to use the Public Service as a scapegoat for his own Government's inadequacies. The Budget Review Committee or, as it is known, the State razor gang, has recommended wielding the axe on the Public Service in the coming year. It is expected that 1 600 jobs may be lost. Where these jobs will go is anyone's guess; it is not made clear, and one would expect it to occur over a wide range of public services.

One notes in the Budget that the Public Buildings Department has had a cut of \$6 000 000. People employed in the Public Buildings Department who are involved in the building industry have little or no hope of obtaining alternative employment in the private sector. It is amazing that, although the Government talks about creating employment, we have record unemployment in this State. Indeed, it has been consistently worse than any other State over the past two years. There has been no evidence that cutting the public sector stimulates the private sector. In fact, the opposite occurs, particularly in the building industry. So, this is a false philosophy on which the Government rests, and it is bringing this State into some degree of financial chaos, as this Budget has shown.

In addition to record unemployment, we have a significant population decline. This is occurring in a particular age group that we can least afford to lose in this State. I recall the Premier, as Leader of the Opposition, some three or four years ago making a very substantial criticism of the Government of the day in regard to loss of population. However, the population decline has been more significant in the past two years than it was on that occasion.

Dr Billard: It's not true; you look at the figures. It has never followed—

Mr SLATER: I have looked at the figures. I am sure that the temporary member for Newland will have his opportunity, when he talks in this debate, to give his version of the population figures. I claim that the decline in population in the past two years has been significantly greater than that of the last two years of the Labor Government. People are not leaving the State because they want to retire to the Gold Coast or something of that nature (as I have said, they are the people that we can least afford to lose): people are leaving the State because they cannot find employment here. So we have a record unemployment situation and an exodus of population. I note the Premier has been conspicuously silent on this particular matter. There is no doubt that this is not a people oriented Government. It is not interested in the ordinary citizens of this State and no amount of propaganda from members opposite can hide that fact.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: What are you talking about?

Mr SLATER: No matter how the Government tries to cloud the issue, it is a Government that believes (and I think this is quite wrong) in private wealth and public squalor. This means that sections of the Public Service are

denied the opportunity to expand and provide services to which citizens of this State are entitled, through payment of their taxation.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: You are talking through your teeth.

Mr SLATER: The Minister of Agriculture may believe that. I am sure that he would know better than I that this is a Government of private wealth, and of privilege of patronage, rather than its looking after the interests of the ordinary citizens of this State. For the benefit of the Minister of Agriculture, the Government looks after the greedy rather than the needy. We see that every aspect of public expenditure in the Budget has been reduced. The significant factors affecting the community generally such as welfare, housing, law and order, employment, and so on, right down the line, have been significantly reduced. This is a Government of privilege and hand-outs to its mates, in many instances done subtly.

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

Mr SLATER: The member for Glenelg can snigger, laugh or do what he likes. However, I stand by the claim that it is a Government of patronage and privilege that looks after its mates. In many instances this is done rather subtly, but in some instances it is done quite blatantly.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Just give us an example.

Mr SLATER: I will give the Minister of Agriculture an example.

Members interjecting:

Mr SLATER: I do not know anything about Nigel Buick. However, to give the Minister of Agriculture an example, I refer to an article about the Budget in the *Advertiser* last week regarding a comment made by the Assistant General Manager of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry. It states:

The main thrust had been towards continued growth and development in SA in times of difficult economic circumstances.

The Budget reinforces State Government policies in reducing over all levels of government and placing the initiative in the private sector, Mr Thompson said. The welcome moves included a significant increase in funds for sealing the Stuart Highway.

I have no argument with that. The article continues:

Doubling funds to industry establishment payment schemes.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: You haven't got any argument with that, have you?

Mr SLATER: I have an argument with that.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: What about the jobs you're squawking about?

Mr SLATER: That is part of the deal, of course. But, we must consider taxpayers' money and how many jobs are created through this incentive scheme to industry. I am a member of the Industries Development Committee, which deals with these references. On very rare occasions we have rejected applications because they came within the guidelines of the scheme. I am not talking out of school but am expressing publicly a view that the Government has now indicated doubling the sum of money available for this purpose to provide opportunities for business and employers to apply to the Industries Development Committee for a 99-year long-term loan or, alternatively, a grant.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: What's a 99-year long-term, loan?

Mr SLATER: It is a 99-year long-term loan.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: That's a long, long one.

Mr SLATER: It is, if it is for 99 years. Alternatively, it could be by way of a grant. So two options are available. There has been a significant increase in that field in the past 12 months, but I doubt whether the scheme has fulfilled the ultimate aim of being entirely in the public interest and creating jobs, as has been claimed. We should

look seriously at the actual benefit to taxpayers of this State. I query that aspect of the Budget.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: You would actually be querying the role of your committee, then.

Mr SLATER: No, the role of the committee is different altogether: it is to consider whether those references are within guidelines under the Establishment Payments Scheme. We look at this from a number of aspects. Of course, public interest, employment situations and so on, come into it. I do not query that, but I ask how the Government can consider doubling that aspect in anticipation of what may occur in the next 12 months.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman interjecting:

Mr SLATER: I do not question that at all. I ask that the Minister read the remarks I made a few moments ago so that he will understand what I mean. If the Minister is not interested, that is his prerogative. To bolster the Government's electoral prospects there was in the *News* and the *Advertiser* a full-page advertisement on Friday 18 September, which stated:

Two great years of steady achievement.

It was stated that the message was prepared and paid for by a large group of proud, confident South Australians. It lists so-called Government achievements over the past two years. Although I cannot deal with all of them specifically in the time allocated, I wish to deal with some.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Who are you alleging inserted that advertisement?

Mr SLATER: I have no idea who paid for it, but it would not surprise me. Perhaps the Minister of Agriculture could tell me. I challenge him to tell the House and the world. It would be helpful for us to know who these proud and confident South Australians are. If he does not know, perhaps the Minister could help us to find out. Whoever prepared the advertisement on their behalf made substantial omissions in the Government's record, and included matters that I think are quite trivial. In 1979 it is claimed that stamp duty remissions were given for first home buyers. It also states that in December 1979 the Government announced plans for improved State Bank home loan packages. They have not greatly assisted the building industry of this State, and were more of a palliative than a cure. No doubt, from November 1979 to December 1979, these aspects assisted individuals buying their first home. I do not deny them that opportunity. But, other things have taken over in that time, over and above those sort of palliatives rather than cures for the building industry.

It is claimed that the abolition of succession duties and gift duties occurred in January 1980. That is true, but it did not assist the general populace of this State. It was devoted more to the more affluent members of society, cost the Government or taxpayers some \$20 000 000 a year, and did not assist a great many of my constituents. It assisted the very wealthy people who are friends of the Government. In March 1980, the Government reorganised the Agent-General's office in London, placing greater emphasis on trade and investment. That assisted one of the Government's friends who was quite involved in the September 1979 election, Mr John Rundle, now Agent-General in London. In May 1980, a family impact assessment scheme for Government decision making was announced. That would be the greatest joke of all time. Neither I nor anyone else has seen any family impact study here or anywhere else.

Dr Billard: You are not meant to.

Mr SLATER: I see. I asked the Minister of Health a question at one stage during a debate on the Residential Tenancies Act. She told me that these studies were only for Cabinet. Why is it such a great initiative if that is the

case? It is just a farce. That is one of the greatest achievements of May 1980. I could go right through this, but I want to devote at least part of my remaining time to another matter of interest. I mention one more thing in the advertised screed of achievements over the past two years. The advertisement states that in its Budget in September 1981 the Government lowered the price of low-alcohol beer.

However, the advertisement does not mention that the Government increased the licensing fee on turn-over from 8 per cent to 9 per cent, which will obtain for the Government from 1 January 1982 to the end of the financial year, an additional \$4 000 000 from the liquor industry. It is estimated that in a full year it will cost the liquor industry \$6 000 000 and that cost will be passed on to the consumer. So, although the Government has claimed that it has reduced the tax on low alcohol beer, in fact it has increased the tax by 1 per cent over the general total sales of alcohol. This will reap the Government \$6 000 000, which it does not mention in its list of achievements. The Government includes in its list of achievements commencement of the building of the Hilton Hotel in Victoria Square. However, this was really an achievement of the previous Government. When in Opposition, the present Premier said that it was a Grimm fairy tale. It has now come to fruition, and it is now claimed as a Government initiative, which is a different situation from that which obtained when the hotel for Victoria Square was proposed in the mid-1970s. Another listed achievement is that of the launching of the VISA campaign and other tourism initiatives. The VISA (Visitor in South Australia) campaign has not had the results that the Minister of Tourism has claimed. For the benefit of the member for Newland, let me explain why it has not had the achievement claimed by the Minister. I attended the launching only a few weeks ago of another campaign called 'Hit the Trail', which was the sequel to the VISA campaign. The Visitor in South Australia campaign was designed to influence interstate tourists to come to South Australia to boost our tourism industry.

The 'Hit the Trail' programme is designed to encourage people to travel within their own State and to boost the tourist industry intrastate. During the Parliamentary break only a few weeks ago and after the announcement of this campaign by the Minister, I am given to understand that she did not follow her own advice: she did not hit the trail in South Australia but holidayed outside the State. I reckon that, if one offers advice, one ought to be prepared to follow it oneself.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman interjecting:

Mr SLATER: I have no idea but I understand that that is the case. During the 'Hit the Trail' campaign it was claimed that 6.3 per cent more interstate visitors had come to South Australia in 1980-81, and this represented \$12 000 000 spending and sustained 550 jobs. I do not know where the Minister obtained her statistics, although she claimed that they were A.B.S. figures. I have looked at the latest available A.B.S. figures for the period from March 1980 to March 1981. They show only a slight increase in accommodation statistics (these are room occupancy rates) in that period.

Dr Billard: The programme did not start until September 1980.

Mr SLATER: The Minister claimed that there had been a 6.3 per cent increase. I am trying to tell the member for Newland that the real statistics show a 1.3 per cent increase during that period.

Dr Billard: You have the wrong time span.

Mr SLATER: What I am saying is factual; I am quoting the A.B.S. figures, and I am asking the Minister of Tourism to justify that 6.3 per cent increase that she claimed occurred during 1980-81.

Dr Billard: You are talking about a different time.

Mr SLATER: For the member's interest, I point out also that the Australian Standing Committee on Tourism, which is sponsored by the Australian Tourist Commission, has published statistics which show different figures in relation to various statistics in each State. I noted a recent article from the Australian Associated Press in the *Financial Review* that stated:

Queensland's State Tourism Minister, Mr Tony Elliott, says Queensland is outdoing the rest of Australia in tourism. He said the national rate of increase in all-purpose visitor nights was 3.7 per cent compared with Queensland's 8.05 per cent. New South Wales had a 3.85 per cent increase, Western Australia gained 2.05 per cent, Victoria 0.39 per cent, while South Australia recorded a drop of 3.7 per cent.

Those figures are quite contrary to the figures quoted by the Minister of Tourism at the launching of the 'Hit the Trail' campaign. I have tried to verify those figures through the Australian Tourist Commission. I have had certain information relating to its holiday visitor nights, which include intrastate, interstate and international travellers during that particular time. I suggest to the member for Newland that the Minister's comments are not correct. She has gilded the lily somewhat and has used statistics to bolster the publicity campaign.

Anyone can whip up a trendy publicity campaign with plenty of glossy handouts, but that is not the answer for the tourist situation in this State, or anywhere else for that matter. I believe that the Minister has been a trifle over-enthusiastic in her attempt to justify heavy spending on media campaigns.

I asked a Question on Notice two weeks ago and received a reply last week; it is pretty significant. The question related to the sum spent by the Department of Tourism in regard to private consultants. The reply was that a staggering sum of nearly \$400 000 in 12 months had been paid to 11 different organisations in relation to media campaigns. So, we are looking for results which justify that sort of expenditure to private consultants.

I believe that the expertise exists within the Department of Tourism to enable it to undertake its own campaigns rather than paying money to people like Rob Tonge and Associates who did a review of the Department of Tourism in concert with the Public Service Board, which review cost the taxpayers of this State \$58 986. I think that there are better ways of spending the taxpayers' money to promote tourism. Those thoughts are shared by members of the community generally. I refer in particular to a letter to the Editor published in the *Advertiser* on 15 September 1981. The letter, from James Larkin of Corporate Public Relations of North Adelaide, is headed 'Wrong Trail'. The letter states:

The only thing the South Australian Government's 'Hit the Trail' advertising promotion hits is the taxpayer's pocket.

From a promotional viewpoint I find it hard to believe it will have any other kind of impact.

If this is the best that the Government can do I suggest it follows its own advice.

That is a significant critique in relation to the campaign. I agree that the Minister has been over-enthusiastic. Not only is the 'Hit the Trail' campaign lacking in sophistication but also it is rather flippant and part of it is inaccurate.

Mr Mathwin: Rather flippant?

Mr SLATER: It is rather flippant. It has no depth. I am not a public relations expert, but I have the common sense to know when something can be sold and when it cannot. We are not going to sell people in this State the opportunity to travel within the State by such advertisements. The maps are wrong. I pointed out to the Minister by public comment that Spalding is 30 kilometres north of Clare, not 60 kilometres south of Clare. This appeared in the *Northern*

Argus, and the people of Clare were disconcerted by the fact that Spalding had got lost.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has lost his time!

Mr McRAE (Playford): I support the very excellent speech made this afternoon by the Leader of the Opposition and, in doing so, I want to say that the Tonkin Government, like the Fraser Government, came to power offering a version of the Milton Friedman philosophy—and I use that word advisedly, because it is certainly not a style of economics but a style of political philosophy, and I will expand upon that presently.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I take it that the honourable member is using copious notes, and is not reading his speech.

Mr McRAE: You may take it that way, Sir, yes. That doctrine, to use the neutral term, of Milton Friedman has been adopted by Mrs Thatcher, in the United Kingdom, and by President Reagan, in the United States. Some of the wellknown slogans of this doctrine include such messages as 'smaller government', 'a lower inflation rate', 'greater production', 'lower unemployment', and 'reduced taxation'. I admit that the State Budget which we are now debating is of course heavily influenced by the strategies of the Federal Government—and that is acknowledged in the Financial Statement of the Premier, to which I shall refer.

It is useful, therefore, in my opinion, to look at the performance of the Federal Government and, in particular, at its performance in the term of office of the Tonkin Government in South Australia. In summing up the economic performance of the nation in the 1970s, in its review of 16 August 1981, the *National Times* made certain comments. I think it is worth my quoting from the report in quite some detail, because it does give a fair appraisal of three administrations, as seen from the mind of a well-known economic reviewer, and the data I think beyond doubt is accurate. First, under the heading, 'The McMahon Years', the report states:

The Australian economy started the decade in great shape compared to the way it finished. Yet the McMahon Government's supposedly poor performance on the economic front contributed largely to the mood that it was a time for change. By election day in December 1972, unemployment had risen slowly to a point just over 2 per cent. Inflation was a little over 6 per cent. The interest rate on a first-mortgage loan in New South Wales was hovering around the 11 per cent mark and the amount of income tax paid as a share of the nation's output was 7 per cent. A speculative mining share boom had frittered out, but the overall prospects for the economy could only be described as sound. The only thing running wild was the money supply due mainly to a heavy injection of foreign funds. Labor won the election promising to reduce unemployment and inflation. Never in their craziest dreams could they foresee what would happen.

The next heading is, 'The Whitlam Years', and the report states:

For those who see any relevance in the rate of growth of the money supply, a sharp turnaround occurred during Whitlam's period in power. But there were disasters in areas of more direct importance than gyrations in M3—the favoured measure of the money supply in Australia. Inflation shot to over 16 per cent before easing back to around 13 per cent after Bill Hayden took over from the hapless Jim Cairns as Treasurer. Unemployment rose steadily, while real wages increased so abruptly that the spin-offs were further inflation and unemployment.

Income tax rose steadily, while overall output (GDP) slumped after an initial rise. One bright spot for borrowers was that there were only moderate increases in interest rates. Labor's problems were exacerbated by the severe international economic dislocations caused by OPEC's shock price rises for oil. Many other countries in this period also experienced an extremely poor performance, but, nevertheless, Labor ranked worse than average on key features such as inflation. Fraser won the December 1975 election promising lean, hard, responsible economic management.

Under the heading 'The Fraser Years' the report states:

For all its devotion to taming the money supply, early gains have been reversed and M3 is now only growing at a marginally smaller rate than when Labor was tossed out. Income tax has continued to rise, despite promises of spectacular reductions. Unemployment during the period reached levels not exceeded since the great depression, although there is currently some tapering off. The average performance on growth of GDP has been worse than under Whitlam, and nothing like the Fraser promise in the 1975 campaign of 6 to 7 per cent. Inflation has improved, even if nowhere near the Fraser prediction announced after the 1978 budget of 5 per cent by mid-1979 with 3 to 4 per cent soon after.

Until the past year, real earnings have fallen very badly under Fraser, often dipping into the negative zone. Interest rates are a particularly sore spot. Despite being portrayed as simply a responsible reaction to market forces, interest costs are now at historic highs. After more than five years in power, Fraser is still to demonstrate that he can make good his overall promise of sustained growth in a context of low inflation and small government.

That was, I think, a reasonable review by a responsible journal and a responsible journalist.

Dr Billard: Where was that from?

Mr McRAE: The *National Times* of 16 August. There are graphs which underlie the summary I have just recorded. Another interesting comment I found in the *Australian*, in its editorial on Friday 11 September 1981, under the heading, 'Whatever happened to the original Fraserism?' I shall not be reading these things out endlessly, Sir, but they serve as a platform for the rest of my remarks. The editorial was written in the aftermath of the criticisms made of the various Fraser policies by Mr Peacock, after that gentleman had resigned his Ministry. The editorial states:

The public's post-war faith in high spending on Government-provided services died in Australia in 1975 when Malcolm Fraser was elected. In 1979 Mrs Thatcher won government in Britain with a policy akin to Fraserism. Last year Ronald Reagan introduced Americans to Reaganomics.

Mr Fraser was first in the field with a policy that purported to be lower taxation, smaller government and a fair society. He did indeed, as he has since claimed, lead the world in his thinking, picking up much of the doctrine of the cogent and clear-headed Secretary of the Treasury, Mr John Stone.

It is very hard to perceive whether Andrew Peacock, in his first major pronouncement since resigning from the Fraser Cabinet, is groping for an alternative philosophy or just trying to demonstrate that he can get Fraserism back on the rails.

The Prime Minister started off well in 1975 and soon had his first tax reforms. He slipped after re-election when he brought in a tax surcharge in the first Budget of his second term and has been slipping ever since. He is now perceived as a big taxer and spender.

I shall be pressing that line somewhat determinedly. The editorial continues:

Mrs Thatcher made three main mistakes: she failed to sell off to private enterprise British Steel, British Leyland or British Airways, raised the VAT sales taxes which boosted inflation, and gave an enormous pay rise to the public sector. Now, the nationalised industries are virtually unsaleable and as unemployment is now so high she is committed to continue bailing them out. Reaganomics is now being tried and tested and it is too early to see the result.

If Fraserism, Thatcherism and Reaganomics fail, it is difficult to see what the next philosophy will be. We could be back to high public spending and nationalisation à la Mitterrand. The value of Mr Peacock's contribution, for whatever motives, is to demonstrate how far the Prime Minister has strayed from his original and highly successful line. It is unlikely that Mr Peacock has the depth to come up with an entirely new policy of his own, but he is on a good wicket in his Party-room ambitions to nail his flag to original, unexpurgated Fraserism.

He makes the point that Commonwealth outlays on its own spending will rise by 15.5 per cent this year...

I interrupt to say that so does the Premier of this State, and when he does he is on good grounds, as I will acknowledge in a minute. The editorial, which was quoting Mr Peacock, continues:

The average family has been faced in the past 12 months with increasing taxes and charges on all fronts—higher interest rates, higher petrol prices, higher health charges and now higher sales tax across the board with little or no compensating increase in real disposable income.

The effect of this has been to fuel wage demands. Accusing the Government of a lack of wages policy, Mr Peacock said it appeared to be based on the hope that, if profits were squeezed, business would find itself unable to meet pay demands. There was also a lack of stability and predictability in Government policies.

So far, Mr Peacock's forte has been foreign affairs. His foray into home affairs may smack of opportunism, but he has successfully flashed the warning light to the Government. The point where Mr Fraser began to slip was when he started to get immersed in foreign affairs, particularly as regards Africa.

Mr Fraser's strong point is not foreign affairs and Mr Peacock's is not the Australian economy. The Prime Minister should get back to the basics of his own philosophy and make it work because there is nothing else in sight that will fulfil the aspirations of Australian society today.

I read that out not because I support the end result or viewpoint of that editorial, but to give an appraisal from a newspaper that most certainly does not support the Australian Labor Party in what has happened over the past few years. In particular, it was to give an appraisal of the true nature of the Milton Friedman philosophy.

Honourable members will note that, in that editorial, nowhere is the word 'economics' used, except as a bastardisation of some other term—'Reagonomics'. That must be so, because it is not a policy of economics; it is a political philosophy which has a certain aim, and Mr Peacock has quite clearly pointed that out. The Premier of our State, whether he is totally to blame or whether he is in part a victim of his own Federal colleagues (which I suspect he is), is really on the wrong track when he continues to point the bone at employees seeking wage increases when he must well know that it has been the very pressure of the Federal Government's economic policies, combined with his own policies, which has led to those quite justifiable demands.

Each of the issues that was referred to by Mr Peacock, namely, interest rates, petrol prices, health charges and sales tax, has a direct effect on the ordinary member of the community. In two cases, namely, petrol prices and sales tax, they have had a direct effect on State revenue, as I shall demonstrate in a moment. It is fair, I think, in relation to both State and Federal measures, to ask the question: 'Who, if anyone, has benefited from these philosophies and from these strategies?' It is my argument that it is the well off and the rich who have benefited and will continue to benefit and that the ordinary wage and salary earner, the poor and the disadvantaged, have lost and will continue to lose. The cause is quite simple; the fact of the matter is that the poor are being taxed to support the rich.

Let us first consider the Federal situation. First, it is quite clear that those on the PAYE system (and that group represents the middle income and low income groups, in the main) are being continually taxed by stealth. That is obvious, and it was pointed out by Mr Fraser himself prior to his election in 1975. While it is true that there is no stated increase in taxation levels, or adjustment in tax scales, the effect of inflation and related wage increases pushes more and more people into higher percentage tax brackets. Real taxes are up and real wages are down.

The strategy of the Federal Government, at least, is what Mr Peacock said it was; that is, to push small business into the situation where it is so squeezed that it cannot meet any wage demand no matter how realistic. That, in my analysis, can only lead to a social disaster—in fact, a social revolution which has only now begun. Let me repeat that real taxes are up and real wages are down.

Compared with the PAYE group, those on high incomes have a greater capacity to minimise taxes, and do so. There is an ever increasing group in our community who earn huge sums of money and who pay no tax at all, or who minimise their tax to a great degree. Not only that, but because of the fixed maximum percentage rate, and because

of the stability of that rate, the relative position of that very rich group continues to improve, even if they meet the whole of their tax burden.

Secondly, however, it is clear that there is an ever-increasing tendency to diminish percentage income tax in percentage terms in providing revenue. Personal income tax, in fact, now represents only 50 per cent of revenue. In an article which appeared in the *News* on 13 September 1981, there is a neat diagram which shows Australia's tax cake and the cost per head of population. Personal income tax represented 50 per cent of gross Commonwealth revenue; company tax, 15 per cent; sales tax (and I will come back to this later), 7 per cent; cigarettes, 2 per cent; beer, 3 per cent; petrol (and I will return to this later), 9 per cent; tariffs (and, again, I will return to this matter later), 5 per cent; and all others, 9 per cent.

The benefit of the personal income tax system is that, at least to some extent, it reflects the capacity to pay in its graduation of scale. At least in theory, therefore, the taxpayer who can afford to pay most does in fact do that. That is not the case with the petrol levy, beer and cigarette imposts and sales taxes. To a man on \$1 000 or \$2 000 a week, a 2 per cent or 2½ per cent (or even 15 per cent) increase in sales tax is a tiny percentage of his income. However, to the true average income earner on \$200 a week (and I stress that that is the true minimum wage average in Australia today, not the ludicrous figure of \$300 a week I hear bandied around this House so often and see in the newspapers all the time) it is, by definition, a much greater burden.

Dr Billard: How do you get around tax avoidance, though?

Mr McRAE: I think the honourable gentleman has missed the bus a bit, because I dealt with tax avoidance on the income tax scheme quite a while ago. I want to continue now with indirect taxes. However, because of the existing tax sharing arrangements (and I stress that they are the existing tax sharing arrangements) between the Commonwealth and the States, there is the further problem that the revenue of the State is determined in relation to each share of personal income tax, and nothing else. Therefore, it has been a double advantage to the Fraser Government to impose petrol taxes and sales taxes and to increase other excises. It has been a double disadvantage to the average earner in South Australia.

Thus, for instance, according to the *News* figures of 21 August to which I referred, the 9 per cent of total revenue extracted from the motorist represented \$200 000 000. If we take South Australia's share as being approximately 10 per cent, that was a chance for this State to gain \$20 000 000. Then again, if one takes sales tax on existing levels, that represented \$140 000 000. I realise that there are some adjustments in the air—and not just in the air; there are adjustments by Statute and arrangements still to be made by the Premiers and the Commonwealth. However, looking at the existing arrangements, it can be seen how the Commonwealth Government has been so able to adjust its own affairs that there has been a doubly adverse effect on the ordinary income earner in this State, and how there has been a disadvantageous effect on the revenue of this State.

When to all that one adds the latest health muddle and the interest rate increases, it is very clear that the ordinary man in the street has fared badly from Mr Fraser indeed. What is more, I would say that this State has fared very badly from Mr Fraser. In some support of that view my final article quote is a summary from the *News* of Friday 21 August dealing with the Federal Budget aftermath, an article written by Mike O'Reilly, as follows:

The average South Australian family will have to find at least \$12 a week extra to pay for increases caused by the Federal Budget, higher interest rates, and the new health fees applying from 1 September. This is the forecast of Flinders University senior lecturer in economics, Mr Graham Scott.

In his 'average' family, there are two children and a dog or cat. He says the new 2½ per cent tax on household goods is 'significant' and could put up to \$12 a week on the family living bill. And the family pet will add at least 50 cents to \$1 to the shopping bill with its new 17½ per cent tax for manufactured pet food.

Mr Scott said the tax on commodities was 'regressive' and would result in lower income families spending a proportionately higher part of their wage on necessary items like clothes and basic household equipment. 'There is no contribution to growth from this budget,' the lecturer said.

The average family also will face \$20 to \$25 a month increase in its house mortgage repayments—adding \$5 a week to the household bill.

And the economics expert predicts an extra \$5 pay-out to keep the family covered by health and medical insurances when new rates are announced later this month.

'There's nothing too cheerful about this Budget when the average family man has to come up with another \$12 at least after tax to just keep his head above water,' Mr Scott said.

Warwick Costin reports from Canberra families wanting their first overseas holiday—

and that would not apply to too many people in my electorate—

will be hit with Federal charges of at least \$100 and probably \$150 before even reaching their plane or ship.

The penalty for leaving the country was increased in the Budget, with families being hardest hit. Many families are certain to cancel overseas holidays because of the departure costs.

I read that article in full so that I could be perfectly fair about it. I stress that there would not be too many families in the electorate of Playford who would be able to afford the luxury of taking an overseas holiday after the way in which they have been treated by Mr Fraser and now by this Government during the past two years.

I turn now to the Budget of the Premier, acknowledging that there are difficulties which have been imposed on this State by the way in which Mr Fraser has chosen to arrange the affairs of the Commonwealth Government. Nonetheless, I must point out that this Government was elected on certain quite specific promises and all of those promises happen to be Milton Friedman promises. We have heard it all before from Mr Fraser: smaller Government—Mr Fraser said that and Mr Tonkin said it: reduce taxation—Mr Fraser said it and Mr Tonkin said it. What Mr Fraser and Mr Tonkin each said also was that there would be better community welfare, although they used different words, bearing in mind their different jurisdictional levels, and they also promised that there would be better provision for education. Mr Tonkin further said that our law and order arrangements would be made much more suitable, and I shall refer to that later as well.

What has happened to the ordinary man in the street so far as the Tonkin Government is concerned? Who, if anyone, has benefited? I put it to members that between 1975 and 1981, in Federal terms, it is quite clear that the rich have benefited and will continue to benefit, and that that must be so. An analysis of what has happened in the income tax sphere, with the gradual shift from income tax to indirect tax, must surely show that fact to the most hardened of analysts. Likewise, we have seen the same thing happen at State level. Indeed, the Premier promised to abolish succession and gift duties, and he did so, but who benefited from that? Certainly there would be farmers in your electorate, Sir, who would be able to give up their probate policies (I think they were called) and thus gain an income windfall on that. I acknowledge that not every farmer is a rich man; not every farmer is without difficulties. However, certainly many people in the farming community could be in such a category and could afford to meet their fair burden of the needs of this State. However,

that has been one bonanza, and one group of people that has benefited. Certainly, their children or their legatees will most definitely benefit.

The people in the electorates of Bragg and Davenport, for instance, will most certainly benefit, first because those people on \$1 000 or \$2 000 a week will be able to give up their probate policies and, secondly, because their children will gain the windfall benefit of non-taxable estates. However, the children of the poor already had that benefit under the former Government, and gained nothing at all from the change. Again, it has been the rich who have benefited. How has the shortfall been picked up? I will come to that very shortly.

The Premier also promised the abandonment of land tax. The reason why he did that is buried in the past of the Liberal Party, and I think it has something to do with a lady who owned a property on Greenhill Road, which is now owned by the Liberal Party. I can recall, having looked at her case, thinking that indeed it was somewhat harsh that, just because she had inherited that particular property and because there were huge commercial properties going up around, she should be taxed on the commercial rate. The lady said (and as far as I could tell quite honestly) that she intended to use the property only as a domestic home. However, the problem was that the Tonkin Government went overboard, and went from an extreme case which could have been dealt with as an exception to making an offer across the board. Who stood to gain from that offer on land taxes? Did people in the electorates of Playford, Napier or Elizabeth gain? Perhaps to some extent, perhaps \$5, \$10, or \$15 a year at the most. What about the people in the electorates of Bragg or Davenport? I would suggest that those people on 10 times the income gained 10 times as much.

Dr Billard: Rubbish!

Mr McRAE: The honourable member says 'rubbish'. Let him produce the figures in relation to Newland, and the income figures in relation to Newland and then compare them in relation to Bragg and Davenport, and see what result he comes to.

Mr Max Brown: I don't think he'll do that.

Mr McRAE: I do not think he will. Someone obviously had to pay for this bonanza for the rich, and, again we find that the poor have been asked to do it, and this has come about because of another Milton Friedman classic—the user pays principle. Again, it is perfectly obvious that, except in the case of Engineering and Water Supply Department rates, where the old land tax principle to a certain extent tempers what occurs, flat rates, non-adjusted rates according to income across the board, must hurt those on lower incomes compared to those on higher incomes.

I refer to a few of the increases over the past few years: bus and tram fares, 25 per cent; train fares, 17 per cent and upwards, as high as 100 per cent; Engineering and Water Supply Department rates, with the corollary I have given, 12½ per cent; electricity, 12½ per cent; motor vehicle registration, 12½ per cent to 20 per cent; and drivers' licences, 33 per cent. It is quite clear that the Tonkin Government, having made those promises, must live with the results. It is quite clear, too, that the Tonkin Government, knowing the philosophies of the Federal Liberal Government, and urging the people of South Australia to vote for that Government last year, must also shoulder that responsibility as well, or alternatively go back and say bluntly that it made a mistake, that it could not foresee that the leopard would change its spots. It seems the Government is in either one of two positions. Either the Government meant what it said, had carefully researched the situation (and that is what I am sure the Premier would claim), and wanted South Australians to vote for Mr Fraser,

because the Government thought that would be a good thing (which means that it should have been able to predict what he would do, and therefore it should shoulder the blame) or, alternatively, the Government did not quite understand or perhaps it was misled by Mr Fraser, in which case, to be honest the Government should bluntly say so to the people of this State, thereby clarifying the situation.

The same situation obtains in relation to promises it made in 1979. It is no good bleating about the situation. What I have said is either right or wrong. The user pays principle combined with all the Milton Friedman doctrines that I have recited are either right or wrong: they do or do not produce the results that I have stated. Clearly, the people of South Australia have no doubt that what I say is right. I have no doubt that this Government will be thrown out on its neck at the next election, and that it will go out on its neck in a landslide. Not only the ordinary people of South Australia but also the business community share this view.

I have never known a situation where a Government in this State has been held, in any part of its career, in such low esteem by the business community. There is no communication between this Government and its own business leaders in the community. This is staggering, but it is true. Time and time again in the course of my affairs I meet people engaged in industry and commerce who tell me that they simply cannot communicate with the Government. They may share the general philosophies of the Government, but that they cannot get their points of view across to Government Ministers, and cannot hold a sensible conversation with them. They are increasingly angry about what is going ahead. I suspect that this is why the Government had to write out the advertisement that appeared in Friday's *Advertiser*, because I am sure that the so-called large group of concerned business people, as it was advertised, is getting back to our old friends of 1979—a very small, ever-declining group of people. The morale of the whole Public Service causes me great concern because it is disgracefully low. Morale is low because people are worried about their jobs, and they have every reason to be.

Mr MAX BROWN (Whyalla): I want to pursue for a short period the point that was made by the member for Playford in his concluding remarks. There is no doubt that the economic problem that we have in this State has been intensified by the Government's coming into power on an election promise that did the Treasury of this State out of some \$30 000 000 a year. I refer, as the member for Playford referred, to the election promises of this Government, in the abandonment of death duties and land tax.

Mr Keneally: And gift duty.

Mr MAX BROWN: I include gift duty, as well, as my learned colleague for Stuart points out. I could go even further on the question of pay-roll tax, but I will come to that in a moment. I recall vividly the question of death duties because in my own area honest, decent people took heed of this bogy election promise on the basis that they believed somewhere along the line it was going to save their estate a huge amount of money on their death. Nothing could have been further from the truth.

If we analyse the death duties legislation, we see that the previous Labor Government decreased it considerably, and to such an extent that the only money that was being paid to the State Treasury under death duties was that from extremely rich estates. This was not fabricated by the then Labor Government: it is a fact. Unfortunately, the ordinary people in the street somehow got the message that this abandonment of death duties proposed by the now Government would in some way save the estate of old Mr Smith

a large amount of money. That has never eventuated and, I suggest, never will eventuate.

I now deal with the question of land tax, to which the member for Playford referred. I recall that my payment was about \$6.25 a year under the previous Government. That is what this Government has saved me personally per year. This is ridiculous when we say that we are going to provide some financial relief to the important people of our community, the working-class or ordinary-class people, by the abandonment of land tax. That election promise was a complete bogey and did nothing but put this State's financial problems in jeopardy. I suggest that this Government is giving very serious consideration to where it can tax in the best possible way to recoup that \$30 000 000 deficiency that it has at present under its policies.

I shall be interested in the year that the Government has in power to see what it comes up with. The Government is in a very serious economic position in relation to imposing some form of taxation that will recoup the \$30 000 000 of which I speak. I suggest also that the abandonment of payroll tax has not provided one extra job in this State. Indeed, in some shape or form we have lost jobs in this State.

This is the position in which we find ourselves in the second year of this Government's reign. The Government finds itself in an economic situation that to some degree has been brought about by its own election promises and inefficiencies in relation to what those election promises would cost. We are dealing with a Budget that means very little pleasure or hope for the future when it comes to the important people of our society. I refer, of course, to the man in the street. When they were in Opposition, members of the present Government expounded their theory that the then Labor Government was a high taxation Government and that taxation was manipulated by the then Premier, by increasing State charges before the State Budget was tabled in Parliament. How many times did we hear that theory being expounded by member of the present Government?

The Labor Party at that time, and the then Premier (Mr Dunstan), were very amateurish in this respect compared with this Government or this Budget. I am not exaggerating when I say that the Government has increased State charges in 50 or 60 different areas. The Government is still relying heavily on its hopes for a resources boom. This Government came to office by a very cruel hoax: it promised the people of this State between 10 000 and 14 000 jobs. The figure at that time varied to such an extent that it is very difficult to pinpoint exactly how many jobs were promised. Mining is not and never will be a labour-intensified industry. I have been saying for a number of years that much more attention should be shown to the problems that are causing, and continuing to cause, a decline in our manufacturing industry.

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

MR MAX BROWN: I had been saying prior to the adjournment that this Government had continued its policy of paying much attention to solving its economic ills through the mining industry. I had pointed out what has been said many times: the mining industry is not labour intensive; it never has been, and it never will be. I have often said that there should be a greater analysis of the problems associated with the rapid decline in our manufacturing industries throughout the Commonwealth. Taking it a step further, I think the demonstration by motor vehicle industry employees in Victoria Square and outside of this House today was a classic example of the point I am making.

In his Budget speech, the Premier made great play of the resource development programme, and I refer briefly to his remarks. He said:

There is no doubt that the economic future of South Australia will be influenced substantially by resource development. The signs in this respect are indeed favourable. Exploration for a diversity of minerals and petroleum, mostly by large companies having extremely sound technical and financial capacities, is at an unprecedentedly high level in this State.

I would have thought that by now the Government would be showing a tendency to change course and to put more effort into salvaging our manufacturing industries. Ironically, as recently as today, in the Murdoch-owned *Australian* there appears an editorial which in my opinion is of great significance on the point I am making. The Murdoch press generally has not been in favour of manufacturing industries. It always seems to have played up the statement that the Government and its Federal counterpart have a future in this resources boom. The editorial is headed 'A shaky juggling act', and it states:

Manufacturers are less optimistic about the general business outlook for the next six months, according to the Confederation of Australian Industry-Bank of New South Wales latest survey. The wane in confidence came after an unexpected slowdown in growth of factory activity over the past three months. It is timely, therefore, that the Minister for Industry and Commerce, Sir Phillip Lynch, should warn the nation not to rely too much on the mining sector.

It is rather ironic that here we have a banking organisation warning the Federal Government that it should not rely too much on the mining sector, and yet the State Government continues to be hell bent on its pronounced policy of resting on the future of some resources boom. The editorial continues:

He remarked that in recent years mining had contributed less than 5 per cent to gross domestic product, and employed fewer than 2 per cent of our work force. Manufacturing industry contributed around 20 per cent to GDP and employed some 20 per cent of the work force. In fact, manufacturing employs 15 people for every job in mining.

That is significant, to say the least, but it is no more than has been said in this House several times by me and my colleagues. The editorial continues:

Also pertinent to the debate on the protection of our manufacturing industry is Sheikh Yamani's call yesterday for a freeze on oil prices until 1982. The present world glut of crude oil is having the effect of slowing down the world rush to coal on which so much of Australia's resources boom is based. It is fair enough to keep all our protection policies under review, but succeeding in world trade is all about keeping as many options open at the same time as is humanly possible. As the balance of trade figures show, right now our juggler's act is looking positively shaky.

The Premier, in his Budget speech, pointed out that companies such as B.H.P., for example, were booming, with B.H.P. spending \$100 000 000 in Whyalla. I have heard this theory put forward many times, and I point out that, in one area where B.H.P. invested \$30 000 000 in a blast furnace, it reduced the number employed by one in so doing. It is time for this Government to reassess its announced policies on the resources boom.

The attempt by the Premier to boost his back-bench colleagues by trying to convince them that this State has at last turned the corner of an unemployment disaster does very little, and makes an inhuman mockery of the real problems of some 48 000 jobless South Australians. The Government, through its Premier, has enunciated policies of protection for small business, for the ultimate solution of our economic ills, solutions that supposedly will cure our unemployment situation. It has been said, on so many occasions that I have lost count, that this Government supposedly has pursued a policy of protection for small business. It would not be so bad if the Government in fact was protecting small business, possibly the small business people being assisted to employ more people than they now employ, but it is feeding the system of big business and so, through this feeding policy, it is forcing the small business proprietor out of existence. I want to refer to what I can

only describe as the complete ballyhoo we endured early in the term of this Government, and point out its complete disregard of small business.

On so many occasions, members opposite have tried to put down my throat and the throats of my colleagues that they believe in private enterprise and are the champions of small business. I recall vividly (and I am sure members opposite also do) the advertisement in the newspapers of this State just after the election of this Government. It was in similar vein to the advertisement I am now holding. It contained a glowing photograph of the Premier of the State and the piping shriek that we had such a debate about this afternoon. The advertisement is headed 'A message from the Premier to small business'. In bold print, the advertisement states, 'Let's cut the red tape out of running a business in South Australia'. I think we all recall the advertisement. It continues:

Over half the State's workforce is employed by small business. In many cases these firms have to comply with regulations that are designed for large organisations.

The Government recognises that unnecessary controls can stand in the way of job creation, investment and business expansion. Sensible controls are always needed, but the Government has promised to get rid of restrictive and unnecessary red tape which is petty, time wasting and adds to business costs.

The Government is planning a programme to rationalise existing legislation and reduce unnecessary controls.

This is where we want your help. As small business people you know which State Government controls are the greatest barriers to your development. Only you can tell us, if we are to help. Please write—

The advertisement then lists the places to which people should write. That advertisement appeared in the daily newspapers.

Mr Oswald: Very responsible.

Mr MAX BROWN: Well, the member for Morphet says that it was a very good advertisement, and all that sort of thing. I say quite seriously that it was a disaster, because nothing really happened. I recall correspondence that was sent to the Premier at that time by the small businesses in my district. I have a copy of that correspondence and I shall read it, because it does exactly what that advertisement has asked people to do. The correspondence, which was written on 15 July 1980, states:

Dear Mr Premier, We the undersigned, being small business people operating within the city of Whyalla, wish to protest vigorously against the current moves by the large shopping complexes, namely, Coles and Woolworths, in opening their premises for trading Thursday evenings and all day Saturdays.

We see this move as an attempt by the large traders to establish themselves to an even greater degree than they now experience, even if it means in the beginning a trade loss.

I pause there, because those two paragraphs point out what I said earlier. That is exactly what the so-called private enterprise system does. The letter goes on:

We refer you, Mr Premier, to your advertisement—

I have referred the House to the advertisement and have read it—

whereby you are recognising in that advertisement the unnecessary controls that can stand in the way of job creation, investment and business expansion.

The current shopping laws operative in the Whyalla area allow for unrestrictive trade, which in turn allows the big trader to trade at the detriment of the small.

Currently, for these laws to be changed it requires that a country district has to be proclaimed, an application must be made by the local council to the Minister of Industrial Affairs, and it may even be necessary to conduct a local poll within the council area.

No-one could say that that was not absolute ballyhoo and red tape, the very thing that the Premier was talking about in his advertisement. The letter goes on:

We certainly believe that such a requirement could only be regarded as an unnecessary control and unnecessary red tape.

It concludes by stating:

We ask you as Premier to assist us to change the existing shopping hours legislation to provide that shops of large magnitude in trading cannot indiscriminately trade outside the normal recognised 5½-day trading hours and so change that law without having us enter into a programme of red tape as we have described earlier in this correspondence.

To my knowledge, no assistance has been forthcoming from the Government. In fact, I doubt very much that those small traders in Whyalla were even given the courtesy of a reply from the Premier. The slow but very real disappearance of the small delicatessen or the small grocery business on the corner of any community has just about occurred. What has taken its place is the big supermarket complexes and the chain-owned stores that have sprung up like cancer mushrooms, bringing to communities so-called low-consumer price every-day commodities and trading for those commodities at so-called hours of convenience.

Some years ago, I expressed my personal concern amongst my own colleagues and my very good colleagues in the trade union movement about whether we, as a society, were not heading towards a cancer-type growth in consumer trading that might some day create even more problems for our society than the quick apparent benefit that these supermarkets, etc., may create within that society. I believe that that day is fast approaching, and society will awaken to the fact very soon.

What we have created is a robot system, with no employment opportunities for our school-leavers, and, more important, we are creating in the long term a system of manipulation by management boards of price fixation. When I expressed my personal concern on this matter, I remember quite vividly that people, even in my own district, expressed their strong opposition to my thoughts, saying that a worker, his wife, and his family ought to be allowed to shop at their leisure and ought to be allowed and afforded the right to buy at bargain prices.

These people showed no concern for the plight of the shop assistant girl working longer hours, with very little in the way of conditions within her award to facilitate those longer hours. Those people, in the main, were workers in industry themselves, and I put to the House that they would not have tolerated the practices that supermarkets were bringing into operation with these longer shopping hours. However, those people expected the right to shop at any hour of the day on any day of the week. The recent edition of *Probe*, in a front page story, deals with another aspect of the squeezing out of small businesses. It deals with the aspect of large investors in shopping complexes squeezing, by exorbitant rents, the small retail outlets within those large shopping complexes.

Before dealing with that matter, let me say that my own city has a classic example of that very matter. I am sure that my own colleagues, and Government members if they were quite serious and truthful and looked at what was happening in their own districts, could not agree more with what I am saying. The member for Henley Beach is looking like a Cheshire cat, but he is out of his seat, so he will not interfere. I was saying that the large chain-operated store in Whyalla at one time, I recall, owned 60 per cent of that shopping complex. Currently, it owns it lock, stock and barrel.

I want to refer to the following item, because it shows quite glaringly what can happen, and what did happen in Queensland. The article states:

The large Indooroopilly Shoppingtown complex in Brisbane is the scene of a bitter public row between small retailers and its landlord, Westfield Holdings Ltd.

The small retailers claim they are being ruined by excessively high rents—'rented out of existence'—while the large groups such as Woolworths, Myer and Target receive favoured rents from Westfield.

There's a similar picture throughout Australia. Small retailers are beginning to buck at what they consider to be excessive rental demands by large corporate landlords. In one shopping complex, small retailers occupy only 30 per cent of the total floor space, yet pay 70 per cent of the total yearly rent.

That is not uncommon. In fact, if we look at the question in depth, I suggest that, even in that particular area and in that particular shopping complex, if the truth was known, somewhere along the line either Myer, Target, Coles, or one of the other chain monopoly stores has some major interest in that complex. I venture to say that all they are doing is paying a token rental contribution to the overall cost of that shopping centre.

The shadow Federal spokesman on consumer affairs, Senator Gietzelt, issued a pamphlet in 1980 about this particular matter which sets out very well the concern I expressed in my earlier remarks, a concern that spells out how disastrous is this often pronounced slogan of the Liberal Party 'We believe in private enterprise—private enterprise will get us out of our economic ills.' I am suggesting to members opposite that I would believe more in the private enterprise rights of small business than the Liberal Party members in Canberra or this State do.

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

Dr BILLARD (Newland): I want to direct my remarks to a portion of the Budget which affects my district and the district of Todd in particular. That is the line that allocates \$6 700 000 to detailed design and commencement of construction of the north-east busway. In speaking about that general allocation, I want to report on what I found when I visited several countries in northern Europe earlier this year to have a first hand look at that system. I was able on that trip both to draw comparisons between the O'Bahn system and a wide variety of other forms of public transport systems and to look at much wider issues related to public transport.

The concept of the O'Bahn busway was introduced by the then shadow Minister of Transport, the member for Torrens, immediately prior to the last State election. It played some part in the State election in the north-eastern area, although I believe that, politically at least, it was not a determining factor at all. I believe that at that stage it was still too early for the public to grasp the concept of the O'Bahn system. I must confess, for my own part, that I had never heard of that system prior to the concept's being put to me early in that election campaign by the then shadow Minister of Transport, the member for Torrens. I questioned him closely on a wide variety of aspects of the system, because I did not want to be sold a pup, so I was critical in my questioning. As I said, I do not believe that even then, having accepted it, it played a determining role in that election, because the concept was so new that the public could not grasp what it was all about. The public accepted that the Liberals had an alternative and that we were proposing a system which would meet their needs at a fraction of the cost of the Labor Party's l.r.t. system. It is with some feeling that I say now, having seen this system in operation—

Mr Russack: At your own expense.

Dr BILLARD:—at my own expense, and not going on hearsay and technical evidence, that I believe that the proposals by the member for Torrens about that system at that time will be seen historically as a master stroke. I believe it is an amazing system. I found when on my trip throughout Europe that it gave a ride superior to that of any other mass public transport system that I tried, and that included a range of l.r.t., tram, and bus systems. The fact that we can now have a transport system to the north-

east suburbs of Adelaide which incorporates this superior O'Bahn system at a fraction of the cost to the State of an l.r.t. system (which I now believe would have given an inferior ride) I believe was a master stroke. I believe that history will reflect great credit on this man for what he has brought not only to the people of the north-east suburbs of South Australia but to all of South Australia. Also, I think it will bring great credit to South Australia. I say that, having seen the system, experienced the ride and closely questioned those engineers associated with that system in Essen, not as vendors but as users of the system.

I think this is all the more remarkable because, prior to the member for Torrens being appointed shadow Minister of Transport, the Government of the time had spent nearly \$1 000 000 on investigating alternatives. If one looks at the 1979 Auditor-General's Report, one sees that it shows that at that stage \$968 000 had been spent on the NEAPTR review, which was set up to look for and find, supposedly, the best alternative to service the public transport needs of the north-eastern suburbs of Adelaide. In addition, since that time an amount estimated in the 1980 Auditor-General's Report at \$724 000 has been expended on preliminary detailed design studies for an l.r.t. system to service that area. All in all, nearly \$1 700 000 has been spent on investigating an l.r.t. system, hopefully to provide what the previous Government thought would be the best system for the north-eastern suburbs.

Within two months of being appointed to the shadow portfolio, the shadow Minister was able to produce what I believe will be seen to be a vastly superior system for the north-eastern suburbs. That is not to say that l.r.t. is no good anywhere. As I will show later, there are certain situations in which l.r.t. may still be an appropriate public transport solution. Having gone through a period of close questioning and uncertainty, and having seen the system in operation, I can say with confidence that I believe that the people of the north-eastern suburbs will be extremely grateful to the contribution the Minister has made to their future.

Honourable members may recall that in August 1980 a decision was made that a section of guideway would be incorporated into the overall busway and, in particular, into the section passing through the inner suburbs down the Torrens River valley. The guideway was included in that section because a normal busway would cause environmental impacts that a guideway would avoid. The arguments proffered against the guideway would not apply in that region, and there were very compelling environmental reasons why a guideway should be used there; in particular the fact that the tracks were much narrower than the tracks required for a normal busway through that very sensitive Torrens River valley.

Having seen the bus system that operates in Essen, I can now say that, in addition to there being less environmental impact, the ride is smoother (that is, there is less vibration), and it is quieter than the l.r.t. systems that I tried in Europe. This is not merely a subjective judgment: I have been told that there are now objective measurements to support the claims that there is less vibration in the buses than in l.r.t. systems, that the quietness inside the bus is comparable to the best l.r.t. systems, and that outside the bus the quietness is greater (that is, there is less noise outside the bus that operates on a guideway than in regard to l.r.t. systems). This is not a subjective judgment: it has been established as objective fact through measurements that have been carried out in Essen.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Geoff Virgo's biggest fear about l.r.t. was that it was too quiet for public safety.

Dr BILLARD: Once we get to a system that is too quiet, we must take into account other safety factors. Quietness

would certainly be an attribute to residents living along or near the busway: I believe that they would rather a quiet public transport system than one that was disturbing in its noisiness. I compared the O'Bahn system with another guided bus system that was operating at Halmstad in Sweden. That system had been constructed by the Volvo company. In some respects, it was not directly comparable, because the buses were guided only in the vicinity of a bus stop. An electronic means was used, whereby an electrical loop was implanted in the roadway for 100 metres prior to the bus stop. The bus would have in the middle of the front bumper bar a sensor that would detect electrical currents in the loop. The sensor would then drive the steering of the bus so that it maintained the position with the sensor in the middle of the loop.

The loop started out being 2 metres wide 100 metres away from the bus stop, and narrowed to 1 metre width adjacent to the bus stop. In this way, the bus could be guided into a bus stop that was, in fact, a raised platform. The aim of the exercise was to give level entry to buses so that there were not the normal three steps that a person must climb to enter a bus. Wheel chairs could roll into the Volvo buses in Halmstad.

There were greater difficulties in relation to that system that were not experienced in relation to the O'Bahn system in Essen, simply because the guidance was electrical and not mechanical. If there was ice on the road, in an O'Bahn busway the bus is physically constrained to stay in the guideway, whereas, using the electrical system as devised by Volvo, the bus would try to turn the steering wheel to direct itself to the desired position. If the bus happened to slide around and there was not sufficient traction between the wheels of the bus and the surface of the road, the bus might still not go to the desired position. So, there were inherent difficulties with the electrical guidance that was used by Volvo at Halmstad.

Also, because the guidance system was used to guide the bus into a bus stop, which was a raised platform, the trajectory of the bus was curved near the bus stop. In the initial stages, problems were experienced with the ends of the bus scraping against the platform at the bus stop as the bus moved into and away from the stop. The bus was then brought in at a position about one foot away from the stop, and platforms emerged from the bus immediately outside the door of the bus. There were two of these platforms: one platform would emerge when the bus detected that it was over a loop planted in the pavement, and hence at a raised platform bus stop, and another platform would come out at a lower level if the loop was not detected. So, if the bus pulled up at another place in the street and someone wished to alight, that person would have to step down on to the road. Therefore, two different platforms could emerge from the door of the Volvo bus.

That system seemed to work very well, but there were some problems in regard to the electrical base that were not experienced in regard to the O'Bahn system. I also looked at the V.A.L. system at Lille in France, where the MATRA aerospace company was developing what could be most conveniently described as a rubber-tyred l.r.t. From South Australia's point of view, what is interesting is not the detail of the design of the V.A.L. system but rather the technical reasons why the rubber tyre system was chosen. Some arguments were put in South Australia last year when the debate about the north-east busway was being pursued that, in fact, steel on steel was the best option to give the smoothest ride, as well as being the most efficient option.

In fact, the tests done by the MATRA company in France showed that rubber-tyred vehicles give superior traction, and that, for a public transport system that is starting

and stopping frequently, they are more fuel efficient. Steel on steel is only more efficient for very long haul transport, and therefore for public transport systems rubber-tyred vehicles are more fuel efficient and are also quieter. It was said that tests had shown that on average rubber-tyred vehicles were six decibels quieter than the equivalent steel-wheeled vehicles. Also, they had the advantage that they gave a smoother ride, and gave it for a longer time, and the implication of that is that steel wheels on steel rails may give a smooth ride initially, but this ride will deteriorate over the years and cannot be maintained, whereas rubber-tyred vehicles continue to give a smooth ride indefinitely.

The significance of the V.A.L. system is not so much that we should copy that system, but in the design decisions taken which reinforce the decisions that we have taken with respect to the north-east busway and which show again we are on the right track.

I also tested and investigated many of the l.r.t. systems. In my view, these systems in Germany are very good systems. They had modern vehicles which give a good ride, which are quite roomy inside, and which are quiet. My only criticism of them was that having just ridden on the O'Bahn system, and within the hour then having the opportunity to try what they call the U-Bahn system, which is the l.r.t. system as we know it, the l.r.t. system ride was not as good in my view as the O'Bahn system. On occasions, it lurched and there were clacks every time it crossed a junction point, and generally I felt that the ride did not quite come up to the standard of the O'Bahn system in Essen.

It is significant to note that in the debate that ensued last year one of the systems that had been proposed as being the epitome of l.r.t. systems was the Tyne and Wear system in Newcastle, England. So, I took the opportunity to go and see the people there and try out that system. I think it is important that I give a short history of that system. It was initially proposed in 1971 when some railway right of way became available for use as a public transport system. At that time, the people concerned investigated whether they should create a busway or an l.r.t. Obviously, a busway created on a rail right of way would require the resumption of land to widen the corridor, and the busway system at that stage was costed at £15 600 000. The l.r.t. system, on the other hand, was costed at £6 500 000, and on the basis of that comparison of costs the go-ahead was given for the l.r.t. system. Subsequently, they decided to add other sections to the l.r.t. proposal, and the total package cost that was given the go-ahead in 1972 was for an l.r.t. system that would cost £70 000 000. So, in two years, although the size of the project had grown, the cost had grown from £6 500 000 to £70 000 000.

When I visited Newcastle in May this year, the l.r.t. system was open, although not yet complete, and at that stage the estimate for the cost was £300 000 000. So, there had been a substantial increase from £70 000 000 to £300 000 000. In fact, in order to keep within their cost targets, they had been forced to cut several corners with regard to costs, to the point where from my experience of that system it was certainly not the best l.r.t. system in Europe. I know that the vehicles were modelled on the vehicles in use in Germany at Frankfurt, but I am told that they had to cut a few corners and do away with some of the insulation that they would have liked to include in those vehicles. I can say without exaggeration that I found it impossible to conduct a conversation at shouting level in those vehicles, such was the noise. I was trying to conduct a conversation with my guide, and we had to stop because the noise was just too great. This was a system hailed as a quiet system, but that is what happens if one cuts corners in relation to an l.r.t. system.

There are good l.r.t. systems. I am told by others that some of the l.r.t. systems in North America are far superior to any in Europe. That may well be true—I have not been to North America and I do not know. However, I can say that the Newcastle-on-Tyne system was one of the noisiest trains that I have been on. It was not a smooth ride. In fact, I think that the London underground gives a smoother and quieter ride than the Newcastle system. It certainly was nothing to compare with the German systems on which it had apparently been modelled.

I turn now to some of the other things I found and examined on that trip. One of the most significant things for me to discover was the amount of research that had been done in Europe into the factors that influenced the public in accepting a public transport system. From several different quarters, I received advice which confirmed the opinions that I held. The M.A.N. company in Germany has produced a good book detailing a lot of research results, amongst which were included the factors affecting public acceptance of public transport systems. In view of the debate that has occurred in South Australia in the past about the level of fares on public transport systems, it is perhaps salutary to note that universally in Europe research has shown that the main factors affecting public acceptance are, in order: reliability, frequency, accessibility, comfort, and, finally, cost. Cost is one of the main factors affecting the public acceptance of a public transport system, but it occurs at the end of that list.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: That's where they made the mistake in San Francisco.

Dr BILLARD: Yes. Having spoken to a great number of my constituents since returning, and having raised with them this subject to test with them whether they concurred with this assessment, I have found that they have universally said that it is right. A public transport service must be reliable. Secondly, services must be frequent. I could mention that the standard that was generally accepted in Europe for frequency was that services should have a separation of not more than five to 10 minutes. The assertion was that, if the separation time between successive buses was more than that, people had to use a time table in order to catch a bus. In fact, they said that people hated having to wait more than five or 10 minutes for a bus. I think that that example has a lot of lessons for us, especially in the operation of interchanges.

The significance is that the standard that they tried to work to was that buses should have a gap of not more than five to 10 minutes. Obviously, this is a standard that we cannot hope to approach in South Australia at the moment. We simply do not have the patronage, and the cost would be absolutely enormous. In Europe, it is an established practice that a large proportion of the public uses public transport systems. Typically, in many centres between 60 per cent and 80 per cent of those travelling to work in the central areas of those cities use the public transport system. That can be compared with the situation in my own electorate where, according to the 1976 census, 11.1 per cent use the system. Frequency of service was one very important area where we could not at the moment hope to achieve that standard.

Accessibility was another important matter raised. By 'accessibility', I mean the distance that a person has to walk to catch the bus, the train, the tram, or whatever the public transport system is. The standard in Europe is about 400 to 500 metres. More often than not it was 400 metres.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: That is the standard S.T.A. distance.

Dr BILLARD: I can accept that it is the standard S.T.A. goal but, in some newly developing areas of Adelaide, that standard has not yet been achieved. I accept that there are

some difficulties in achieving that standard in Tea Tree Gully, because many main roads are 1.2 kilometres apart, and that makes it fairly difficult to achieve that standard without finding a way to send a bus route through the centre of a suburb, a question that poses severe problems.

One of the other things that I discovered was that, in relation to achieving these aims, it is important to recognise that they are of course inter-dependent, and the time it takes for a person to travel on the bus, say, from Tea Tree Gully to town, is not important in itself, but these other factors are important. Time assumes importance in so far as money can be saved and an improved frequency offered if faster services are provided, that is, if fewer buses are required to provide the same frequency.

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

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): I support the motion. I think I am the first member in this debate to have made that rather empty rhetorical point. Perhaps it should be made; we are debating a particular motion. However, I do so with a singular lack of enthusiasm for the task which is before me and the Chamber. It is traditional at this part of the Budget process for one to comment on the Budget strategy. That is very difficult with the Budget before us, because it is difficult to discern any strategy behind this document, unless it is a strategy of simply keeping the ship afloat.

If one could picture members on the Government side out in a boat in the middle of the ocean, one would assume that the strategy might be to sail towards some particular goal, an island somewhere on the horizon. It seems to me that what we are faced with instead is the whole ship's crew furiously baling to prevent the ship from sinking and there is little thought given, nor can there be much capacity for thought, to steering the ship in any particular direction. From that point of view it is difficult.

In addition, my Leader and other members from this side who have spoken in the debate have already fairly effectively savaged the main points of the Budget. Thirdly, I rather hoped that the member for Newland might have given us some sort of defence of the Government's Budget strategy, such as it is, but he, perhaps wisely, confined his remarks to a very narrow area of policy which directly affects his own electorate. That was probably very wise, both from the point of view of home consumption (if one can say that), and also because surely it must be a Budget that is extremely difficult to defend. For those various reasons, I also want to be fairly specific and narrow in my remarks this evening. I want to concentrate on certain aspects of funding of the Department of Environment and Planning and, in particular, on certain issues which have come up and which impinge on that funding, and which in turn are affected by the Government's present budgetary position.

Before I do that, I want to make one remark about the document before us and the way in which it is sent out in regard to the Department of Environment and Planning. As the Minister sitting on the front bench would know, there has been an amalgamation in the past 12 months, and the department is an amalgamation of two departments, the Department of Environment and the Department of Urban and Regional Affairs. Somehow, the setting out of the Budget papers has had to take that matter into account. This makes it very difficult to see just exactly where certain votes have gone because, if one turns to the relevant pages, one finds, for example, clustered at the beginning of the pages on environment and planning, the Estimates of Expenditure for that particular department. I refer to page 80 of the Estimates of Payments (Recurrent and Capital).

But, when one looks on this page for what was actually voted and spent in the past financial year, one finds nothing, because that is included further over under the heading 'Department of Environment' on the one hand and 'Department of Urban and Regional Affairs' on the other hand.

I suggest that, unless the famous yellow booklet (or whatever colour it is this year) is going to give us some assistance when it comes along, members will have some trouble in the Estimates Committees, because the obvious point of departure for any question to the Minister is, 'In the last financial year under this line you were voted so much, you spent so much, and so much is now proposed. Can you explain why, on the one hand, you spent far more than was voted to you or, perhaps, on the other hand, you propose to spend far less this year than you spent last year?' Members will have to do a fair bit of scissors and paste work on this document in order to track down exactly where these expenditures have gone. Indeed, I have attempted to do just this, and one finds all sorts of problems in tracking it down.

To give just a couple of examples, it is proposed in 1981-82 to spend \$116 125 under the heading 'Deputy Director-General and Executive support staff'. When one tries to find out how much was spent specifically in that area in 1980-81, one is unable to do so. I appreciate the fact that, with the problem with amalgamation, it was going to be very difficult to give some of these details in the Budget papers, but it will certainly cause some problems as far as we are concerned. Of course, I am referring as much to Government back-benchers as to members of the Opposition.

On the face of it, it would appear that the National Parks and Wildlife Service has been treated considerably less harshly than have most Government departments. I am told there is an additional inspectorate function which has been added into this year's vote which was provided for elsewhere last year. Therefore, those figures are by no means as rosy as they may appear. I use that term relatively; there is nothing very rosy about this particular Budget.

I will not continue in this vein; it is something to which I may have to turn later in the budgetary process. I point out to members who may not have looked closely at the environment and conservation vote that this is going to be a real problem—tracing through how expenditure in this financial year, as proposed, compares in detail with what was actually spent in the last financial year.

Let me turn to the more specific matters I want to raise. This afternoon the 21st report of the Public Accounts Committee on the financial management of facilities at Wilpena Pound in the Department of Environment and Planning was tabled in this House. I have only had a very brief opportunity to peruse it. It will not be possible for me to say very much in detail about its contents beyond page 34 or 35, although if there is some time there is one matter later in the report to which I will turn my attention. I do not believe in getting up in this House and speaking on the basis of just a skim through a document. It has only been possible for me to read in detail and digest the earlier parts of the document. First, it is important that some of the conclusions from these earlier pages are read into the record because they are pretty heavy sorts of conclusions. I refer to page 4 of the document. I will read the first three conclusions because they are the conclusions I will turn the attention of the House to in some detail. Section No. 3.1 says:

The P.A.C. considers there has been a history of gross incompetence by Government departments in managing the Wilpena complex over a long period. The P.A.C. believes that without its inquiry, commenced in June 1980, the position would not have improved.

Section No. 3.2 says:

Since resuming the inquiry on 10 April 1981 the P.A.C. has been frustrated by delays by the Department of Environment in providing accurate financial information and the inability of its senior witnesses to give precise answers when called to give evidence.

Section No. 4.1 says:

In negotiating terms of settlement for a new lease agreement, signed on 31 July 1981, with Flinders Ranges Tourist Services Pty Ltd (FRTS), the Department of Environment considered that the then current agreement dated 15 August 1967 was worthless. This view is not supported by the Attorney-General. As a result, the Government has accepted responsibility for expenditures which are legally the obligation of the lessee.

These are pretty strong accusations. I have often been less than impressed by reports coming from this particular committee. I do not enter this debate as a firm supporter of everything that this committee has done. It has often been quite shallow in its approach to things. Often it has begun with a preconception and then set out to find evidence to bear out that particular concept. The present Chairman of the committee, the member for Hanson, is on some sort of crusade largely because he missed out on a Cabinet position in this place (I am sorry he is not here to hear this, but he will of course hear about it) and he has a rather inflated idea of his own accountancy capacity. Maybe I have said things to hurt some people I would regard as friends. Having said that, I believe that the committee is an important committee and that what it says on any topic cannot be ignored.

There are some questions in the report what have to be answered by the present Minister. The conclusions I read to the House are conclusions which deal with the period of the Ministry of this particular Minister. Let us turn to the particularly spelling out of some of the details in the report. First, as to conclusion 3.1, there was obviously a good deal of correspondence between the committee and the Minister about this matter. Obviously, the committee had a great deal of difficulty in getting detailed information from the Minister. On page 11 of the report we are told the Public Accounts Committee met with the Minister and several departmental officers on 22 July 1980. The Minister stated he had obtained Cabinet approval on 30 June to set up a committee to make recommendations by September 1980 on the viability of the motel and the best lease arrangement for the Government to adopt. The P.A.C. wrote to the Minister on 5 August 1980 as follows:

Thank you for briefing the P.A.C. on the current situation concerning the Wilpena Pound motel and camping ground. The P.A.C. has noted that, subsequent to receiving the P.A.C.'s previous letter of 11 June 1980, and the reply dated 25 June 1980, you have decided to establish a committee of inquiry to investigate the matter and to report by the end of September 1980. While the P.A.C. is concerned at the protracted delays in resolving the Wilpena situation, it has resolved to defer making further investigations and taking evidence until the end of September. Consequently, I would appreciate it if you would keep me informed of the committee of inquiry's progress and findings. In the meantime would you please provide a copy of the terms of reference of the inquiry and the membership of the committee.

Details of the terms of reference and membership of the committee were supplied on 27 August last year and the committee of inquiry held its first meeting on 2 September of last year. The P.A.C. wrote to the Minister on 8 October asking for the supply of a copy of a report prepared by the committee. The report was not completed until December 1980. A copy was not supplied, so in February 1981 the committee had to write back to the Minister. On page 12 of the report part of the letter says:

I am concerned at the delays in providing the P.A.C. with the committee's report. Section 14 of the Public Accounts Committee Act provides powers to compel the production of documents. I would therefore appreciate it if you would provide a copy of the committee's report and advise the P.A.C. of the current situation.

Again, no reply was received so the P.A.C. resolved to visit Wilpena Pound, to take evidence, and wrote to the Minister along those lines. The Minister notified the Public Accounts Committee on 16 March 1981 that Cabinet had approved the existing long-term lease with the complex to be purchased by the Government and replaced with a short-term commercial lease to the company in order to restore the leasing arrangements to a businesslike basis. The Minister acknowledged P.A.C. letters dated 12 February and 3 March 1981 which drew attention to the P.A.C.'s powers to complete the production of documents and the report of the committee of inquiry was still not provided. The minutes of the P.A.C. meeting held on 17 March 1981, says:

It was considered there had been gross incompetence in managing the Wilpena project and the P.A.C. should establish what the real position was re ownership of assets, arrears of rent and other Government assistance given in maintaining assets, including the caravan park since 1957.

That eventually led to some sort of response from the Minister, who told the committee that he was concerned that negotiations had reached a very delicate stage and that he really did not want them dipping their oar in at that particular time. The P.A.C. decided it should continue with its inquiry and notified witnesses to give evidence at Hawker and Wilpena Pound on 10 and 11 April 1981. By letter dated 3 April 1981 the Minister stated that the matter of outstanding rent had been resolved and that a written agreement had been negotiated with the Managing Director. Copies of the committee of inquiry's report were finally enclosed.

The report was dated 11 December 1980. The Government was really asking for trouble in fobbing off a committee for that period of time. Therefore, it is hardly surprising that the committee drew the conclusion which it did and which I have already quoted to the House. It is obvious that I am not going to have time to turn in detail to section 3.2. I therefore turn my attention to section 4.2, which looks at the whole matter of the legality of the lease. The committee was at pains to find why the Government had not attempted to enforce the conditions of the lease. Some of what was said there is interesting indeed. For example, Mr B. J. Lovell, consultant to the Department of Environment and Planning, was interviewed by the committee as set out on page 28 of the report as follows:

Question: You mentioned that in your opinion the initial lease was not actionable. Was that also the opinion of Crown Law?

Answer (Mr Lovell): We did not obtain a legal opinion. This was my opinion. The lease stated specifically that various things should happen and had not happened, and no action had been taken; in other words, the position had been acquiesced to.

Question: Because the lease was not in your opinion actionable, and I presume that is the basis for drawing up the new lease agreement with FRTS, yet one of the difficulties was the verbal commitments that had been undertaken that were expected to be fulfilled. I find that a contradiction?

Answer (Mr Lovell): We did not see it in that way. It was only my opinion that the lease would have been unlikely to have been processed through the courts and the various parties would have obtained the position that they expected to obtain under it. The lessee maintained that he had many areas of counter claims, many areas in which the Government had not fulfilled its promises.

Question: But they were only verbal promises?

Answer (Mr Lovell): Verbal promises.

Mr E. J. Phipps, Director-General of the department, was interviewed as follows:

Question: What you are really trying to tell me is that the previous lease was worthless. That is the impression I am starting to get. Is that right?

Answer (Mr Phipps): Yes, Mr Chairman. What I would say is that it was just an inadequate basis with which to manage the arrangements between the Government and FRTS today and in the future, and that the arrangements had to be substantially reconstructed.

On page 29 of the report it gives considerable details of correspondence with the Crown Solicitor in the first

instance and then correspondence with the Attorney-General. On page 30 of the report the letter to the Attorney-General asks the following questions:

1. Would the failure of the Government to enforce some of the clauses in the lease have made the lease unenforceable?

2. If the lease was unenforceable would the lessees have any rights in this matter?

An urgent reply would be appreciated.

On page 31 of the report the Attorney-General is quoted as saying, in his reply of 30 September, the following:

Having had some involvement with the crystallising of the arrangements between Government and the lessee of the Wilpena Pound tourist complex, I must say that I cannot see how 'failure of the Government to enforce some of the clauses in the lease' would 'have made the lease unenforceable'. My recollection is that the original lease was not in the best interests of the Government but nevertheless was a legally binding document. The new arrangement seems to be eminently sensible and is very much more favourable to the Government with considerably more certainty than the previous lease.

The committee is not arguing about that final statement but it does pick up the point made by the Attorney-General that it was a legally binding document. What are the consequences to the department of its not being regarded as such or not being acted upon as such by the Government? On page 27 of the report we have quoted to us a Cabinet recommendation from the Minister as follows:

1. That approval be given to the purchase of the interest held by Flinders Ranges Tourist Services Pty Ltd in the Wilpena tourist complex, such purchase to be implemented by:

(1) payment of an amount of approximately \$550 000 for surrender of the existing lease, such payment to involve a net cash outlay at settlement of between approximately \$329 000 and \$369 000.

(2) payment to be funded within the department's existing loan budget for 1980-1981.

(3) negotiation of a normal three-year commercial lease with management conditions appropriate to a National Park location.

(4) the lease to include provision for a rental adjustment based on the provision of power at the rural rate.

2. That approval be given for negotiations with the company to commence accordingly.

I now turn to page 123 of the Estimates document before us. We find, under the capital lines for the Minister of Environment and Planning, 'Conservation—Open Space and Recreation Purposes'. I assume that the appropriate heading under which this expenditure was made is 'Recreation and Open Space Improvements' under which \$645 000 was voted and actual payments were \$1 306 000. I assume that that is where the expenditure arose. Maybe I am wrong. Maybe there are still some elements of the transaction to be worked out, in which case it does not appear in this document at all. That would seem to be the reason for that doubling of the estimate in the financial year. I regard this as a serious matter. I do not pretend to have done more than scratch the surface of this report. No doubt there will be a great deal of debate on it in the media.

The problems surrounding it go back well before the time of this Government. There is enough in the first three major conclusions of the inquiry for this House to be asking the Minister of Environment and Planning, first, to explain why there was not greater co-operation with the committee when it entered upon its appointed task and, secondly, why what appears to have been the opinion of the chief law officer of the State, the Attorney-General, was ignored at cost to the Government of this State. I am referring to conclusion 4.1 of the report. Money is tight, particularly capital money, partly because (as somebody from the Government benches said today) there has been a cut-back on Loan funds from the Loan Council (which is the Federal Government) and also predominantly because this Government is using the Loan Account to shore up its Revenue Account. There are things which the Department of Environment and Planning

should be doing which it is not able to do because it does not have the funds. They range from matters which are fairly minor in their impact to matters which are fairly major in their impact.

In Alfred Street in the city there is, in effect, a picket line. It does not deal with industrial matters—it deals with the demolition of two cottages in that street and arises from the fact that the Minister has not been prepared to act. In terms of the Planning and Development Act, he appears to have no powers to intervene. The City of Adelaide rejected an application for demolition and commercial redevelopment. It was taken to appeal and it lost the appeal. Everybody is saying to the local people who want to retain the residential character of that part of the city, 'Bad luck, boys and girls, that is it. Cottages have to come down and there will be a further commercial invasion into what is supposed to be a residential precinct'. I ask the Minister whether he has examined in this regard his powers under the South Australian Heritage Act of 1978, in particular section 13.

Has he considered action in relation to the residential precincts of the city of Adelaide in terms of section 13, which enables the Minister to declare an area of land as a State heritage area where he considers that it is part of the physical, social or cultural heritage of that State or is of significant aesthetic, historical or cultural interest? I suppose one of the reasons is that, if the Minister acts, there is every chance that he will be up for some compensation and he has not got the money to put into compensation.

Let us turn our attention from the man-made heritage to our environmental heritage. There are various areas of the State which are crying out for acquisition on a proper basis by this Government so that they can be preserved and protected, and that is not happening. The Minister is under pressure from certain people at Vivonne Bay, on Kangaroo Island, for the acquisition of an area which has been technically subdivided, and the people there who own some of the blocks of land I understand would be happy to see them acquired so that the frontal dunes can be protected. The Minister has said that he is not in a position to provide adequate protection because the money is not there for the acquisition to take place.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: There may be another alternative.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Since the Minister of Agriculture is so interested in what I have to say, and because I am so interested in his electorate, because of its tremendous scenic potential, let us look at what happened at Newland Head recently, where a landowner had offered an area of scrub to the national parks people. The Government knocked it back on the grounds that it did not have the money to acquire the land, and the landowner became so impatient that he rolled and burnt a portion of the scrub.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: It may well have been good producing land.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: It may well have been, but it is also one of the important remnant areas of bush land on Fleurieu Peninsula, which has been overcleared, as far as I am concerned, as well as many other people in the community. I invite the Minister, if he has not examined it recently, to look at the excellent map prepared by the environment people in relation to remnant areas of scrub land in the agricultural areas of this State. I refer to areas around the Billiatt Conservation Park, in the Mallee land. I have the local member here on that one. There is also the Messent Conservation Reserve, in the Upper South-East. There are areas where money was provided by the Federal Government and where acquisition has occurred and yet, for some reason, these areas have yet to be dedicated as conservation reserves.

Returning to the electorate of the Minister of Agriculture, there are areas associated with the Deep Creek Conservation Reserve which have not yet been declared, although Federal money was used to purchase them some time ago. There is an area in the vicinity of Coffin Bay where there has been no dedication of the land involved, although there should have been. Finally, I again remind the Minister of Agriculture of the famous Gosse Crown lands area, and how badly that needs to be transferred to national parks and committed as an extension of the Flinders Range Conservation Reserve. All I can say in conclusion is that, if the attitude of the Minister of Agriculture is reflected over the whole of the front bench, that does not say very much about this Government's commitment to the concept of the conservation of our natural heritage.

Mr OLSEN (Rocky River): I support the Bill but, before making some comments in relation to the Budget, I want to make a comment in relation to the speech of the member who has just resumed his seat regarding the report of the Public Accounts Committee which was tabled in this House today. The honourable member said that he had not had an opportunity to look at the report in detail. When he does so, he will see clearly that the reason for the action of the Public Accounts Committee in the first instance in looking at the financial arrangements between Flinders Ranges Tourist Services and the Government was on the basis of the non-collection of rent dues by Flinders Ranges Tourist Services to the Government over a period of years. He will see that there has been ineptitude on the shoulders of successive Ministers responsible for the area covered by Flinders Ranges Tourist Services. Indeed, I am sure that he will realise that there has been ineptitude not only on the part of Governments involved but on the part of departments, by not following through and ensuring that rents were collected on behalf of the Government.

The current lease will be subject to review by successive Public Accounts Committees. Our charter as a committee of this Parliament is to take the historic perspective of the financial affairs being administered within this State by various instrumentalities of Government service, and indeed the lease agreement that the Government has entered into now will be the subject, no doubt, of review in due course. The main text of the Public Accounts Committee's report is the ineptitude by successive Ministers and by departments in not enforcing a lease and collecting dues to the Government of South Australia and thereby to the taxpayers of South Australia. It is indicative of the approach of the former Government in its financial management of South Australia, an approach in relation to financial affairs of this State that has put an enormous burden on the current Government in terms of financial management now and for the future.

I note from the Budget papers that in the area of agriculture we have seen an increase in the allocation from some \$23 200 000 to \$27 900 000 in our current financial year. I believe that that reflects the Government's recognition of the importance of rural industries to the welfare of South Australians. We also note from the Budget papers that an additional \$517 000 has been provided from State funds for extension services and soil conservation programmes to compensate for the loss of Commonwealth direct grants in these areas. From the point of view of my electorate, it is very heartening to see that inclusion in this year's Budget papers. There is a very real need to undertake consistent soil conservation programmes in certain areas of South Australia. I believe we need to remind the people of this State that, despite the development of natural resources, our land is still our greatest asset and the production of that land remains vital to the welfare of our economy.

Agriculture still produces about 42 per cent of our national export income, compared to 27 per cent for mining and 22 per cent for manufacturing. Even more graphic is the situation applying in South Australia. These figures are indeed even more outstanding, for more than 60 per cent of our export income in this State, almost \$1 000 000 000, is directly connected with agriculture, while minerals contribute 18 per cent of our export income and manufactured goods 8.7 per cent. Wheat and barley production together made up one-third of this State's export income, contributing in the 1979-80 financial year some \$567 000 000 of overseas exchange to our economy, not only to this State but indeed to the nation. South Australia's total crop value for 1979-80 was \$793 000 000, of which almost \$600 000 000 was derived from broad acre farming.

The farmers in this State have turned what a century ago was basically described as an infertile environment into one of the most efficient agricultural economies in the world, and the figures to which I have just referred clearly substantiate that fact. In looking at the very significant growth of the agricultural industry in South Australia over the past century, we need to take stock of the development, that extraordinary growth to which I have referred, and look towards the turn of the century and into the twenty-first century to ensure that we as a State (indeed, as a nation) have the facilities to handle that production.

We need to have easy, efficient access to international markets and to ensure that the cost effectiveness, and therefore the profitability, of South Australian farmers is maintained so that we can provide foodstuffs for an ever-increasing hungry world and ensure that, in providing those foodstuffs, we are able to compete with other countries.

Allow me to read comments made recently by the President of the Australian Chamber of Shipping (Mr McLellan), who claimed that industrial disputation and disruption in our ports had reached the level where many overseas shipping companies were forced to pay special insurance charges on cargo coming here. He said that, in fact, a shipping company could face a bill of up to \$40 000 a day for a big ship held up by an industrial dispute in this country, and these disputes are going on in Australian ports all the time.

Indeed, a classic example of that is the current fuel crisis in this State as a result of which, because of the marine engineers' dispute, tankers are unable to berth in South Australia and to relieve the situation at Port Stanvac so that the refinery there can restart production of fuel supplies for this State. What a graphic example that is of the point I am trying to make! Indeed, the situation applicable in the Melbourne ports during this year has been disastrous and, no doubt, has cost this country millions of dollars. In the long term, that means that the community bears the cost.

Mr McLellan also said that it was not unusual for a loading of 63 per cent to be applied to an Australian cargo, as opposed to a 10 per cent loading on cargo to the United States. These are cost pressures that we cannot afford to continue. We have to be able to provide our goods on international markets on a competitive base.

That means not only that the farmer has to be cost efficient and competitive (indeed, he is) but also that the method of distribution and transport to the markets has to be cost effective. We need to make sure that, where one sector of a market is efficient, it is not placed in jeopardy or significantly disadvantaged by the pressures inflicted by another sector, more particularly by industrial disputes in this country.

We need to plan positively to the turn of the century and beyond for the provision of cargo ships in Australian ports. The well-being of this State and, indeed, of this nation

depends on our export income and, as I have indicated, this applies more particularly in South Australia, where \$1 000 000 000 is derived from the export income of our agricultural products, or something like 60 per cent. With Australia's grain trade expected to increase to about 25 000 000 tonnes a year by the end of this decade, it is well to estimate what the likely repercussions on shipping needs are going to be.

The 1978-79 crop year was a record one for the Australian wheat industry. It was a year that saw record supplies, record exports and, indeed, record prices. Wheat was the premier export dollar earner for Australia. The 15 200 000 tonnes of wheat exported during that period necessitated the successful loading and dispatch of something like 530 vessels from Australian ports. It earned Australia the No. 2 spot among world wheat exporters, for the first time ahead of Canada. The question to be asked is whether Australia is capable of catering for the transport and handling of the increased quantities expected to be available for export, and what logistics will be needed to cater for those shipping operations. There is no doubt that improvements will be necessary to our ports and to loading, storage and transport facilities.

There needs to be, I believe, an urgent review of what will be the future requirements for the inland railway transport system of this country and that supplying the storage facilities of principal ports and the updating of facilities at ports to cater for ships and vessels of the size expected in the future.

I note that, in relation to the Budget items on Marine and Harbours, the line has, basically, been held in expenditure terms. However, I was heartened to note the comments of the Director-General of Marine and Harbours recently when he indicated that an assessment will be undertaken as to what the future requirements will be. I trust that such an assessment will incorporate a consultation with the Barley Board, the Wheat Board and those major exporting bodies that are vitally interested, of course, in the free flow of Australian produce overseas.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Not to overlook the facilities required to dispatch our meat both in carcass and live sheep form.

Mr OLSEN: The Minister refers to the export of live sheep. I noticed on a previous occasion that the member for Semaphore was critical of the fact that live sheep had been held in holding pens in what is a built-up area. I hasten to add that in the rural electorate of Rocky River we do not have difficulties where the community is singularly against the promotion of a new industry. We at Wallaroo would be pleased to see the expansion of the port facilities.

Mr Keneally: Do you live at Wallaroo?

Mr OLSEN: No, I do not, but I can assure the honourable member that the Mayor, council and people at Wallaroo who derive their incomes from the promotion of that port and increased services from that port are anxious to see expansion of the live sheep export trade through the port of Wallaroo—not only to safeguard the trade but because, as the Minister would well know, it was the port of Wallaroo from which this State was able to export live sheep when there were difficulties in the port of Adelaide. Therefore, because of the industrial record at Wallaroo, and because of the community attitude towards the provision of the service and facility, I would encourage the Government to give real consideration to transferring those facilities to that port.

With the principal ports such as Wallaroo, to which I have just referred, now being connected to the standard gauge line, the coupling of that port with the majority of the main wheat-growing centres of Australia would give the

capacity for long-term development to deep sea port status. There is no doubt that the grain trade in the 1980s, principally as a result of fuel prices, will expedite a change through to the end of the 1980s for vessels of 40 000 to 60 000 tonnes dead weight in size.

Because of marine fuels and operating costs, more efficient vessels will become fully operational towards the turn of the century. While most States have established investigating committees to determine what developments will be necessary in the years ahead in order to cater properly for larger vessels, I believe that it is essential that some of the restricted ports in South Australia be upgraded to enable them to handle vessels of at least 40 000 to 60 000 dead weight tonne capacity. Statistics reveal that between 1963 and 1980 there was a 700 per cent increase in the use of vessels between 40 000 and 60 000 dead weight tonne size, while there was only a 100 per cent increase in the 10 000 to 18 000 dead weight tonne size.

We have been used to exporting wheat in what may generally be termed handy-sized tonnage vessels in the 25 000 to 30 000 dead weight tonne size. It is conceivable that, towards the year 1985, more than 70 per cent of our grain that is exported to two of our major clients will be transported in vessels of about the 60 000 dead weight tonne size. If there is a rapid introduction of these new generation ships in the 40 000 to 60 000 dead weight tonne range, we as Australians must be prepared to meet the challenge, because failure to do so would place severely at risk one of the biggest export earners for this State and this country, and it would place us in a less competitive position in overseas markets.

The South Australian Department of Marine and Harbors is dredging channels by an extra metre, providing larger swinging basins to accommodate larger ships, and increasing the loading rate at several ports. I understand that there are plans to deepen the channel at Wallaroo. The swinging basin at Port Pirie will be dredged and there has been an upgrading of facilities for the loading rate of grain. I notice that there is an allocation of \$280 000 in the Budget for the upgrading of loading facilities at the port of Adelaide.

However, the smaller ports in this State will not be able to respond to the trend towards increasing sizes of grain vessels and, therefore, we must develop a long-term plan to assist in the requirements of larger grain vessels. It will be essential to develop a port in this State that has the capacity to take ships involved in the grain trade of the size which can be envisaged and to which I have referred towards the turn of this century. I have referred to vessels in the 80 000 dead weight tonne size, and it certainly appears at this stage that that will be the requirement by the turn of the century. There is no doubt that, to preserve and maintain that export earner, further development and improvements are necessary at most ports, in addition to the upgrading of the storage and transport facilities to meet dispatch requirements from those ports.

In determining a policy, we must give adequate consideration to the ports that have had minimum disruption. I have already referred to the port of Wallaroo and the role that it has played during the live sheep export dispute in recent years. A port with a good record should be seriously considered in regard to the development of a major deep sea port to serve the State and the major grain growing parts of the State near our borders. I am pleased that the department has placed wave monitoring units in the port and at points north of Wallaroo to check wave movements during summer and winter to gauge the suitability of the area for the development of a deep sea port.

Loading rates of between 2 000 and 2 500 tonnes per hour will be the minimum requirement by the end of this

decade, and the increase in port costs must be kept in check. We cannot allow an escalation in costs at ports, because of substandard facilities, to erode that competitiveness to which I have referred and which is all-important in the future protection of our grain trade. There is no doubt that the time is right to undertake detailed planning towards that end. Although it may be argued that a professional in-depth study might cost several hundred thousand dollars, when one looks at the protection of a trade worth \$1 000 000 000 to this State, in 1979-80 it is but a small insurance to pay for the protection of that vital industry to South Australia.

The Budget papers state that there will be a reduction of \$10 000 000 in capital funds for the capital works programme this year, basically as a result of the cut in real terms of the Commonwealth Government's allocation for capital works and tax sharing and an escalating wage and salary bill is placing very real constraints on the development of this State. In the 1980-81 financial year, for example, \$79 000 000 was allocated in the Budget for salary and wage increases in the public sector. The actual figure expended was \$92 000 000. When one considers that the 70 000-odd employees of the Government and its agencies in this State extracted something in excess of \$1 000 000 000 in salaries and wages for that year, or about 58 per cent, or thereabouts, of our outlay, one can easily recognise and understand that there is limited scope for the Government for expansion of the capital works programme. I think that that points up readily the need for us to be very careful over the next 12 months to maintain some basic—

Mr Slater: You're skating on thin ice.

Mr OLSEN: Not really, at all. Over the next 12 months we need to maintain adequate but not excessive wage increases throughout the public sector. I do not believe that it can be emphasised too strongly that continued and excessive wage increases will cost jobs and, whilst the Government can continue to do all it can to contain wages and salaries to realistic levels, that to which I referred earlier, namely, the reduction of \$10 000 000 in the capital works programme this year, is in effect costing jobs, because without the increase in the capital works programmes, without the expansion of the provision of services in the community, there is not the expansion in job opportunities in the building industries that are so vital to this State. However, what alternative did the Government have? The Government had little alternative. The only ray of sunlight that one can see in that regard concerns the expenditure of \$180 000 000 by the Electricity Trust during this financial year. That \$180 000 000 from the Electricity Trust and other agencies, coupled with the State Government's expenditure on the capital works programme, will indeed mean that there is an increase in real terms in the capital works programme over the next 12 months. We ought readily to understand that excessive and unwarranted salary and wage increases will cost the jobs of other people in our community. If there is one thing for which we all, as members of Parliament, ought to be striving at the moment it is a reduction in unemployment levels and an increase in the employment levels in this State. At least some success has been encountered by the State Government during its period in office since September 1979 in creating more jobs within the community.

Mr Slater: We've still got over—

Mr OLSEN: Two factors are to be taken into account when looking at employment and unemployment. It is all very well to point out clearly the high levels of unemployment, and no-one would condone that: no-one would suggest for one moment that we ought to turn a blind eye to the high levels of unemployment in this State. We all ought to be striving to do something about those high levels, to

reduce them and to make long-term effective jobs available to people in this State so that they have a meaningful living, so that they have some status and self pride in the jobs that can be offered for them, and so that the prospects for those jobs are long-term and not short-term, *ad hoc* band-aid schemes like SURS, RED and the like.

The other factor is how many people are actually employed: how many people are actually in the work force. When we look at that employment scene, we need to look at the two figures in parallel, because they tell a very real story. Indeed, as I said just a moment ago, this Government can draw some consolation from the fact that, in the first two years that it has been in office, it has seen an increase in the number of people actually in employment *versus* the period prior to our taking government of a reduction of 20 600 in the total number of people employed in the work force in South Australia. As I have said, it is essential to take those two figures in parallel when looking constructively at employment and unemployment in this State.

I want to touch on one or two other aspects of the Budget papers that are the subject of this debate, and I refer, first, to tourism. I was staggered, when undertaking a little survey, particularly as it relates to part of my electorate in Yorke Peninsula, at the enormous impact of tourism in that area. Surveys have indicated that in the 1979-80 year on Yorke Peninsula there were 457 000 visitors who had 2 000 000 visitor nights and spent \$21 000 000 in the course of that year on tourism in that area. If one equates that sum with job opportunities and full-time equivalents, one sees that about 1 000 people would be employed in terms of full-time equivalents on Yorke Peninsula as a direct result of tourist expenditure in that area. I do not believe that South Australians appreciate just how beneficial the tourist dollar can be within the economy and in providing jobs. The Government's increase of 27 per cent over the 1980-81 Budget for advertising and promotion by the South Australian Travel Centre—

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

Mr ABBOTT secured the adjournment of the debate.

ESSENTIAL SERVICES BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD (Minister of Water Resources): I move:

That the House do now adjourn

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): This evening I want to remind the House of something that seems to have fallen out of public view, yet it is a very important issue for people in a certain part of metropolitan Adelaide. I refer to the future of what are called the Samcor stock paddocks, that is, the 164 hectares of land at Gepps Cross, that the Government decided at the time of the restructuring of Samcor should be sold off as part of this restructuring process.

People who live in this area of metropolitan Adelaide are concerned about the amount of developed open space, in the sense of open space for recreation, being of an intense or lower intensity nature, that is available to them. It is somewhat of a paradox that the fringe areas of Adelaide often are, in the sense of usable open space, rather poorly served. I know this is so. In my electorate; there seems to

be a lot of open country, but most of it is not available for recreation purposes. Members on the other side of town have often commented on the same thing. In this we are in part voicing the concerns of our constituents.

It was therefore entirely predictable that people should voice their concern at the possibility that this large area of open space in the northern suburbs of metropolitan Adelaide should be developed for housing, commercial, or industrial purposes. I draw members' attention to a news report of 13 March 1981, which states:

The Conservative Council—

I am sure it means The Conservation Council; they were not referring to the Liberal Party—

has urged the retention of 164 ha of land at Gepps Cross as open space. The land was formerly used by the SA Meat Corporation. But its future has not been decided since the Government restructured the corporation in January.

Council President, Mr John Sibly, said it would be a pity if the Government did not show something of the initiative and foresight used by Colonel Light in planning Adelaide. "Let us take up the project as a major development of an outer-parkland system," he said. Light's planned parkland had attracted much public praise but expansion in suburban Adelaide had lacked his inspiration. Mr Sibly said there was a chance now to partially remedy the situation with provision of a major green space.

That is one voice from a very influential body of opinion in South Australia, The Conservation Council. I turn now to a document, which was almost certainly sent to every member of Parliament, from the National Council of Women of South Australia, Incorporated, which sets out a proposal to establish 'Light's Vision Park', as it was called, and to commemorate the vision of Colonel Light who laid out the City of Adelaide in a setting of fine parklands. This is a project for the forthcoming Jubilee 150 instigated by the National Council of Women, in conjunction with the Women's Committee, on the Samcor paddock land, and is dated April 1981.

It goes on to detail the fact that at a meeting on 9 April this year the council passed unanimously the resolution that this land should be kept as open space and the continuation of Colonel Light's vision of an outer green belt. It then details how this might happen. The council suggests that the South Australian Government hold the title to the land. It says that, in the first instance, the most appropriate measure might be to place the land under the State Planning Authority in accordance with present provisions for holding land for recreational, open space and regional park purpose. It is here referring to the concept of the major district open space.

Secondly, there is the declaration of the project as a Women's Jubilee 150 Project. Thirdly, target of \$1 000 000 is to be set for the development phase. Fourthly, there is to be a charge of \$10 per tree for inclusion in the Memory Garden.

Fifthly, specific groups within the community might adopt particular projects, sponsored by business and social and service clubs, with assistance in development of barbecue areas and so on. The council suggests there should be caretakers for the area, and that there would have to be provision for general maintenance and gardening work. It raised the possibility of inmates of Yatala gaol being involved in some of this work, and suggests in the immediate short term that these paddocks be well watered and fenced and leased for agistment until such time as the developmental phase could occur. I do not have time to go on with the rest of the suggestions. It is signed by Mrs G. S. Necia Mocatta, President of the National Council of Women.

Then there is a local group called 'Save the Samcor Paddocks Action Group' which, on 11 June sent to me, over the signature of its Secretary, Mrs Louise Altman, a copy of a submission sent to the Premier and Treasurer concerning the future land use of surplus Samcor stock paddocks at Gepps Cross. It pointed out the following:

The Save The Samcor Paddocks Action Group came into being on Tuesday, 3 March 1981 at a public meeting at Enfield High School. In attendance were 200 persons, including State Ministers, local politicians and local councillors. The meeting was called by an interim committee of four which organized itself following Government announcements on Samcor stock paddock development. The meeting constitutionally elected a committee of 10 persons.

That meeting was attended by two of my colleagues, the members for Playford and Florey. I have spoken to them about that meeting. They pointed out to me that the Ministers present, the Minister of Lands and the Minister of Agriculture, gave a commitment to local people that they would be consulted before anything happened. So far as I am aware, they have not been consulted and also, as far as I am aware, nothing has happened. We cannot argue that in any way these two Ministers are in breach of some sort of undertaking. On the other hand, everybody is very concerned about just what might happen, and they are looking for some sort of reassurance and indication that their submissions have been properly received and considered by the Government.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: They certainly have.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I am glad to have that assurance from the Minister. If he is able to induce some action from his colleagues, either the Minister of Environment and Planning or the Premier and Treasurer, to whom this submission was sent, good luck to him. He will have performed a service to the people of that area of metropolitan Adelaide. I did think for one moment that something had happened without consultation because, in the *Advertiser* of 29 August, we noted that a draft for public exhibition of the Salisbury stock paddocks (a supplementary development plan) was available for public perusal. However, on consulting a map, I found that that was not the same area to which these people are directing their attention and concern.

However, it would seem that this sort of proposition might well be the sort of proposition that the Government should be looking at in relation to the 164 hectares of land. It may be that a supplementary development plan is the appropriate way to treat the development of the area.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Do you think the whole area should be entirely open space?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: If at all possible, yes. It should be entirely open space and a mixture of recreational use, both intense and less intense.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: But you have to have facilities.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Indeed; that is what I mean by 'intense.' In our park lands there is a low level of recreation facilities, but you still have to have the occasional public toilet. That is some form of development. One submission talks about barbecue areas and so on. One would not set aside the possibility of rather more ambitious types of recreational projects. I take the opportunity to urge upon the Government, first, to make some sort of public announcement as to what it has in mind and, secondly, to take into account what these people, whom I am trying to represent in these remarks, also have in mind.

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): How many members of this Chamber believe that, for every pound of whole grain exported from this country, one frozen loaf of bread should also be exported? How many members of this Chamber really believe that, for every kilo of wool exported raw from this

country, we should export an additional kilo of wool already manufactured and turned into textiles?

How many members in this Chamber would believe and advocate that, for every hide that we export from this country as raw leather, untanned, we should also export the equivalent number of pairs of boots or other leather products? And yet, while most if not all members of this Chamber would say what a stupid proposition that was, what a ridiculous idea to advance, what an inane question that is to ask of any honourable member, nonetheless, that is the very same logic that is presently being applied by officers and members of the Meat and Allied Trades Industry Union when they insist that they should be entitled to have one slaughtered carcass exported for every live sheep sold.

It seems to me that neither they nor their supporters and sympathisers understand what marketing is all about. Push bikes are not iron ore and coal; push bikes are push bikes. No householder, no schoolchild, would shop for 400 lbs of coal and 100 lbs of iron ore with a view to taking it home and, in his own backyard furnace, converting it into steel components to build a push bike to ride to school, and yet that is the kind of logic involved if we follow the argument that those in the Meat and Allied Trades Industry Union are advocating for their own job protection.

I, along with every member on this side of the House at least, and on the other side, too, I am sure, feel sympathetic to anyone who loses his employment through redundancy, and I certainly sympathise with the people who have worked in abattoirs, but, like any other seasonal occupation to do with any cyclical product in an economy, there will be fluctuations in the demand, not only for the product out put from the abattoirs but also for the services of the labour provided in those abattoirs. This will be related not only to the demand but also to the supply, and the cyclical factors have shown a down-turn in the number of times human beings are required to slaughter for market beasts available for that purpose as meat for consumption on the Australian market and on the international market.

There can be no question that, whilst it is regrettable, everyone in that industry knew that the job they had was influenced by cyclical and seasonal factors, (and that has been advanced whenever that union has presented itself with a log of claims before the Arbitration Commission over the past 30 years) the fact that its members needed to be given additional remuneration for every hour they worked when the work was available because of its seasonal nature—the cyclical nature of the market and the supply and demand factors in that industry.

However, tonight I raise this point and focus the attention of the House on this matter for no reason other than the fact that I have recently been informed that this union is again planning to attempt, once again, to hold this country and the farmers and this country's customers to ransom, by mounting a campaign of the kind that we saw a few short years ago; only this time when farmers are so busy harvesting their cereal crops that they will be unable to assist in the dispatch of those poor beasts consigned and sent from the farms to the waterside for the purpose of being loaded.

If that kind of campaign is to be mounted in that way, I think it is despicable. It will not only cause those animals, in the event that we have anything like an ordinary summer, a great deal of suffering whilst they wait in hot rail or road trucks awaiting loading, but it will also cost the rural community an enormous amount in redirecting the stock, and in feeding the stock while the dispute is settled, but, what is more and worse, it will destroy the already tenuous reputation that Australia has as a reliable supplier of this kind of material to overseas markets which have demand for it.

Mr Hemmings: How can you talk about them as being poor unfortunate animals and then talk about them as being material?

Mr LEWIS: If they are held in unreasonably high temperatures awaiting loading for more than a day while the meatworkers decide whether they will permit them to be loaded, that is when I say that they are unfortunate. Then there are the increasing mortality rates and the higher cost burden which will have to be borne in the end by the producers; the farmers; some of the people whom I represent. Not only do I represent meatworkers who have been laid off at Murray Bridge abattoirs and elsewhere: I also represent farmers and, as I have said earlier, they have lost their jobs not because exports are being made of live animals but because of cyclical factors in the industry. The kinds of sheep that are bought and taken by our Middle-East customers are not sheep that in carcass form are saleable anywhere else in the world. What needs to be remembered is that, even if it were so, the demand is not for carcass meat in any greater quantities than we already supply. It is for live sheep and, if we do not supply that live sheep trade, some other country will.

Mr Hemmings: We are selling—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Napier should talk to his Whip about getting on the speakers' list.

Mr LEWIS: Indeed, it would be interesting to understand something of what he believes is happening and why, and whether he considers that the campaign that I have heard is being planned to be executed while farmers are harvesting is legitimate. I do not. We need to remember that five years ago, this country exported only 1 500 000 sheep. Last year, the figure was almost 5 500 000. That is the increase in demand for that commodity.

We are not exporting orange juice. We are not exporting motor cars to Japan. Where people want whole oranges, we export them. Where people want steel, we export steel. Where they want iron ore and coal, we sell those things. What is more, as I have said, if people want whole grain, we export that and sell it to them. Not one member opposite or anywhere else in this country has ever argued that we should sell, pound for pound, whole grain and frozen bread, yet that is the proposition put to use by the meatworkers.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: In the same period, our overall stock numbers went up in Australia and so did our slaughtering.

Mr LEWIS: I am reminded by the Minister that not only did overall stock numbers in the country increase during that period, but apparently slaughtering did also.

Mr Hemmings: A good bit of coaching there, Ted.

Mr LEWIS: It is a pity that members opposite did not consult and consider the information that the Minister's papers contain more often, as shown by the remarks that they have made tonight. My point has been that it is not reasonable, just or fair to contemplate such a campaign, and I call on the officers of that union to deny that what I have accused them of tonight will happen. What is more, the number of jobs lost over the years as a result of a change in technology such as is the case in this industry in no way needs to be reflected in the statistics relating to these circumstances.

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

Mr WHITTEN (Price): It is not my intention tonight to talk about the lower animals. I want to talk about the higher animals, people. On 19 August last, I was reading the *Advertiser* to see what the Federal Treasurer (Mr Howard) had done to Australia, and I saw an item that stated 'Boost to programme to help the hunt for jobs'. I thought

that that was very good and I was very pleased with it. I looked at the bottom of the report and saw, first, that Mr Howard said that funds, including \$24 000 000 more than in the previous financial year, would be given to help young unemployed get prior work experience and practical job skills. Hidden away at the bottom of the article is a paragraph which states:

Because of the increases in these programmes, the Government will end the Community Youth Support Scheme on 31 October 1981. This will allow available funds to be concentrated on programmes more attuned to labour market conditions.

That disgusted me. It showed me what the Liberals think of people. The Liberals have a lot more thought for sheep than they have for people. I was then bolstered a little in my thoughts when the Federal member for Hindmarsh advised me that Mr Neil Brown, Q.C., M.H.R., Minister in charge of the CYS Scheme, was still sending out letters saying that we were not publicising the CYS Scheme enough. On 25 August, six days after the Budget, John Scott, member for Hindmarsh, was reported as saying:

Two days after the Budget had ended CYSS the Federal Minister for Employment and Youth Affairs, Mr Brown, had sent letters and large posters to all Federal MPs urging them to promote various training programmes, including CYSS.

'This same Minister in June assured CYSS project officers and local committees that CYSS was not in danger,' he said.

They do not quite know what they are doing themselves. Then, on the following Tuesday, my hopes were buoyed again, because the State Minister of Industrial Affairs made a statement about the CYS Scheme. I was quite pleased, because I thought that all those thousands of young unemployed out there getting some employment under the CYS Scheme were getting some hope again, because he said:

The State Government will continue to investigate what action it can take to minimise the undesirable effects of the abolition of CYSS.

Later, in the final paragraph of that statement, the Minister said:

The Government believes that it is especially important that funds be made available to meet the needs of youth living outside of the inner metropolitan area. The reality is that there are a large number of young unemployed people within our community who need assistance and encouragement in their search for employment and in the maintenance and development of skills which will enhance their employability. Community support in this area is vital. The State Government will maintain its commitment to assist in this area.

That is the same Minister who condemned what was happening here about five and a half years ago. As soon as the Liberal Party came to Government it eliminated the SURS scheme. However, there the Minister was saying he would endeavour to help. I attended last night a meeting at the Woodville Town Hall, which was attended by about 150 people, who filled the hall to overflowing. Several members of Parliament were in attendance.

Mr Hemmings: Any Liberals?

Mr WHITTEN: No, there were no Liberals there.

Mr Lewis: None of them were told about it.

Mr WHITTEN: Yes they were, because on the wall for all to see were posted all the replies from Liberal members of Parliament. Those letters stated, 'I will be there', or 'I will support you', or 'We will do what we can'. I thought it was quite good when I walked into the hall and that there were going to be many people present who were interested in the young people of the State and who were endeavouring to keep the CYS Scheme operating. However, no Liberals turned up. Some sent apologies for not coming after saying they would come. My colleague the member for Spence was there. An Independent member was also there; he showed some interest.

The superintendent of police in charge of the Port Adelaide region attended the meeting and stated that he was disgusted that the scheme was to be knocked off, because it had done such a lot of good for the young people of the district; it had kept them off the streets and had given them the incentive to do some work. I want to refer to two schemes: one is known as Comskill and the other is 'The Garage'. Comskill is a system whereby young, unemployed females are able to gain typing skills and to retain their skills so that they can get some sort of work. Provision is made at Woodville for 50 young females to obtain some training each week. From February to September this year, 50 young girls obtained full-time employment and 50 obtained part-time employment because of the training they received at Woodville. There is a waiting list and 60 per cent of those who go through the course obtain either full-time or part-time employment. This is the sort of scheme that is being knocked off.

I was a little encouraged after I saw the report of the meeting of State Ministers of Labor in Darwin on Friday. They unanimously agreed to pressure the Federal Government to retain the CYS scheme in its present form or, failing that, to provide finance to each of the States to enable the CYS scheme to be funded in a like manner. The

member for Henley Beach sent an apology to the meeting last night; at least he acknowledged it and apologised for his non-attendance. I am sure that, if he had attended, he would have learnt what is happening in the Woodville council area, part of which is in his district. I was disappointed that the honourable member did not attend the meeting.

I do not have a great deal of time left and I want to talk about the costs of the Woodville Comskill. A first project officer works 21 hours a week at a cost of \$8 520 per year for her salary; second and third project officers each work 24 hours a week at a cost of \$9 050; a cleaner receives \$800 a year and hourly-paid instructors receive \$2 000, making a total of \$36 420. That is the sort of money that the lousy Federal Government is endeavouring to save. If it could only see the benefit that has come about because of Comskill at Woodville, I am sure it would not knock off that scheme. I hope that the State Minister of Industrial Affairs will be able to find the money to keep Comskill going at Woodville, because it is doing such a good job.

Motion carried.

At 9.54 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 23 September at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 22 September 1981

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

MINISTERS' CARS

6. Mr MILLHOUSE (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What economies, if any, are now proposed by the Government in the use of Ministerial motor cars by—

- (a) the Premier;
 - (b) each Minister;
 - (c) the Speaker;
 - (d) the President;
 - (e) the Leader of the Opposition in the House of Assembly;
 - (f) the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in the House of Assembly;
 - (g) the Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council;
 - (h) the Chairman of Committees in the House of Assembly;
 - (i) the Chairman of the Public Works Committee; and
 - (j) the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee,
- and what are the expected savings in the present financial year and the rest of the financial year, respectively?

2. Are any further economies planned and, if so, what are they and when are they to be put into effect?

3. If no economies in the use of Ministerial motor cars are planned, why not?

4. What is now the expected total cost of these Ministerial motor cars to the Government in the present financial year and how is it made up?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. The Government will continue to reduce the number of eight-cylinder vehicles in the Ministerial fleet by replacement with six-cylinder vehicles. The replacement of eight-cylinder with six-cylinder vehicles will save between \$3 500-\$5 500 per vehicle on the cost of replacement with similar eight-cylinder vehicles.

2. and 3. Action has been taken to reduce chauffeur overtime by the Government's direction that the use of Ministerial cars is not to extend beyond 8.00 p.m., when a House of Parliament is sitting beyond 8.00 p.m., except in the case of the Premier, Deputy Premier or a country Minister returning directly to his home. The Government will consider and evaluate further means of achieving economies in the use of Ministerial vehicles as new technology and more efficient vehicles become available.

4. \$864 000 comprising:

	\$
Salaries and administration	592 000
Operating expenses	167 000
Net cost of replacement vehicles	105 000

RECLAIMED WATER

48. Mr MILLHOUSE (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. Is reclaimed water supplied by the Engineering and Water Supply Department and, if so—

- (a) how much;
- (b) to whom;
- (c) when; and
- (d) for what uses?

2. Is it proposed to supply greater quantities of such water and, if so—

- (a) where;
- (b) when; and
- (c) at what cost compared with the supply of other water,

and, if not, why not?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes. Effluent is supplied to various consumers from the Bolivar, Glenelg, Christies Beach and Port Augusta West Sewage Treatment Works.

- (a) See schedule attached.
- (b) See schedule attached.
- (c) On a continuing basis.
- (d) See schedule attached.

2. The provision of effluent supplies is considered by the Engineering and Water Supply Department on application to it from an interested party.

- (a) Not applicable.
- (b) Not applicable.
- (c) At a cost to be determined according to the requirements and location of the applicant's property.

EFFLUENT UTILISATION SUMMARY

Consumer	Annual Volume Allocated By Licence, kL	Usage as of March 1981
Bolivar Sewage Treatment Works—		
Angle Vale Irrigation	1 000 000	Grape vines
Centofanti, J. J.	180 000	Lucerne, onions, carrots
Copanpra Pastoral Co.	4 092 000	Lucerne, pasture, maize, oats
Corporation of Salisbury	546 000	Landscape irrigation
O'Connor Investments	500 000	Potatoes, sunflower
Sheedy Bros, P. & B.	310 000	Pasture, field peas, sunflower, millet
Solomon, S.	80 000	Lucerne
Tassone, N. & M.	14 000	Cereal crop, tomatoes
Trimboli, G. & D.	240 000	Cereal, onions, potatoes
Xenophou, T.	930 000	Lucerne, olives, potatoes, field peas and maize
Total	7 892 000	

EFFLUENT UTILISATION SUMMARY

Consumer	Annual Volume Allocated By Licence, kL	Usage as of March 1981
Glenelg Sewage Treatment Works—		
Corporation of Glenelg	227 000	Landscape irrigation
Glenelg Baseball Club	82 000	Landscape irrigation
West Beach Trust	3 400 000	Landscape irrigation
Glenelg Golf Club	455 000	Landscape irrigation
Kooyong Golf Club	455 000	Landscape irrigation
Lockleys School	36 000	Landscape irrigation
Lockleys Oval	70 000	Landscape irrigation
Adelaide Airport	3 007 000	Landscape irrigation
Total	7 732 000	
Christies Beach Sewage Treatment Works—		
O'Sullivan Beach Sports and Social Centre ..	182 500	Landscape irrigation
Corporation of Noarlunga	182 500	Landscape irrigation
Port Augusta West Sewage Treatment Works—		
Port Augusta Golf Club	260 975	Landscape irrigation

TEACHERS

110. **Mr TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Has the Minister recently received correspondence from a Mr M. Hughes of Balhannah in relation to Question on Notice No. 758 from December 1980 and, if so, does the Minister stand by his statement that 'Standard Education Department procedure provides that each year of National Service training counts as one year of country service,' and will he honour that commitment in the 'Equitable Service Scheme: Transfer Arrangements for Teachers in 1982' and, if not, why not?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Yes, I have received a letter from Mr Hughes of Balhannah. It is intended to honour the previous arrangement in 1982. That is, in determining the placement of teachers required to transfer, national servicemen will accrue transfer points on the basis of three transfer points per year of overseas service and two transfer points per year of service in Australia. National Service will not count in lieu of country service.

MURRAY RIVER SALINITY

122. **Mr KENEALLY** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. What has been the average EC salinity count of water flowing into the Murray River via the Menindee Lakes for each of the last 10 years?

2. In what years has this inflow worsened Murray River water?

3. In what years has this inflow improved Murray River water?

4. What are the major causes of high salinities in Darling River water?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. 2. and 3. In the past 10 years there have been nine periods during which water was released from the Menindee Lakes in sufficient quantities that the Darling River contributed a significant flow to the Murray River. Of these, six periods were releases made by the New South Wales Water Resources Commission in anticipation of floods. Salinity records are not available for some of these periods, but as these releases are generally during high flow times it can be expected that the salinities will be low, in the order of 250 EC to 300 EC units. Generally, these would improve Murray River salinities.

The remaining three periods were releases made at the request of the Murray River Commission. During these periods the average salinities of water entering the Murray from the Darling were 530 EC units (1977), 623 EC units (1979), and 764 EC units (1980). In only one of these periods (1977) did the Darling River improve the quality of the Murray River.

4. The salinity of water entering the Murray River via the Darling River and which is released from Menindee Lakes is governed in the first instance by the salinity of water held in Menindee Lakes. The Menindee Lakes are in a high evaporation region and consequently the salinity of water stored in the Lakes is concentrated over a period of time. Salinity continues to increase until good quality inflows of large magnitude are received. The longer the duration between such freshening inflows the greater the increase in salinity of the stored water.

Additionally, irrigation along the Darling River between the Menindee Lakes and the Murray River, particularly in the downstream sections, has the potential for returning saline drainage to the river thus increasing the total salt load in the river.

124. **Mr KENEALLY** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. In view of the discrepancy that exists between the Maunsell Report, which states on page 27 'The Murrumbidgee flow has been recognised as generally improving Murray salinities at Euston by a negative listing in Table 8' and the South Australian Government *Salinity File*, Bulletin 4, July 1981, Table 6.4 which shows the Murrumbidgee River as seriously worsening the quality of the Murray River, was the Maunsell Report wrong and, if so, how was it wrong and, if not, is the *Salinity File* misleading and, if it is not, how can the discrepancy be explained?

2. If the Murrumbidgee River worsens the quality of Murray River water, why have no specific salt mitigation works been recommended for that river?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. The table in the Maunsell Report, which intended to represent existing salt inflows, indicated a negative salt load, that is taking salt out of the Murray River. Clearly, this is not the case. Based on data used during the derivation of that report, the Murrumbidgee River was shown to contribute 2 100 tonnes of salt per month.

The revised table does not show the Murrumbidgee River as seriously worsening the quality of the Murray River. It indicates neither an improvement nor a worsening of the situation as it merely depicts the existing salt load.

In this regard it is imperative to appreciate the difference between salt load and salinity concentration.

2. See 1.

DARLING RIVER SALINITY

125. **Mr KENEALLY** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. In the period July 1980-January 1981 when 39 per cent of salt entering South Australia came from the Darling River (R.M.C. figures), what percentage of water entering South Australia came from the Darling?

2. In January 1981, when 64 per cent of salt entering South Australia is stated as coming from the Darling River, how much of the water came from that source?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. 18 per cent.

2. 44 per cent.

MURRAY RIVER

126. **Mr KENEALLY** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources: Does the Minister still oppose:

(a) calling for the urgent establishment of a national authority to control the Murray River and its tributaries;

(b) an immediate extension of the powers of the R.M.C. to include controlling water quality; and

(c) calling on the Federal Government to immediately fund salinity control proposals recommended by the Maunsell Report,

and, if so, why?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

(a) Never opposed—refer to the 'Permanent Solution to the River Murray Salinity Problem'.

(b) As for (a).

(c) As for (a).

TRAVEL CONCESSIONS

133. **Mr MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Why will not the Government give war widows concessions to travel on public transport?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The South Australian Government offers the most generous concessions to pensioners for travel on public transport of all the States. These include free travel between 9 a.m. and 3 p.m. on weekdays. Pensioner concessions represent a considerable charge against State revenues and, at the present time, the Government is unable to extend these concessions to other groups without a means test.

WATER SUPPLY

135. **Mr MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. Why will not the Government give a water supply to the property of Mr G. J. Mundy at 10 Suffolk Road, Aldgate?

2. How close to this property is the nearest water main?

3. Will the Government reconsider its refusal and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

4. When was application first made for a water supply for this property and why was it not granted then?

5. Did the Minister write to Mrs M. J. Mundy on 27 March 1980 saying, in part, 'Until the Government has had an opportunity to review the present policy on the extension of water mains and indirect services into catchment areas,

I am not prepared to consider your case in isolation by granting approval for the connection of a water supply, and, if so, has that policy yet been reviewed and, if so, with what result and, if not, why not and when does the Minister expect that it will be reviewed?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. Mr Mundy's situation does not comply with the conditions under which water supplies will be provided in the metropolitan watershed area.

2. 75 metres.

3. This matter has already been reconsidered. The letter to Mrs Mundy of 27 March 1980 is the result of that reconsideration.

4. October 1970—See 1. above.

5. Yes. The review of the watershed policy has not yet been completed. As it is a complex and delicate issue which involves the health aspects of Adelaide's water supply, of necessity thorough investigation of the ramifications of any decision is required.

ROAD SAFETY CENTRE

136. **Mr MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What percentage of the capacity for use of the Road Safety Instruction Centre has been used in each year since its opening?

2. What has it cost to run in each such year and how has such cost been made up?

3. Is the Government satisfied with the level of use being made of the centre and, if not—

(a) when did it become dissatisfied and why;

(b) what action, if any, has it taken or does it propose, and when, to increase its use; and

(c) is it considering closing down the centre and, if so, why?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. The capacity for use of the Road Safety Instruction Centre is governed by the number of field officers employed. To this extent maximum capacity has been maintained since the commencement of operations at the centre.

2.

Years	Salaries and Wages	Administrative Costs (\$)	Purchase of Vehicles	Maintenance of grounds	Total
1971-72	41 444	11 990	2 003	—	55 437
1972-73	68 085	15 962	—	19 500	103 547
1973-74	99 373	22 706	36 019	22 499	174 597
1974-75	160 953	24 353	13 524	22 499	221 329
1975-76	200 000	28 000	3 490	24 875	256 365
1976-77	226 921	66 947	32 703	24 527	351 098
1977-78	298 815	89 162	17 565	25 058	430 100
1978-79	311 593	70 238	40 204	35 960	457 995
1979-80	329 870	68 507	15 997	32 979	447 353

3. The Government is satisfied with the level of use being made of the centre.

(a) Not applicable.

(b) Not applicable.

(c) No.

FOOTBALL PARK

138. **Mr TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Does the Minister, either in his portfolio of Transport or that of Recreation and Sport, have any proposal to alleviate the chaos involved for vehicles attempting to exit from the car parks after games at Football Park?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The control of parking and vehicle movements within the car park at Football Park is the responsibility of the S.A.N.F.L. Police control is provided to assist traffic after it has left Football Park.

MUNNO PARA SCHOOL

140. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs: Has the Minister received a letter dated 14 July 1981, from the Secretary of the Munno Para School Council and, if so, in the light of the building requirements of the school in addition to the proposed school/community hall, will the Minister accede to the council's request in that letter to attend a public meeting at the school to discuss the whole question and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I have received correspondence from the Secretary of the Munno Para School Council dated 25 June and 23 July 1981. No letter dated 14 July has been received. The school/community hall is to proceed immediately at an estimated total cost of \$250 000. However, the Government has decided to delay the solid construction stage of all existing holding schools for at least three years. In the circumstances, I do not believe that there is any purpose in a further public meeting.

RESERVOIRS

141. **Mr MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. When did the Government receive the Report *Recreational Use of Reservoir Reserves*?

2. What consideration, if any, has it given to the report and what action, if any—

(a) has it already taken; and

(b) does it propose to take and when, as a result of the recommendations in the report?

3. Why will not the Government make the report public?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. March 1981.

2. The Government has considered the report concerning recreational use of reservoirs, but does not intend to proceed with the proposals at this stage.

3. The Government will consider making the report on recreational use of reservoirs available if and when it is decided to implement the proposals contained therein.