

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 31 August 1982

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

## SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

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

## PETITION: INTEREST RATES

A petition signed by 1 302 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge all politicians to unite nationally to do all within their power to reduce interest rates across the board was presented by Mr Lynn Arnold.

Petition received.

## QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the following answers to questions, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Questions on the Notice Paper Nos 19, 28, 60, 71, 76, 91, 101, 121, 123, 124, 126, 127, 129, 130, 137, 140, 147, 149, 151, 153, 156, 161, 164, 165 and 167.

## FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE

In reply to **Mrs SOUTHCOTT** (22 July).

The **Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON**: There are several compounding problems which cause delays in answering incoming telephone calls on the Flinders Medical Centre switchboard and they are as follows:

1. Intermittent technical faults result in incoming calls not being registered on the consoles and switchboard staff have no way of knowing that calls are waiting to be answered. The Flinders Medical Centre leases the switchboard from Telecom Australia and Telecom Australia is continually advised of technical problems as they occur. To date, its technicians have been unable to rectify these faults.

2. Overload of the telephone system during periods of peak demands, particularly when calls to consulting clinics bank up at the switchboard.

This problem is caused by the very heavy load on outpatients which involves a number of extended calls, often from patients who are not sure of which clinic they wish to attend, whether they have attended the Medical Centre previously, etc. The Medical Centre is taking urgent steps to overcome these difficulties by the computerisation of the patient master index.

3. The radio paging (beeper) service is operated by the switchboard staff. If there is a high demand for this service, the additional workload may result in delays in answering and/or extending incoming calls.

A voice synthesized paging system is available and installed in other Australian and overseas hospitals. The cost of introducing a voice synthesized paging system to replace the existing system is under consideration. It is anticipated that a proposal to the South Australian Health Commission for additional funds will be completed shortly. The introduction of such a system would reduce the workload on the switchboard and the switchboard staff.

Recently the Flinders Medical Centre held discussions with representatives from Telecom Australia as part of a feasibility study to replace the existing switchboard, which, although it has only been installed for approximately eight years, is now technically obsolete when compared with the more sophisticated and efficient equipment which is now available. A submission will be made to the South Australian Health Commission shortly detailing the costs and benefits of replacing the existing switchboard with a suitable alternative. Part of the feasibility study will include the identification of any savings in reducing salary expenditure which could result from a more technically efficient system and which would overcome the current complaints from callers to the medical centre.

## PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (Hon. D. O. Tonkin)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

1. South Australian Superannuation Board—Report, 1980-81.

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

*Pursuant to Statute—*

1. Electricity Trust of South Australia—Report, 1981-82.

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

*Pursuant to Statute—*

1. Motor Fuel Distribution Act, 1973-1981—Regulations—Sale of Motor Fuel at Racing Circuits.

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

*Pursuant to Statute—*

1. City of Mount Gambier—By-law No. 7—Traffic.

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

*Pursuant to Statute—*

1. Road Traffic Act, 1961-1982—Regulations—Traffic Prohibition—Noarlunga.

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

*Pursuant to Statute—*

1. Crown Lands Act, 1929-1980—Section 5 (f)—Statement of Land Resumed—Various (67).

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT:  
NATURAL GAS

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

Leave granted.

The **Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY**: The annual report of ETSA, which I have just tabled, makes reference to the situation with regard to supplies of natural gas to South Australia after 1987. It is, as honourable members would know, a matter of concern to the trust, the South Australian Gas Company and, of course, the Government, that the State's entitlement to natural gas from the Cooper Basin expires at the end of 1987 while the present contractual arrangements with A.G.L. expire at the end of 2006. Meanwhile, proven and probable reserves of natural gas in the Cooper Basin are insufficient to meet A.G.L.'s contracted entitlement, let alone South Australia's requirements after 1987.

It is against this background that I inform the House that the Government is taking positive steps to resolve this situation. The most significant of these is negotiation with A.G.L. regarding the sharing of existing and future reserves in the Cooper Basin.

The Government has also taken part, in conjunction with A.G.L., in discussions with the Amadeus Basin producers and the Northern Territory Government regarding the possibility of obtaining natural gas supplies from the Northern Territory in the event that sufficient economic reserves are delineated by current exploration programmes. It would be premature to speculate on the outcome of that exploration programme or the commercial negotiations that would follow in the event that exploration was successful.

In addition to these steps, the Energy Division of my department is reviewing other options available to deal with the situation. ETSA itself, as indicated in its annual report, is examining ways in which it can reduce its dependence on natural gas. The importance of the matters referred to in ETSA's annual report is well recognised by the Government and it is pursuing solutions to them with vigour. In the event of any significant developments, I will ensure that Parliament and the community are fully informed.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: NORTHERN PASTORAL LANDS

**The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD (Minister of Lands):** I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD:** Recently a 10-day inspection tour of the Northern pastoral lands was undertaken by the Assistant Director-General of Lands, the Chairman, Pastoral Board, and the Director, Administration and Finance, of the Department of Lands. As a result of that inspection, I am in a position to refute the headline in the morning press of 28 August 1982, which states 'Overstocking hits big outback area'. I have also called for a detailed report on the allegations made against the Pastoral Board from the Director-General of Lands, Mr Taeuber.

The present position is that pastoral sheep numbers inside the dog fence have been subject to steady off-shears reduction and drought stress disposals over the past 12 months. As a typical example, it should be noted that on 26 August for instance, some 30 000 sheep were offered at Peterborough market, and sheep disposals such as this from marginal and pastoral areas have been occurring over the past year.

Outside the dog fence, cattle herd numbers are currently substantially less than half of normal. This situation is a consequence of lessees' compliance with national herd control programmes to eradicate bovine tuberculosis and brucellosis, which has also caused massive sales and herd reductions over the past one to two years. The headline and the following article also imply that overstocking and degradation are rife over almost the whole of the State's arid zone lands.

The State's arid lands total approximately 800 000 square kilometres. Land degradation is known to exist, and to have existed for up to 70 years over pastoral leases totalling approximately 5 000 square kilometres in area, that is, less than 1 per cent of the State's arid outback, and approximately 1 per cent of occupied pastoral lands. In the context of the present position, therefore, the headline is grossly misleading, factually untrue, and mischievously irresponsible.

Since coming to office, the Government has taken a number of initiatives in relation to the management of South Australia's pastoral lands. It called for a review of the administration of these lands by appointing a committee on 5 November 1980.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The level of audible conversation is far too high. The Minister of Water Resources.

**The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD:** Cabinet received that report in June 1981 and then sought public comment. Public comment was received by Cabinet during September 1981 and on 26 October 1981 Cabinet approved the drafting of a

range of amendments to the Pastoral Act which were introduced to the House of Assembly on 2 March 1982. The Government's efforts were negated by opposing interests and forces in the Legislative Council on 18 June 1982.

The present Government has approved the appointment of two professional rangeland technicians to the pastoral board field staff, and overall the Pastoral Board staff has been increased from eight officers to 12 full-time field and office staff. In September 1981 an Assistant Director-General of Lands was appointed with Masters qualifications in agricultural science and in planning, which complement the existing practical skills within the Pastoral Board.

These initiatives by the present Government are the first attempt by any Government in over 80 years to recognise and respond to the need to provide resources to adequately monitor and manage the use of the State's arid land resources.

Financial expenditure relating to the Pastoral Board's activities for the 1982-83 financial year, including salaries and contingencies, is expected to be in excess of \$300 000.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: EMERGENCY SERVICES

**The Hon. J. W. OLSEN (Chief Secretary):** I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J. W. OLSEN:** Following an incident in mid-June of this year which resulted in considerable interest being aroused in the roles of the various emergency services operating in our community, I instructed the Acting Police Commissioner, Mr Hunt, and the Chief Officer of the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service, Mr Bruce, to undertake an immediate investigation of their individual services' roles and capabilities with a view to rationalising existing accident rescue resources.

A series of meetings between Mr Hunt and Mr Bruce followed, and I am now pleased to inform the House that agreement has been reached in key areas relating to the co-ordination of emergency service response and operations at non-fire related emergencies between police and fire service operations within a nominal 40 kilometre radius of the city. This will mean the best possible rescue service is available to the public.

Problems presented by joint operations in rural areas must be addressed separately, and these will require further consideration by all parties concerned. There is no doubt that the result of these investigations into joint operations will be a more efficient and cost effective service to the public. The proposed operation plan is an extension of existing procedures and I am advised that it poses no difficulties in its effective implementation.

The plan being adopted will require immediate notification by either service to the other. The fire service will respond to all incidents with the appropriate unit containing fire-fighting and basic rescue equipment, and will together with police provide on-site assessment to ascertain what extra units, such as the Police Special Rescue Units, are required. It is intended that the first service on the scene will have the primary rescue role, and that additional units attending will adopt supporting roles.

However, I must stress that police officers still have the overall responsibility for public safety and resource co-ordination, and the police should still be the primary department to which initial notification of an incident is given by the public. Once services are on the scene, there is an obligation for them to provide an immediate assessment of the situation and immediately notify police communications and the fire service communications of a 'word back' situation assessment.

I believe that this initiative will be of immense benefit to the community. I envisage the joint operational procedures which will be adopted as being vital in catastrophes such as aircraft and rail smashes, chemical and fuel spillages, people being trapped in lifts, buildings or machinery, gas leakages, collapsed buildings, vehicle accidents, flood, and other extraordinary situations which require rapid, professional action on the part of all emergency services to minimise the risk of personal injury and damage to property.

In order to maximise the benefits of this new era of inter-service co-operation, we will be embarking on joint training sessions, arranging joint service public displays when appropriate, and instituting regular first-aid training sessions for all personnel involved in that field. In addition, a direct dedicated telephone link will be installed between the Police Communications Section and the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service headquarters. The personnel of both services will be immediately notified of this plan by a service directive, and the existing resources currently held by each service have been detailed to facilitate logistic support.

I am pleased that this Government was able to instigate such prompt action in such a sensitive area, and I believe that a new era of community protection and security is being heralded in as a direct result of the excellent co-operation which was obvious between the two services in nurturing the proposal from concept to completion. The mutual aid plan will begin operating at 8.00 a.m. on Friday 10 September.

## QUESTION TIME

### TAX AVOIDANCE

**Mr BANNON:** Does the Premier agree with the strong words used yesterday in Adelaide by his Federal colleague the Prime Minister on the subject of tax avoidance, and will he now reconsider his non-committal response to my suggestion that South Australia at once institute its own full-scale inquiry into 'bottom of the harbor' and similar schemes of tax avoidance? Yesterday Mr Fraser was reported as saying:

Any Liberals involved in tax avoidance should leave the Party. I don't know if anyone in the Liberal Party has been adopting or pursuing certain techniques or approaches in relation to tax avoidance, but if they have, I would like to see them leave the Liberal Party before they get caught by our special prosecutor. I think these high-priced lawyers and accountants who have devised and promoted tax avoidance schemes do much more damage to this world than a thousand Gallaghers or a thousand Builders Labourers' Federations.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** At the outset, I believe that the comments made by the Prime Minister are entirely right and they are echoed by me, and I would welcome a statement from the Leader of the Opposition as to members of his own Party who might also be involved. I notice that the Leader was very silent in that regard. I am not too sure whether the Painters and Dockers Union is affiliated with the Australian Labor Party in South Australia, but I would have thought that his comments could apply equally as well to those people.

**The Hon. D. J. Hopgood:** We're all on group certificates here.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The honourable member said it. As far as the question of a non-committal stance is concerned, I realise that the Leader of the Opposition is trying to beat up this issue in some way. He has been doing it to the expressed surprise of most people in the community yesterday. There has been nothing non-committal about the stance that has been adopted by this Government and I

would repeat, for the honourable gentleman's benefit, that we have, as I told him some weeks ago, agreed to co-operate fully with any investigation which is to be conducted by the Federal Government into tax avoidance in South Australia. There is also to be a meeting of Treasurers, together with the Commissioner of Corporate Affairs and the State Taxation Commissioner, or their counterparts, in the near future, and I have agreed with great pleasure to participate in that meeting.

If the Leader is not grandstanding for political purposes, all I can say is that he is incredibly naive. If the Leader really believes that a State Government inquiry specifically into tax evasion can achieve any of the things that he suggests (that is, that it can establish what is happening, if anything is happening, without any specific leads at all), again, all I can say is that he is incredibly naive.

It is important that we understand that the question of tax evasion is basically a Commonwealth Taxation Office matter and, as such, it is the responsibility of the Federal Government. If the Leader has any information on which to base this claim, I suggest that, instead of playing politics, he should do what his duty requires and notify officers of the Commonwealth Taxation Division in South Australia to institute an appropriate inquiry into any facts that he can put forward. However, the Leader and his Deputy are not too bright at doing other than making allegations: they do not follow them up terribly well with concrete facts, and that is what is necessary.

I believe that the Leader has forgotten that the McCabe inquiry in Victoria was established in 1978 not to consider tax evasion: it was established (I may say by a former Attorney-General of the Liberal Government at the time) to consider breaches of what was then the Companies Act, which has since been superseded. Those investigations into the operations of the Companies Act threw up some instances of what have now been called bottom-of-the-harbor tax evasion schemes. That Act has since been changed, and much more stringent provisions are now involved. It seems to me that it is really not serving any good purpose at all for the Leader to demand that a special State inquiry be conducted into matters which are properly the province of the Federal Government and which are, in fact, about to be investigated most stringently in any case.

I realise that the Leader does not have much else to do. I believe that at the weekend or perhaps yesterday he said that the Government was not serious about giving the Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal extra power to consider the need for restraint. I believe that the Leader called that proposal grandstanding and stated that we were not fair dinkum, but I hope that he has taken note of the notice of motion that has been given in this Chamber today. Frankly, the Leader's efforts do not impress me one little bit, and I suspect that they are impressing the electorate of South Australia even less.

### HOUSING

**Mr GLAZBROOK:** Does the Premier believe that there is adequate public awareness of his Government's policies on housing and interest rate relief? The Government has taken a number of initiatives to provide assistance to people who are feeling the pressure of rising interest rates. Since many people will be interested in knowing whether they are eligible, I wonder whether the Government is planning to take any special steps to ensure that the public really knows what help is available. It is noted that the Leader of the Opposition has been making claims about alleged Government inaction in this field and it has been said that this

misinformation may be causing confusion in the minds of members of the public.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I am most grateful to the honourable member for his question, because I know of his great concern about the problems that are facing people in his district and in other districts who are trying to buy their own home and are finding that interest rates are an enormous burden or who are having difficulty in meeting increasing rental costs. I thank the honourable member for his question and I understand the concern that he shows, which is not expressed by members opposite, judging from their reaction.

The Leader of the Opposition has indulged in quite disgraceful behaviour in this matter, which is one of great concern to me and to the community. I point out that help is available to people who are in great difficulty. Having seen the statements of the Leader of the Opposition as reported by the media (and I am amazed at the naivety of certain columnists in the weekend press), I find them absolutely disgraceful. Help is available, and it is being made available now.

My repeated statements, which have answered the Leader's repeated misrepresentation of the facts, do not seem to stop him from carrying on. He should, I believe, properly exercise some responsible attitude to the position that he holds. Apparently, he aspires to higher office but, if he does not show any better sense of responsibility than this, I do not think he will ever make it.

He has played on the fears of people in the community by telling them that no help is available to them when they are having difficulty with their interest or rental payments. That is untrue and it is totally disgraceful conduct. In his attempts (and they are frenzied attempts at times) to knock this Government, he acts as though he almost does not want people to know what help is available.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** If, in fact, he does not want people to know that help is available (it is considerable help), I do not believe that he is worthy to lead the Party that he does lead, because I would have thought that everyone in the community and members on both sides of this Chamber would be concerned to ensure that those people who are having trouble with interest and rental payments are treated with compassion and concern and given accurate information.

I remind the Leader of what we are doing at present. This is the first State to implement the home loan and rental assistance scheme, jointly funded with the Commonwealth Government. We responded as quickly as possible and, indeed, that scheme is now under way. The Commonwealth's share of the money will not be available until November, but that does not stop the scheme from going ahead, because we are using State funds to make sure that it goes on from this time.

We are continuing our own mortgage crisis relief scheme. The State Bank is continuing to provide some 55 home loans per week, with interest rates for concessional loans starting at a level of 5.75 per cent. The Housing Trust is paying record sums in the capital spent. It will reach \$126 500 000 in 1982-83, and this is the equivalent of 3 150 dwellings, which is far more than the 1 815 dwellings last year.

We have pushed the Commonwealth very hard for taxation relief. That has been given and home buyers will benefit after 1 November because of the concessions and rebates that will be given now on their interest payments above 10 per cent. We have, it goes without saying, exempted first home buyers from the burden of stamp duty, almost from the time we first came into office. The record is good. Help and assistance are available and all the carping, whingeing,

whining, and denial by the Leader are not going to obscure this fact. We have acted promptly and have provided help to those people most in need.

I believe that the Opposition would do well to stop playing on the genuine concern about the economic situation. The Leader should not add to what is genuine concern being felt by people in the community by making misleading statements and telling downright untruths. People are concerned about their accommodation, whether they are buyers or renters. They are anxious enough without the Leader seeking to perpetuate their fears or concerns.

Help is available, and the Government will be taking action in response to this repetition of inaccurate information being peddled by the Labor Party. The Government will be taking steps to ensure that those measures and this assistance that is available will be publicised widely so that everyone can see what help is available. We will make sure that people know, and then we will see where the credibility of the Leader, who continues to play politics at the expense of the people, stands.

## PASTORAL LANDS

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** Does the Minister of Lands intend to radically restructure or indeed abolish the Pastoral Board in the light of the revelations of Robert Ball and Julie Gregory in the article to which the Minister referred in his statement and in the light of the various statements made to that investigative team by the Chairman of the Pastoral Board?

It has been put to me that the article to which I have referred made some of the most astonishing statements ever made by a Public Service head in recent years in relation to this particular area of administration. I shall quote two of the statements made by Mr Vickery to those journalists, the first of which appeared on page one of the *Advertiser*, as follows:

Mr Vickery said some field staff recommendations to the board had been 'hidden' from him. The recommendations generally involved compulsory removal of stock from properties, some of which had about double the maximum legal stocking rate.

Mr Vickery said he had been approached last year by two field staff members who were worried at the board's failure to act on their recommendations. He said that was the first he had known of the recommendations—in one instance, three months after one had been officially lodged. 'There have been a number of things hidden from me,' Mr Vickery said.

The other statement, which is in the second half of the article, is as follows:

Last year pastoralists themselves complained directly to the board about a nearby property, Strathearn, a part of which was drifting sand after heavy stock concentration. Lack of action by the board spurred the pastoralists who felt they had to initiate their own complaint to ensure the board acted. Mr Vickery agrees it should not have reached the stage where pastoralists had to complain about a neighbour.

**The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD:** The first question asked was whether I intend to restructure the Pastoral Board, if I remember it correctly. I think that, if the honourable member had listened to my Ministerial statement, he would have heard me say that I had called for a detailed report on allegations made against the Pastoral Board by the Director-General of Lands (Mr Taeuber). I expect to have that report from Mr Taeuber by Friday afternoon or Monday at the latest and as a result of that report I will then make a decision on what recommendations, if any, I will make to Cabinet.

If the honourable member were to read closely that article that appeared in the *Advertiser* on 28 August he would note above all else the fact that during the period of the previous Government there was no increase in the staff of the Pastoral

Board. After a number of years of approaches from the Pastoral Board to the previous Government only one additional officer was provided. He would also have noted that in my statement I indicated that we had increased the staff of the Pastoral Board from eight to 12, that is, a 50 per cent increase in the staffing of the board by this present Government. The scene is totally different from what it was during the term of the previous Government.

An allegation was made that overstocking has occurred. I pointed out that what the article said, and what is the reality of the situation, is that as a result of discussions with the Pastoral Board following a report to me from the Assistant Director-General, who actually went on this trip into the pastoral country before this article was written, his report to me clearly indicates that what the Pastoral Board has informed me in the past is that about 1 per cent of the pastoral lands occupied in South Australia are suffering as a result of degradation, largely as a result of overstocking.

Part of this problem would largely have been corrected by the Bill that the Government has put before the House in that the Pastoral Board, at the present time and under the present legislation, only has power over stocking numbers of sheep and cattle. It has no control over ferral animals or kangaroos. In many instances, if honourable members opposite were to take the time to go up and look, they would find that many of the current properties that are suffering from overstocking are suffering not from overstocking of sheep and cattle but from overstocking of ferral and native animals. Instances can be highlighted where there are more ferral animals and indigenous animals on some station properties than sheep or cattle. It is quite impossible for the Pastoral Board, under the present legislation, to effectively control overstocking. One could reduce the stock numbers to virtually nothing and still be overstocked on some of the properties with the various animals on them.

The answer to the first question which the honourable member asked is that I anticipate receiving a report from the Director-General of Lands by Friday or Monday. Following that report I will then make a decision as to whether it is necessary to make any alteration to the present structure of the Pastoral Board.

### STUART HIGHWAY

**Mr GUNN:** Will the Minister of Transport inform the House whether the Highways Department has let further contracts for the construction and sealing of the Stuart Highway and, if so, who was the successful contractor and what amount of money will be spent?

**The Hon. M.M. WILSON:** I am pleased to inform the member for Eyre that Cabinet this week approved the firm Macmahon Constructions as the successful tenderer for that section of the Stuart Highway from Coober Pedy south to Pootnoura Creek, which is a distance of some 115 kilometres. The value of the contract is of the order of \$16 000 000, including contingencies. I am informed by my officers that it is probably the largest road construction contract ever let in Australia. That is very welcome news indeed, not only for the great leap forward in the sealing of the Stuart Highway but also for the tremendous boost it will give to the construction industry in this State.

I ought also to mention, for the benefit of the member for Eyre and to enable him to pass on the information to his constituents, that this contract will also include four kilometres of access roads around the township of Coober Pedy which I am sure will be welcome news for those people. The contract also calls for the construction of six bridges over creeks in the area.

### INDUSTRIAL LEGISLATION

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** Will the Premier give the House an undertaking that he will direct the Minister of Industrial Affairs to consult with trade unions and employer organisations before introducing any new industrial relations legislation into this Parliament? I am asking this question of the Premier because the Minister of Industrial Affairs has, on several occasions, introduced amendments to the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act without any prior consultation with employers, unions, or even the Industrial Commission itself. In fact, I was informed by the President of the commission that he heard about last year's amendments to his Act on the radio and had not even been given the courtesy of prior notice, let alone consultation.

It was reported in the *Sunday Mail* last weekend that the Minister of Industrial Affairs is planning to introduce legislation that will provide for secret ballots before strike action—probably a controlled leak—a ban on compulsory union membership, and a cooling-off period before strike action.

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

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the Minister of Industrial Affairs that the use of another member's name, rather than his district or title, will not be tolerated from either side of the House. The honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** The *Sunday Mail* reported that an adviser to the Minister replied as follows:

You have really stirred things up in here [meaning in the department]. Nobody is supposed to know about it. I have been told not even to put your request for an interview to the Minister.

I have been informed that the research officer in the Department of Industrial Affairs has been working for several weeks on new amendments to the Industrial Arbitration and Conciliation Act. I understand the legislation that she is preparing runs contrary to the recommendations of the Cawthorne inquiry into industrial relations called by this Government. I have been told that Mr Cawthorne's recommendations relating to secret ballots have been rejected by the Minister of Industrial Affairs. I have also been informed that even though the Government is boasting that South Australia continues to have the best record of industrial relations in Australia (which it inherited, I might say)—

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** —the Government is intent on introducing these changes to stir up union discontent before an election. Such is the desperation of the Minister of Industrial Affairs—

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** —and his colleagues.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to desist from commenting.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** Yes, Sir.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I am very pleased indeed that the Deputy Leader still acknowledges that South Australia has one of the finest industrial records of any State in Australia and, indeed, of any country in the world. With regard to his trying to take the credit for that record, let me remind the Deputy Leader that that record has been in existence for some 50 or 60 years, a large proportion of which was under Liberal Governments, particularly that of Sir Thomas Playford. I think that that is a far more valid reason than any claim that the Labor Party in the 1970s was responsible for that record. It is a good record and one that is tremendously important as far as potential investors in our State are concerned.

In regard to the matter that the honourable member has brought forward, I will not answer any of that rather interesting speculation that he embroidered, and quoted as coming from the *Sunday paper*, as that would be pointless. I would

simply remind the honourable member that I think on more than one occasion the Minister of Industrial Affairs gave such an undertaking as the one that he demands now. I am at a loss to understand why the honourable member wants to waste the time of Parliament by yet again bringing up the matter during question time.

### TAPLEYS HILL ROAD

**Mr OSWALD:** I direct my question to the Minister of Transport and I refer to the recently announced plan known as option 3C for the widening of Tapleys Hill Road, Glenelg North. Will the Minister ask the Commissioner of Highways to review those options previously considered for the widening of Tapleys Hill Road which do not involve the demolition of any residential or commercial buildings?

Following the announcement by the Highways Department recently of the choice of plan 3C, a public meeting was convened by some of the residents who live on Tapleys Hill Road. At that meeting a resolution was passed which may be summarised as follows:

This meeting unanimously rejects road widening plan 3C and requests John Oswald, member for Morphett, to request the Commissioner of Highways to review those options which do not include the acquisition of house properties other than the 7 foot previously proposed.

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** I congratulate the honourable member for Morphett on the representations he has made for some months now on behalf of his constituents concerning this matter. The honourable member has been most assiduous in those duties. It is true that the Commissioner of Highways favours option 3C. All the plans of the options were on public display for some time at the council chambers. Certainly, the option favoured by the Commissioner of Highways is option 3C. However, in the light of the honourable member's representations, I will have the Commissioner, once again, review all the options.

### T.A.B.

**Mr SLATER:** Does the Minister of Recreation and Sport support the concept of operating a number of metropolitan T.A.B. outlets as commission agencies? The Minister would be aware that a proposal to establish commission agencies is being considered by the Totalizator Agency Board. A letter dated 20 August 1982 was forwarded to the T.A.B. agency managers which stated, in part:

If you decide to become a commission agent you will be paid the following: a retainer of \$250 per week, a commission 0.75 per cent of net turnover and telephone betting deposit, and sundries allowance of 35c per square metre weekly.

A special meeting of the T.A.B. agency managers last Friday unanimously rejected the proposal. The contract that was attached to the letter proposed that the agents would be responsible for all the other staff salaries and service payments, taxation deductions, workmen's compensation, provision of an agency bond, electricity and running costs, and cleaning costs of the agency. All the agency managers are long-standing employees of T.A.B., and they consider the proposal in the contract an insult to their intelligence.

Therefore, I ask the Minister whether, in view of these circumstances and the information I have supplied, he supports the concept of commission agencies and what action he is likely to take in view of the T.A.B. managers' total rejection of this proposal.

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** It was my understanding, on the advice I received from the T.A.B., that the managers were going to be given the option of becoming commission

agents, and that there was to be no forcing of the situation at all.

*Mr Slater interjecting:*

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** Indeed, I can only reiterate that. I have asked the T.A.B. to give me a complete report on the question, but I can tell the honourable member that if it makes the T.A.B. more efficient and at the same time—

*Mr Slater interjecting:*

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** If the member for Gilles wants me to answer the question, I suggest he let me. If it makes the T.A.B. more efficient and at the same time preserves the jobs of the staff, I think it is well worthy of consideration. That is the response I have given the Chairman of the T.A.B. at this stage. I have received a letter from the Public Service Association (Mr Mayes, I think, was the signatory) asking for a meeting on this matter, and I will be happy to attend that meeting when I have all the facts at my command.

### NOARLUNGA POLYCLINIC

**Mr SCHMIDT:** In view of the A.L.P. promise, if elected, to build a polyclinic at Noarlunga, will the Minister of Health say whether people in the southern metropolitan area will be guaranteed access to better health services than those already provided? In the *Advertiser* yesterday there appeared a report under the heading 'Australian Labor Party plans \$2m health polyclinic at Noarlunga'. It is interesting to note that there is no reference in that report to when the Australian Labor Party will provide or how it will fund such a clinic. However, the report states:

'There has been a strong local demand for extended health services and a comprehensive 24-hour casualty service in the area for almost a decade. The community feels insecure without comprehensive local casualty services,' said Mr Cornwall.

'At various times they have been promised a private hospital, a community hospital, and a public hospital. The committee examined all of these options very carefully but rejected them.' That final statement puts the whole question in its proper context, namely, as I said earlier, that for the past decade the people in that area—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is now starting to debate the issue.

**Mr SCHMIDT:** I am merely putting the question in its context, because I had asked whether the residents of the southern area would be given better medical care than that with which they are now provided. They are seeking better medical care because, for the past decade (as was suggested in the article), they have been promised various types of hospitals. Those hospitals were promised at election after election, but now the A.L.P. acknowledges that its health committee rejects those options, whatever the form or nature of a hospital might be.

It is also pertinent to note that, in the time since this Government came into power, many facilities have improved in that area, namely, the upgrading of the ambulance service, the provision of a rescue helicopter service in the southern area and through the State but, more particularly, the tremendous growth in the number of private practices in that area. Noarlunga now has more doctors per capita than has any other area of metropolitan Adelaide.

**The Hon. D. J. Hopgood:** Oh, rubbish!

**Mr SCHMIDT:** Check your figures. That is why there is a need to consider whether we should provide a clinic in that area or update facilities.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** I can certainly say with confidence that the A.L.P. promise to build a polyclinic at Noarlunga (and I take the point that the A.L.P. has no idea when such a clinic would be built) would not provide increased health facilities to the people of Noarlunga, because

a study of those services that are presently provided indicates that they are at least as good as if not better than services provided in any other part of the metropolitan area. The idea of a polyclinic is ill conceived and indicates that the A.L.P. simply has not studied the developments in health services that have taken place in those southern suburbs in the past three years.

Certainly, when the A.L.P. left office there were deficiencies, and there is no doubt about that—both Parties recognised those deficiencies. However, over the past three years, a lot of those deficiencies have been remedied. Early in 1981, prior to the development of a second 24-hour practice in the southern suburbs, and because of concern for the health services in that area, I visited the Mount Druitt polyclinic with the Chairman of the South Australian Health Commission to examine its operations and to see whether it might be suitable for application in the southern suburbs. We looked at the services that were provided from that polyclinic and we examined carefully, with the assistance of the commission, the services that were currently being provided in the southern suburbs near Noarlunga.

We came up with the answer that virtually every specialist service is available through private practitioners at clinics in Noarlunga, that there are two 24-hour private practices operating in that area, that the access to the casualty services at the Flinders Medical Centre is excellent and has been much improved in the past three years, and that the people in that area have also had access to excellent para-medical services through the Christies Beach Community Health Centre. Those services have been developed since this Government came to office and, indeed, it is hard to conceive of any health services whatsoever which a polyclinic could provide and which are not already being provided by either Government services or private practitioners in the Noarlunga area.

Again, I think that the A.L.P. should take into account that the Australian health scheme requires people who are not insured or who are not eligible for Commonwealth benefits to pay for services, so, despite whatever kind of clinic is established at Noarlunga, it would provide no financial benefit whatsoever over and above that which is already provided to people who are either insured or in receipt of Commonwealth benefits. So, let no-one in the Noarlunga area be deceived that he would be provided with any free service additional to that which is already being provided. I should add that the improved retrieval practice for accidents and emergencies which has taken place under this Government has certainly created an air of confidence and reassurance in the minds of the people in the southern suburbs.

The improved retrieval to Flinders Medical Centre, the establishment of the State helicopter service, and the opening of the new Lonsdale Road all have created speedy access to Flinders Medical Centre for those who require genuine accident and emergency care. For those who seek the services of a medical practitioner at any hour of the day or night, on the 365 days of the year, those services are now available. They were not available when the Labor Party left office.

The fact that they are now available, together with all those other specialist and para-medical services, means, I believe, that the idea of a polyclinic that the Labor Party has come up with simply means an additional \$2 000 000-plus of capital expenditure, which the taxpayer would have to bear and which need not necessarily be borne, plus an additional annual expenditure of \$350 000 in 1981 terms, and that would be considerably increased this year. Neither the patient nor the taxpayer would benefit from this proposal.

I frankly think that it is a case of the A.L.P. thrashing around in a desperate attempt to recover ground that it thinks it lost when it made that mischievous and mistaken

promise to build a new hospital in the Para districts. That was one of the most irresponsible promises that could possibly be undertaken, and one wonders what kind of influence the member for Napier carries with his Party when his Party is prepared to bow to the wishes of a local member, whose district is already well served, for a new hospital, thereby taking away capital and recurrent funds that should rightly be directed to areas of greater need elsewhere in the State. I think that the Labor Party has its health priorities completely upside down, and I believe that the electorate will judge those policies for what they are—ill conceived, costly, and of no real benefit to the patient or the taxpayer.

#### STATE ASSISTANCE

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** Will the Premier say whether he still stands by his remarks earlier today and claim that he is still credible regarding the answer that he gave to a question from the member for Brighton to the effect that, for persons who are faced with very high rental payments and who are on low incomes, help is available now? In common with, I would think, many other members, I was approached by a constituent who is required to pay \$48 a week from an income that is the widow's pension.

Clearly, that would be a person who, one would assume, would be in the category that would receive assistance from the recently announced Government rental support scheme. I wrote to the General Manager of the Housing Trust and received a reply dated 20 August 1982. I will not give the name of the person concerned, because I do not believe that she would want it made known. The salient paragraphs of the letter state:

At your request, Mrs X's name and address has been registered for possible assistance under the recently announced rent relief scheme. Implementation of this scheme requires amendments to Commonwealth legislation, and it is anticipated that assistance will be available in November.

He did not say 'now'. The letter continues:

The trust will forward information on the scheme and an application to Mrs X as soon as assistance under the scheme is available.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The honourable gentleman obviously did not listen to the answer I gave earlier. I simply repeat, in simple language that I am sure even he will be able to understand, that Federal funds will not be available until November, but the State is making funds available now so that the scheme can go ahead. I have no doubt that the honourable member's constituent will be hearing from the Housing Trust in the very near future and, if the honourable member would give me the details, I would be very happy to take the matter up.

This of course is one of the difficulties, that members opposite keep peddling these untruths and misrepresentations and the people of South Australia could be well forgiven for believing that there was no assistance available at this time. I do not believe that the honourable member is serving his constituents or doing the people of South Australia any good service at all by continuing with this whingeing, knocking and whining. We have got used to this from the Opposition. Would it not be a good idea if just for once they started to get together with the Government and the general community and stopped whingeing and whining and started trying to help, as this Government is doing? It would be refreshing and it would be a tremendously important thing for the confidence of the people of South Australia. As it is, frankly, I think that honourable members opposite should be ashamed of themselves.

### PAGEANT DAY

**Mr MATHWIN:** Can the Minister of Industrial Affairs say whether there has been any further development regarding the proposed extension of shopping hours on Saturday 13 November, which is otherwise known as John Martin's pageant day? On 24 August I asked the Minister if he had been approached by a representative of the Rundle Mall traders regarding an extension of shopping hours until 5.30 on Saturday 13 November, the day of John Martin's Christmas pageant. At the time the Minister said that he had received no final application but when it had been received the Government would consider all the evidence in support of or against the proposal.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** Yes, as I indicated to the honourable member, a request was received from the Rundle Mall Management Committee some weeks ago. The Government has now considered that application. It has decided that the pageant should carry on as it has done in the past and that there will be no extension of shop trading hours on that day.

I can also indicate that the request from the trade union for a public holiday on that day has been rejected. Any festival in the mall on that day would certainly proceed under regulations of the Adelaide City Council and not of the State Government. However, any small traders who under the existing Act are allowed to trade outside of normal trading hours will be allowed to trade in conjunction with that pageant festival during the Saturday afternoon.

### NORTH-SOUTH CORRIDOR

**Mr TRAINER:** Can the Minister of Transport clarify for my constituents the Government's plans for the Emerson overpass and the north-south transportation corridor through Edwardstown along the old MATS freeway route? I wrote on both matters to the Minister of Transport on 15 March, and a Ministerial reply on 23 April reads in part:

Following the recent decisions taken by the Government in relation to the North-South Transportation Corridor the Highways Department has undertaken to review the corridor in three stages namely: Regency Road-Marleston, Marleston-Majors Road and Regency Road-Salisbury Highway. Examination in detail of the section of the corridor between Marleston and Majors Road which includes Towers Terrace will not be completed until approximately the end of July 1982. Although it appears likely that there will be a substantial reduction in the number of properties affected by the revised layout, as compared with the MATS proposals, a considerable number of residents in the vicinity of Towers Terrace will still be affected.

It is for those constituents in Towers Terrace that I am particularly concerned because they have been seeking information on what is happening, as we are now well past the July date by which, according to that reply, information would be readily available for my constituents. I hope a public meeting could be arranged with officers of the department to explain in more detail the matters to local residents.

Similarly, information from the Minister on the inter-related problem of the Emerson overpass is long overdue. Constituents involved in St Anthony's parish church and school at Edwardstown are still most concerned about the possible loss of access to both the church and the school with or during the construction of the Emerson overpass.

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** I will take the latter part of the explanation first. I thought that the question of the St Anthony's school had been satisfactorily resolved. If that is a wrong impression, then I apologise to the honourable member and I will get on to it immediately for him.

I do have a report on the widening of the South Road which has been given to me by the Highways Department. I have not yet studied it but I will now study it in light of

the representations made by the honourable member on behalf of his constituents. The report concerns that section of South Road that goes through his district from Daws Road to Anzac Highway and it does contain a provision for widening. However, I hasten to point out that these are only proposals at this stage and as yet we have not worked out what sort of public involvement exercise there will be, and there will have to be a public involvement exercise before final decisions are made. I do have the preliminary report but I have not yet been able to study it.

**Mr Trainer:** Is that on South Road only, or does it include Towers Terrace?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The honourable member will have to forgive me. I cannot answer that at this stage but I will look at it in light of his question and I will bring down a reply for him.

### PENOLA HIGH SCHOOL

**Mr RODDA:** Will the Minister of Health undertake to preserve the health of students and staff of the Penola High School? A multi-million dollar vineyard is being established on land adjacent to the northern boundary of the Penola High School. Concern has been expressed to me about the effects of pesticides and insecticidal sprays on the rainwater which is used by the school. Concern has also been expressed about the danger of inhaling these pesticides and insecticidal sprays by the population of the school and for that matter by quite a number of residents of Penola. I would be pleased if the Minister could arrange with her department to see that the activities of the enterprise will be monitored so that the health of these people is not endangered.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** I can certainly understand the concern of the member for Victoria and of his constituents at the possibility that any sprays used in conjunction with the vineyard could have an adverse effect on the health of the children at the school or, indeed, of nearby residents. Local boards of health have the power and, indeed, the responsibility under the Health Act to control and monitor the dispersal of spray in a given area. I recall corresponding recently with someone in that area advising them of the powers of the local board of health under the Health Act and of the fact that these powers are exercised locally rather than by the Health Commission itself.

However, the local board of health, if it seeks any information or assistance of a technical nature, can call on the services of the Central Board of Health. I assure the member for Victoria that I regard this issue of possible health effects of sprays as being one of the important environmental health issues which is at the forefront of the minds of health authorities who must always weigh up the benefits to the community at large in spraying crops against possible adverse effects. I am confident that these considerations will be taken into account by the local board of health. I know that the Chairman of the Central Board of Health has offered its services to local boards in arriving at correct conclusions on this matter. I will undertake to follow up the matter personally and write in greater detail to the honourable member so that he can advise his constituents.

### HOUSING APPROVALS

**Mr HEMMINGS:** Will the Premier inform the House why the total number of home building approvals in this State, according to the latest information, have fallen from 2 204 in the three months to July 1981 to 1 871 in the same

period of 1982, which represents a reduction of 15.1 per cent?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Private sector building approvals in Australia fell by 3.4 per cent in June 1982 compared with the previous month. In South Australia in June 1982 they increased by 3.4 per cent. That is a factor which the honourable member chooses to ignore when one compares it with the previous month. There has been a fall but there has been a fall right throughout Australia over a longer period.

*Mr Hemmings interjecting:*

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Perhaps the honourable member could ask all his questions and I will then answer them.

*Mr Hemmings interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I make the point that times are tough. They are tough economically throughout the world. They are tough throughout Australia. It is pointless to ignore that fact. Dwelling approvals certainly have fallen. They are, throughout Australia, the lowest since 1974 but that does not mean that South Australia is reflecting the general trend. It is not. The South Australian increase of 3.4 per cent comes in the face of a general decrease of 3.4 per cent as at June 1982 and that is something about which we can be reasonably happy. In other words, it has been summed up in some of the papers issued by the industry itself that in South Australia the number of new dwelling approvals has experienced a less severe decline in the June quarter compared with a year earlier and there is a 10 per cent difference in that. The State's share of Australian approvals increased from 6 per cent in the June quarter of 1981 to 7.2 per cent in the June quarter of 1982. Certainly, there are ups and downs. The cycle goes up and down, as it will elsewhere, but the position in South Australia is certainly no worse than it is in the rest of Australia. On the present figures it is shown as being better. The other important factor is the question of confidence. The matter of confidence in regard to the building industry is certainly a lot better in South Australia than in other States. As the honourable gentleman has a propensity to do, he has identified a problem but fails to make any suggestion as to what can be done to remedy that problem and what can be done—

**Mr HEMMINGS:** I rise on a point of order. I take it that we are in Question Time. I wish the Premier would not ask for a solution the Labor Party will give when in government.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There is no point of order. I ask the honourable member to desist from making frivolous comment. The honourable member has a right, as has every honourable member, to raise a legitimate point of order. However, I would ask members to raise their points of order on that basis and on that basis alone.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The answer I am giving obviously does not suit the honourable gentleman. He wants to take his bat and ball and go home. He can have that opportunity.

*At 3.15 p.m., the bells having been rung:*

**The SPEAKER:** Call on the business of the day.

#### **SURVIVAL OF CAUSES OF ACTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

Second reading.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education):** I move:

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

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

Leave granted.

#### **Explanation of Bill**

It proposes a single amendment to the Survival of Causes of Action Act. The High Court of Australia recently decided in the case of *Fitch v. Hyde-Cates* that where, under the New South Wales equivalent of section 3 of the Survival of Causes of Action Act a person is killed as a result of a wrongful act, his estate can recover damages which include a component for the deceased's loss of future earning capacity.

The result of this decision is that the person whose wrongful act caused the death can in some situations be liable twice. First, the estate can bring an action claiming loss of future earning capacity, and secondly, any dependants left by the deceased can bring an action which is also based on the future earning capacity of the deceased.

Where the beneficiaries under the estate are not the dependants, or where the beneficiaries who are also dependants would receive shares under a will which does not reflect their respective dependancies, the wrongdoer is liable to satisfy two claims for the same loss. The object of this Bill is to exclude from the damages which an estate may recover the loss of the deceased's future earning capacity, leaving the dependant's respective claims unaffected.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends paragraph (a) of section 3 of the principal Act. In addition to the exclusions which were previously contained in paragraph (a) the clause excludes from the damages recoverable by an estate the loss of capacity to earn or the loss of probably future earnings, in respect of the period for which the deceased would have survived were it not for the act or omission which gave rise to the cause of action. The clause also includes a transitional provision which limits the amendment only to those actions in which a judgment has not been given before the commencement of the amendment, whether or not that judgment has been appealed from.

**Mr McRAE** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### **WRONGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

Second reading.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education):** I move:  
*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

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

Leave granted.

#### **Explanation of Bill**

The present law provides protection against actions for defamation in certain circumstances. The Wrongs Act provides that a fair and accurate report in a newspaper of any proceedings publicly heard before a court, if published contemporaneously with the proceeding, is privileged. It states that this is also the case with the publication of a fair and accurate report in a newspaper of proceedings or the publication of certain official notices or reports unless published maliciously. The Act provides a penalty for unfair and inaccurate reporting. A defence exists where in the action for libel a person can prove that the publication in a newspaper or magazine was published without malice and without gross negligence.

The fact that reporting of matters is privileged in certain circumstances only if published in a newspaper fails to observe that radio and television provide a medium for dissemination of information nowadays. The attention of the Government was drawn to the imbalance of the privilege granted to one form of publication rather than the others. Accordingly, the Bill extends the privilege to radio and television reporting. This will mean that fair and accurate reporting of court proceedings, if published contemporaneously, of certain official notices and reports, reports of meetings of select committees of Parliament, reports of meetings of royal commissions will be privileged against actions for defamation be they reported in a newspaper, on radio or television. The monetary penalty for breach of the Act will be increased from \$20 to \$2 000.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 6 of the principal Act. That section provides that a fair and accurate report in a newspaper of any proceedings publicly heard before a court shall, if published contemporaneously with the proceedings, be privileged. The clause extends the application of the section to reports published by radio or television. Clause 3 amends section 7 of the principal Act which provides that a fair and accurate report in a newspaper of certain other proceedings or the publication of certain official notices or reports shall be privileged unless published maliciously. The proceedings referred to in the section are those of public meetings, meetings of local government bodies, meetings of royal commissions or select committees of either House of Parliament or meetings of shareholders of banks or incorporated companies. The notices or reports referred to are those published at the request of a Government office or department, a Minister of the Crown or the Police Commissioner. The clause extends the application of this section to publication by radio or television and to publication of the proceedings of either House of Parliament.

Clause 4 amends section 8 of the principal Act which creates a summary offence of publishing a report of a kind referred to in section 6 or 7 that is unfair and inaccurate. The clause extends the application of this section to publication by radio or television and increases the monetary penalty for the offence from \$20 to \$2 000. Clause 5 amends section 10 of the principal Act. Section 10 provides a defence to an action for libel contained in a newspaper or magazine if it is proved that the libel was published without malice and without gross negligence. The clause extends the application of the section to publication by radio or television.

Clause 6 amends section 11 of the principal Act which provides for mitigation of damages for a libel in a newspaper if the plaintiff has been compensated or agreed to be compensated in respect of libels to the same effect. The clause extends the application of this provision to any publication whether by newspaper or otherwise. Clause 7 amends section 14 of the principal Act which provides for defences to an offence against section 8. The clause makes consequential amendments to section 14 so that it applies to publication by radio or television.

**Mr McRAE** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 25 August. Page 741.)

**Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition):** We now have before us the fourth Tonkin Budget—a Budget described by its author as providing ‘a continuation of sound financial management’. It is, however, an extraordinary exercise in dishonesty. Its chief purpose is to obscure the results of

three years of failure and incompetence. Far from offering a balanced financial result, it admits to a deficit of \$42 000 000 on the current expenditure which could understate the true picture by more than \$21 000 000. Nor is this a low tax Budget. Indeed, the Premier’s claim that the Government has avoided any rise in taxation rates is simply a shabby half truth. Tax collections will rise by 11.5 per cent—the largest rise since 1976. Revenue has been increased by the Premier’s back-door method of using State charges which were conveniently jacked up in the months before the Budget’s presentation. The impression it attempts to give of major new spending on capital works to boost building and construction has all the elements of a hoax. Certainly, there is an apparent large rise in spending but only because for the last two years it has been kept so abysmally low.

A major component of the so-called increase reflects a changed book-keeping approach for Government vehicles. That expenditure is now classified as a capital payment instead of a recurrent expense as in previous years. In any event, there is no guarantee that funds allocated in this Budget will be spent to the benefit of the South Australian economy. This was a feature of last year’s capital works programme even to the extent of not spending money allocated for such a vital area as housing. This Budget offers no immediate plans for the creation of jobs, no long-term strategy for the development of South Australia. It is a Budget which promises only more of the same—more of the last three years: more unemployment, more stagnation, and more failure. The Premier has produced again a familiar list of scapegoats. Wage and salary earners top the list, closely followed by his Party colleagues in Canberra, who apparently think so much of him that they are able to ignore South Australia.

There is also an addition to the litany of excuses. Who in this House remembers the Premier in 1979 arguing that our recovery would have to await development interstate and overseas, as he does now? Indeed, in December 1979, just three months after the present Government took office, we were told that there was unmistakable proof that the Government’s policies were working. Yet now, three years later, three years after those policies came into operation, we are told that our parlous position is due to factors beyond the present Government’s control: now at the end of its term, in the Premier’s fourth Budget statement, we get this excuse. After three years of bumbling mismanagement we are left with excuses, subterfuge and outright dishonesty. This Budget is useful only as a reminder of his Government’s failure to provide direction and leadership to South Australia, and the sooner a new Government has the opportunity to recast it, the better it will be for all the people in this State.

Let us now look at the details. The Budget result for the year just past confirms the extent to which the Government has raided capital works funds to prop up its recurrent finances. In 1981-82, \$61 800 000 was used following the transfer of \$37 300 000 in 1980-81. That is a staggering figure—virtually \$100 000 000 in two years. That transfer may have provided a cosmetic balance; but make no mistake, it represents a deep-seated cost that will be paid for by people having to do without facilities and services which they need now and which their children will need in the future. Still it has not stopped. This year we are told that a further \$42 000 000 will be transferred—at least, that is what is predicted. Remember that the predicted transfer last year was \$44 000 000, but the final result in actual terms was \$61 800 000.

Let me remind the Premier of his earlier prediction about this Budget. In September last year I asked the Premier how long he intended to continue his policy of deficit funding. That question was asked on 16 September, the day after he

introduced last year's Budget with its prediction of \$44 000 000 transfer of capital funds. In reply the Premier said:

We hope that we will not have to spend all of the \$44 000 000 which it is proposed will be set aside to be transferred to the revenue fund.

The truth is that he spent all that \$44 000 000 as well as a further \$17 000 000. Again on 10 February I asked whether trends in the monthly financial results indicated that the Premier's forecast of economic activity in the Budget were far too optimistic and that the deficit was likely to blow out. He replied, 'I am optimistic that the figure will be better. It is certainly not going to blow out.' How else would the Premier describe the result: a predicted deficit of \$44 000 000 becoming \$61 800 000—an over-run of 40 per cent? It is no good the Premier's hiding behind the concept of an amalgamated account and using his own version of double speak and to talk of surplus of capital funds. There may be only one main consolidated account in the State's financial structure, but the funds that make up that account come from two distinct groups, two sources. Capital funds largely are borrowed and interest is paid on them, but by their nature they provide a means of creating infra-structure which can be paid for over the whole period, during which the State benefits.

The Premier's so-called surplus in fact means that this vital social investment is being delayed or even abandoned. Certainly, in the past, transfer of capital funds or loan funds, as they were once described, have been made, although very rarely. In fact, between 1970 and 1979, under the previous Labor Administration it was done only once, in 1978-79, and the amount of \$5 600 000 is almost insignificant compared with what is being contemplated here, and it was made good the following year.

What was the reaction of those opposite on that occasion when they occupied the benches which the Labor Party now occupies? The Deputy Premier's response was typical: speaking in this House on 13 February 1979 during a debate on the Supplementary Estimates, he referred to the 1978-79 Budget and described the transfer from loan account to revenue account as being 'very poor economics', and to illustrate that point he invoked the name of Playford, and I shall quote his words, as it is interesting to reflect on this in the light of the Premier's results from the last three Budgets. The then Deputy Leader of the Opposition stated:

Along with several other members, I had a discussion with Sir Thomas Playford, when he was here for lunch one day, on this matter. As is his wont and his habit, he was quite interested to talk about what was happening. Nobody, not even the Playford knockers, can deny that he was a very prudent Treasurer. Some people might not have liked some aspects of his Administration, and these knockers have tried to make light of some of his achievements, but he was a prudent Treasurer, and he described the transfer as a very poor economic policy. For one thing, the interest paid on that \$5 000 000 will be about 15 per cent. Also, it will have another very adverse effect on the future of South Australia, in that our Loan allocation in the future could be reduced . . . The Dunstan Administration, far from seeking to increase our Loan funds for developmental projects, on what are truly Loan projects, and capital development, is by transferring these funds, contracting the provision of Loan funds to this State in the future; that is a very poor economic policy.

That was a comment on about \$5 600 000 planned for and recovered over the following year, but if the present Budget runs its course, the Government will have transferred \$141 300 000 in a three-year period. I think it is fortunate for the Deputy Premier that Tom Playford is no longer able to give him a piece of his mind.

A little over a year ago in June 1981, when introducing the supplementary Appropriation Bill the Premier made an interesting comment on what was at that stage a \$37 300 000 transfer, the first instalment of the \$141 000 000 total now facing us. He said:

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

Perhaps the Premier could now tell us how long he will go on using capital funds should the State be so unfortunate as to have him remain as Treasurer. Perhaps instead of this double speak about surplus capital funds we might have some straight talking on that point. Instead, though, all we have is the Premier gloomily announcing the third \$42 000 000 instalment with the comment that such action is 'far from ideal'. It is no wonder that the Premier is cagey, because that figure to be transferred, stripped of all the nonsense about a surplus, represents the basic or minimum deficit of this so-called balanced Budget. I suggest that even that amount has been artificially kept down by official contortions and plain dishonesty by the Treasury. The increasing number of transfers which make it extremely difficult to trace what has happened to Government expenditure have become something of a feature of Budgets produced by this Government.

In some key areas we can identify where money has been brought in simply to affect the overall result. For example, the Premier has padded his Budget result by diverting \$10 000 000 from the funds for the S.T.A. This is revealed in the fine print of the Financial Statement at page 34, which makes clear that the recall of \$10 000 000 is the result of pressure on the recurrent side of the consolidated account. So much for the bonus \$10 000 000 for transport in the Federal Budget, because, in effect, it has already been spent. It can now make no net impact on transport in this State.

Then there is the question of changing the way in which purchases of motor vehicles are handled in the accounts. As I mentioned earlier, motor vehicles are now an item of capital expenditure. I have no argument with that as that is a quite logical way of accounting for that expenditure, but in the context of this Budget, at least in terms of the 1982-83 forecast, it represents a transfer by another name. Had it still been part of recurrent expenses, the deficit in that area would have been \$7 100 000 greater, and an extra \$7 100 000 would have to come from capital funds: in other words, be added on to that forecast transfer of \$42 000 000.

Then we have what is simply left out. One such item is the likely extra cost of pumping water resulting from the extremely dry winter just passed. Just three weeks ago in this place the Minister of Water Resources answered a traditional question, loyally supplied by his Party's Whip, on the capacity of Adelaide's reservoirs. In the course of his answer he said:

What has been said in relation to the fact that the current holdings of the reservoirs are approximately 44 per cent of capacity means that significant pumping costs will be involved in the coming year.

He then pointed out that, unlike last year, we could not really expect any increase from late rains, and concluded:

The cost of the additional pumping, which is anticipated to be anything up to \$4 000 000 in excess of the pumping costs of the last financial year, will be borne out of general revenue.

The pumping costs last year were, in fact, \$5 597 000. This year the allocation has not been increased, as one would assume from the Minister's statement in answer to that question, but in fact reduced marginally to \$5 589 000. Where is the extra \$4 000 000 the Minister referred to on 10 August? Why is that not shown in the Budget? In the *Advertiser* this morning a spokesman from the Bureau of Meteorology is reported as saying:

We have just passed through our driest winter since 1977.

That last bad drought year saw pumping costs of \$7 600 000. Since that time the cost of electricity has risen substantially, so surely a much larger allocation would need to be shown now, particularly as the Minister's answer on 10 August

shows that he is well aware of the effect of the drought on Adelaide's reservoirs. Perhaps the Government is hoping for substantial increases in excess water charges to offset that increase. They have not signalled that to the public. Nevertheless, that prediction should have been shown as an expenditure in the Budget. One thing is certain: if that extra \$4 000 000 had been written in, the deficit on recurrent expenses would have been higher and the transfer of capital funds even greater.

Just taking those three items alone, that is, \$10 000 000 transferred from the S.T.A., \$7 100 000 from Motor Vehicles, and \$4 000 000 for pumping costs, we now have the possibility of a real deficit on recurrent expenditure of the order of \$63 000 000. There are other indications that the Government is being extremely optimistic in its estimate of receipts from some public enterprises. For example, last year the Government estimated that it would receive \$9 000 000 from the Woods and Forests Department, but in fact the amount was only \$4 200 000. This year, in the face of major problems in the timber industry and falling profitability of all forestry companies, the Government expects receipts of \$6 000 000, that is, more than was received last year, without any explanation of how it will achieve this miraculous turn-around.

In his statement, the Premier says that he expects that, while some improvement is expected, it may be some time before the department returns to its previous levels of profitability, and he refers to the depressed building industry and imported timber from New Zealand and the West Coast of the U.S.A. There is no sign of improvement in that depressed building industry. On the contrary, figures to the three months ended in July show housing approvals down 15.1 per cent. So, there is another understatement of expected expenditure in this year's Budget.

I turn now to the question of taxation. On page 32 of the Financial Statement the Premier makes the claim that the Government has avoided any increase in taxation rates. The only truth in this statement is that the Budget does not announce any increase in taxation rates; otherwise it is largely a fiction. The truth is that the Premier has tried to make the Budget look more benign than it really is by distancing taxation increases from the Budget speech, and he has done the same with extra State charges. The fact is that the Budget incorporates substantial extra revenues from recent rises in tax rates.

These are increases which were not announced in the 1981 Budget, and they are not announced in the 1982 Budget. They reflect the discretionary fiscal moves which the Tonkin Government has made in the time between the presentation of those two Budgets, so that the Premier is able to say that he has not altered any tax rates. In recent months, for instance, two tax rates have been increased; neither was announced in the 1981 Budget. Since 24 April motorists have paid increased motor vehicle registrations, and from 1 May licences under the Business Franchise (Petroleum Products) Act were increased.

In addition, changes made by the Valuer-General will result in increased land tax collections. Collections from the Government levy on the Electricity Trust will rise in 1982-83 as a result of the Government's decision to approve ETSA tariff increases from May 1982. Taken together, these changes in taxes since the last Budget will net the Government an extra \$12 500 000. That increase did not just happen: it came as a result of deliberate Government policy. This financial year, tax collections will rise by 11.5 per cent—the largest rise since the 1976-77 financial year. For the first time in our history, State taxation will take more than \$500 000 000 from South Australians. That means approximately \$413 for every man, woman and child resident in this State. It is an increase of almost 40 per cent over 1978-

79, the last year of the Labor Government. So much for the boast in the opening paragraphs of the Premier's Financial Statement that this is the fourth successive Budget to contain no increases in State taxation. I remind the House of the figures: in 1978-79, a total taxation collection<sup>1</sup> of \$385 000 000; in 1982-83, \$552 000 000; in 1978-79, \$296 per head; in 1982-83, \$413 per head.

If that incredible statement by the Premier about no increases in taxation is even technically true, it is simply because the increases have come in the months immediately before or after the Budget is presented and thus are not announced in the speech itself. State charges present the same story. I will not detail them but just by way of an example I point out that on the first day of the 1982-83 financial year Executive Council raised dozens of charges under 15 separate Acts. But we will only find details of a few of them in these documents.

On the matter of public works, I point out that the assault on the building and construction sector through the unprecedented transfers of capital funds will stand as one of the greatest errors in economic management of this Liberal Government. It is therefore staggering to read on the opening page of the Premier's statement that the main benefit of his term so far has been to the building and construction industry. The feeling of amazement is not alleviated by the sudden rediscovery by the Premier in this Budget of the need to spend capital funds where they were intended to be spent—not all of them, but at least some more of them.

Unfortunately, as I outlined in the opening, that superficially impressive increase in spending of some \$50 000 000 palls somewhat when its components are examined. And, in any event, it has merely returned us in money terms to the 1978-79 levels but well behind inflation. To just restore spending to the real levels achieved in the last year of the Labor Government, the Premier would need to allocate an extra \$130 000 000 over and above his \$50 000 000 increase this year. In 1978-79, payments on works amounted to \$232 200 000; in 1979-80, the first year of this Government, \$226 100 000; in 1980-81, \$196 900 000 was spent; and then last year, 1981-82, a rock bottom \$180 900 000. Now we have an allocation of \$236 100 000. It is not unreasonable to assume an inflation rate over those years of around 12 per cent, which would mean that \$363 000 000, or an extra \$130 000 000, would have had to be allocated in 1982-83 just to restore the real value of payments to works.

Certainly, it is true that some major capital projects are undertaken by statutory authorities that do not come within the ambit of this Budget, but that was equally true in 1978-79. But, in any event, the evidence overwhelmingly exposes the Premier's boasts as hollow. Indeed, they are simply untrue. From May 1979 to May 1982 (for which period the latest Bureau of Statistics figures are available, which allows a proper three-year comparison), employment in the building and construction industry decreased by 5 800, an appalling result for the employees of the industry which, the Premier claims, has been the chief beneficiary of his three-year term of office.

There is no doubt that building and construction occupies a strategic role in our economy and is an area in which State Governments can have a direct impact in terms of helping to create growth. But the industry also has a vital social role to play, particularly in the light of the current housing crisis. Therefore, I was surprised to find that, while the Premier claims he is boosting housing funds significantly this year, some money that was allocated last year for housing was actually not spent. Perhaps the Premier can tell the House why we find on page 17 of his Financial Statement that funds set aside for housing needs were not used for this purpose. Perhaps he could explain the meaning of the reference to the fact that this decision was a result of

needs elsewhere for funds. Clearly, this is an admission that housing funds were actually diverted to other purposes, at a time of a major housing crisis. The extent of this diversion of funds appears to have been \$3 500 000.

On page 120 of the Estimates of Payments, under the section for the Treasury, it is clearly shown that \$3 500 000 was voted last year but was not spent. In his Budget speech 12 months ago, the Premier specifically mentioned (at page 27 of the statement) that this money would be made available from Consolidated Account. So, before anything else, we can reduce the real impact on the allocation this year. That is what the Premier calls a saving. On page 10 of his Financial Statement for this Budget, the Premier states:

The savings in the areas of waterworks, sewers and irrigation, effluent drainage, harbor works, other Government buildings and housing amounted to \$9 500 000.

What that euphemism 'savings' means in this instance is that \$3 500 000 had been budgeted for but was not made available at a time when hundreds of South Australians are finding it difficult to get safe and affordable housing, when the waiting lists of the Housing Trust are growing enormously. That is an absolute disgrace.

Who, in summary, are the winners and losers from this Budget? The losers include health (mainly recognised hospitals, brushed off in a couple of paragraphs of text and the usual inadequate information), and health buildings, for which funds have been slashed. Then there is the Department for Community Welfare (excluding 'Miscellaneous'), concerning which cuts have been made in the face of higher unemployment. The allocation for school buildings has been slashed from \$27 300 000 to \$26 700 000 in money terms, and the sum set aside for new primary and junior primary schools has been slashed from \$6 700 000 to \$1 800 000. The allocation for emergency housing and control of rents under the Housing Improvement Act has been cut from \$690 000 000 last year to \$630 000 this year.

The home handyman scheme to create employment was a former Budget priority (a stated priority of this Government) but has now been axed: there is no allocation, and it was overspent in 1981-82. Price control has been cut in money and real terms at a time of rising inflation and when the Premier wants a wages freeze. Funding for the Corporate Affairs Commission has been cut in real terms, when there is a pressing need for investigations to identify tax cheats. The allocation for the Technological Change Review Council, one of the boasts of the Minister of Industrial Affairs, has been cut in money terms, and further in real terms. Consumer services, under the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs, have been cut back in money and real terms.

In regard to smaller items, such as the electric car, nothing was paid. Is this because the project was wound up in any case? The Department of Trade and Industry allocation has been cut in real terms, at a time when one would have thought that the Government would be intent on trying to stimulate economic activity in the State.

They are some of the losers of this Budget. Who are some of the winners? There is the State Development Office of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet: it has had a huge money and real increase. It would appear that the Minister of Industrial Affairs is losing out at present in his rivalry with the Premier, compounding the confusion that already exists in this area. The research branch of the Premier's Department has done very well (the Parliamentary candidates are parked there at present) with a 19 per cent or 20 per cent real increase. Private schools have received a 17.5 per cent increase. The Agent-General and his staff in London have had a further allocation. The country electricity subsidy has increased sharply.

This Budget is little more than rather dismal confession of failure and incompetence. It demonstrates clearly that

any strategy that the Government may have once had for confronting the State's problems is now non-existent. Indeed, it would appear that economic reality has overtaken the very simplistic theories of Government action that the Premier brought to his office. It is interesting that that has occurred in a year when we have seen exactly the same process taking place at the Federal level in Treasurer Howard's recent Budget.

The priorities which this Government set itself are now largely forgotten: they have been thrown out the window. Let us think back to those early Budgets. At the centre of those priorities was the bold new initiative to create 7 000 jobs and the pay-roll tax incentives for youth employment, but less and less has been heard about that and less and less has been spent in that direction. Indeed, the unfortunate absence of the Auditor-General's Report means that we cannot be sure what was done this year, and the lumping together of a number of initiatives under the one heading in this Budget makes it equally difficult to assess what will happen in the future.

One thing is certain—from July 1979 to July 1982, for which period the latest Bureau of Statistics figures are available, on a proper seasonal comparison South Australian employment decreased by 5 600. No doubt if it was not for the obvious political significance, the so-called bold new initiatives would have been scrapped some time ago. I will give two other examples. In 1979-80, the Premier listed as a further priority the need to support the depressed building and construction industry to the greatest extent possible. I have already described what happened to employment in that industry. That priority was supported by a cut in payments on works from \$226 100 000, to \$196 900 000, and to \$180 900 000 in the last financial year. That was the priority.

Then, in his second Budget, in 1980-81, the Premier listed as a priority, under the series of dotted, highlighted information that he produces in every Budget, the home handyman scheme for unemployed youth. That scheme was starved of funds in last year's Budget and has now been scrapped. One wonders how long the latest list of priorities will last. The Premier has tried hard to bury the evidence of his incompetence, but throughout this document we find constant reference to matters that were badly handled, and the truth is that the Premier's performance was somewhat less than his press releases of the time suggested. Indeed, his performance as a Premier has cost this State dearly.

Let us take a few examples. At page 45 of his Financial Statement, the Premier states:

The allocation of \$25 500 000 takes into account a special Commonwealth capital grant of \$10 000 000 [that will just cover what has been taken out of the reserves]; some additional funds for the authority's general upgrading programme which has been affected adversely by the Commonwealth's changed arrangements with respect to leverage leasing...

This comes as no surprise. In the Estimates Committees last year, the Minister of Transport said that the S.T.A. was planning to make full use of this means of acquiring capital equipment. But what is a surprise is the fact that now, hidden away in the end pages of his Financial Statement, we finally have an admission from the Premier that the Commonwealth Government's ending of leverage leasing has had an adverse effect on South Australia. Remember, it is not just the S.T.A. on which the admission is based: it has also caused severe problems in regard to ETSA, which had a similar financial arrangement, which was pre-empted by the hasty way in which Treasurer Howard cancelled those arrangements.

What happened when we first raised the problems in this area? I think this Budget is the final line of an extraordinary saga of incompetence and bluster from the Premier which,

in fact, goes back to that time in December last year when a statement he made was reported in the *Adelaide News*, under the heading 'Funding clamp not to hit South Australia', as follows:

A Federal Government clamp down of borrowing outside the Loan Council would not hit South Australia.

Yet here it is starkly in the Budget. We know what happened in the case of ETSA. Later in January this year, the Premier was finally apprised of the implications of what the Fraser Government was doing.

Throughout this time, I had been raising the issue and had written to Treasurer Howard concerning it. Finally, he was told that it would hit South Australia, so we had another headline in the *Adelaide News*. This time it stated, 'Tonkin takes fight to Canberra'. The thing that was not going to hit South Australia apparently now was something that he was going to take, as a fight, to Canberra, and we were told that the Premier would fight the Federal Government over South Australia's right to use private finance for South Australian projects, which he said was an unreasonable interference with the State's revenue-raising programmes. Of course, he failed abysmally to have any effect on the Federal Government and then switched his tack and once again denied that South Australia had suffered any effect on its programmes. Now, finally, we have the admission, in this Budget.

The Riverland cannery is specifically mentioned in the Financial Statement as requiring a special provision of \$13 500 000 to redeem commercial bills and make up receivership losses. In fact, it is likely that the total cost to the State of this Government's handling of the cannery will be in the vicinity of \$22 000 000.

The responsibility for whatever that final cost will be belongs to this Government, and this Government alone. The Premier was very keen to open the cannery expansion in October 1979, when he spoke in glowing terms of how the cannery would become a focal point of industry in the Riverland and give growers a golden opportunity. They are his words. He predicted it would actually expand its production and provide up to 200 additional jobs. Then there were problems and a special task force was assembled to look at them and to present a report. The receivership decision made by the Government pre-empted that report and any opportunity to assess the situation and do something about it. Now we are faced with the sort of deficit revealed in the Budget, which understates what in fact may well be the true deficit, and it appears that there is no way ahead for the cannery and its future. The Premier is fond of claiming that former Governments were guilty of waste and mismanagement. Perhaps he might explain what he plans to do about this increasing debt.

Then there is the southern boat ramp, where the amount of money, of course, is not so great but it is a good small example of equally appalling incompetence. On page 17 of the Financial Statement, referring to capital payments from the Minister of Marine, we see that the expenditure was below estimate in part because of the delay in finalising a site for the establishment of recreational boating facilities for the southern area. Three years after the Labor Government was ready to go on that project, boat owners in the south are still waiting.

What are the implications of this Budget for the economy? I believe they are very grave. Three years of Liberal Government and three years of this Premier in charge of the Treasury has put South Australia in a critical financial position. Enormous damage is being done to the Government's ability to provide growth and development by the constant use of capital works funds to pay for the running costs of the State. In the past, the Premier has claimed that this was a temporary measure until royalty income, for instance, made up the leeway, but last year royalty income

did not meet the Government's optimistic predictions, and the amount hoped for this year will of course go nowhere near making up for the \$141 000 000 that will have been taken away from capital works. Nobody can believe that, whatever might happen in the Cooper Basin or in the State's north, royalties will increase by that amount in the foreseeable future.

Clearly, the Premier is storing up problems for future Governments. He is going to leave them with very little financial room in which to move, particularly as 1982-83, 1983-84 and 1984-85 will be crunch years for the smaller States, because the growth of Commonwealth funds will be lower than it was this year and the phasing in of the relativities review will eat into our allocations. It is probably little wonder, given this bleak outlook, that the Premier chose this year to provide very little in the way of economic forecasts in the Budget. Certainly, we have been provided with an additional paper on the economy, and I will deal with that in detail in a moment. But let me say straight away that it is also vague when it comes to actually trying to predict what our circumstances will be like next year and the year after.

Members will recall just last week, in the face of predictions of a dramatic increase in unemployment contained in the Federal Budget, Treasurer Howard's own figures, and I asked the Premier what he expected for this State. As has become typical, he refused to directly answer that question. If he has a prediction, he is not prepared to reveal it, or alternatively, he simply has not collected the information or done the work necessary to make it. There is no doubt that this Budget's effect on the South Australian economy will be to add to recessionary pressure. We have been carefully fed the line this year that the State Government has no real control, but where it can do something, particularly in the building and construction area, it has for three successive Budgets cut back in money terms, and in this, its final Budget, it has allocated an increase, certainly, but well below that needed to cover inflation. The Budget also directly reduces employment, at a time when total South Australian employment is falling. However, while from the Premier we often hear of the concept of the multiplier effect of jobs in some industries, we have no indication of those effects resulting from the large decline in public sector employment. How many additional jobs are lost through the policies of this Government in its budgetary management?

**Mr Oswald:** It hasn't lost any.

**Mr BANNON:** I will give the honourable member the figures. I mentioned earlier that South Australia's employment has fallen over the past three years, and over the past 12 months from July 1981 to July 1982 it has declined by 4 500. I suggest that the honourable member seek out the 4 500 and have a chat to them about the success of the Premier in increasing the number of jobs in the State. From July 1979 to July 1982 there has also been a job loss of some thousands.

In view of this, it is quite extraordinary to see, on page 33 of the Financial Statement, a prediction that pay-roll tax collections will improve due to a 'further modest increase in employment during the year'. What increase? It appears that the Premier is allowing his need to justify himself politically to get in the way of his responsibility to properly manage the State's economy. That brings me to the paper we have on the South Australian economy. We welcome the idea behind this paper, but I suggest it contains some glaring omissions. On the credit side, it certainly undermines the Premier's rhetoric of his years in Opposition about the causes of South Australia's problems, and in particular the effect on our economy of public sector growth. Indeed, that Treasury document makes clear that in 1978-79 the main

determinants of our economic downturn were a weaker national demand for motor vehicles, closure by the Federal Government of the Whyalla shipyards, and, later, the poor rural seasons.

It also puts the record straight regarding unemployment and shows, at page 15, that the average unemployment rate in 1979 was lower than in the three succeeding years under a Tonkin Liberal Government—1980, 1981 and 1982. I suggest members look at those figures, supplied by the Treasury. It also shows that the figures brought into this House by the Minister of Environment and Planning recently concerning our population were based solely on the fact that this State has received a well above average proportion of Indo-Chinese refugees compared to any other. In terms of migration between the States we have had a record 15 600 exodus over the period of this Government's term in office.

On the debit side, this economic survey from the Treasury makes no acknowledgement of the impact of capital works cuts on the economy. It neglects to give the latest figures which are available on home building approvals, possibly because they show that there has been a very significant fall in the last quarter.

It does not make use of the more accurate indicator of building commencements. Finally, it does contain a useful warning to the Premier and the Minister of Industrial Affairs against making unseasonal comparisons between different months of different years. We will all be aware of the comparison of August 1979 with various months of the current year, and in fact this document points out why that particular month of August has been chosen when the Government was not, in fact, elected until September. The answer is simply that the month of August each year is what is described as a seasonal employment trough which would artificially inflate any employment growth which might have happened since.

This is a Budget of which any conservative Government in the 1930s would have been proud. And it is likely that it will be as relevant to the problems of the 1980s as those documents were to what followed in the 1930s. It has no new ideas. It has no strategy for overcoming our problems. It presents no comprehensive plan for growth and development in South Australia.

Where are the plans for job creation? Where are the policies to stop small business bankruptcies, which are standing at record levels—small business which is universally recognised as being an area with enormous potential to create jobs. Where are the plans to ensure that the declining level of home ownership in South Australia is turned around? Fewer people now are home owners proportionately than were under previous Governments.

Where are the plans to restore building activity? Certainly the cuts in the past three Budgets have now ended, but the increase in public works activity may well be too little and too late for the many self-employed tradesmen, small builders and others who are going through the bankruptcy court in the coming year. None of this will be found in this Budget. It has been produced by a Government whose only aim is to ensure that the real dimensions of its failure are obscured as much as possible from the electorate it will soon have to face.

South Australia needs a new direction. It needs a Government willing to accept its responsibility to give a lead to the community. It needs a Government which is totally committed to getting this State back to work. I have already outlined our alternative economic strategy which will now be even more vital in the face of this abysmal Budget.

I have made our priorities clear: building, construction, housing—an area in which we can have an immediate impact and which can immediately generate jobs; small business, tourism, high technology—the new areas of growth

which will need to be assisted and developed in every way possible by the Government. We will not stand back or get out of the way of business but establish once again the partnership between the public and private sector which was the hallmark of development in South Australia over many years.

Now that we have the Premier's Budget, we will be better able to develop these proposals so that they may be put to the people in detail whenever the election is called. However, one thing is clear, and that is that South Australia has been running under a deficit for three years and that the Premier has performed some amazing contortions to avoid admitting that simple fact.

If that is the reality of our financial structure after three years of Liberal Government, then we may as well clearly admit it. If it is necessary to operate a deficit, then ensure that we use it to maximise economic activity, to stimulate growth and so get some return through increased State revenues and business activity.

When I began I said this was the fourth Tonkin Budget of extraordinary dishonesty, a Budget designed to mislead the South Australian electorate in an election year. It is now clear that the major hope for South Australia's economy and South Australia's State finances is that the fourth Tonkin Budget be the last.

**Mr McRAE (Playford):** I fully support the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition and the excellent analysis of the State Budget which he gave. Presented with the Budget papers for the first time this year (and one of the few matters on which we can congratulate the Treasurer) was an appraisal of the South Australian economy prepared by the Treasurer at his request in August 1982. One of the problems about this document is that wherever it deals with non-controversial areas it is an excellent and informative document, a very illuminating one. However, when it has to turn towards controversial areas it either cuts the matter completely short or uses some of the policies of the present Government to overcome rational difficulties that would otherwise have arisen. There are two simple examples of that that can be given.

The first is headed 'World Economic Trends' at .4 on page 8, where the whole of the discussion was divided into four paragraphs. There can be no more significant topic than world international trends and it is at that point that I wish to commence my remarks. I have before me two documents, one from John Langmore, a member of the staff of the Parliamentary Labor Party in the Federal Parliament which was published in the *Journal of Australian Political Economy* in June this year, and an extract from an interview in *Der Spiegel* with Professor John Kenneth Galbraith. I carefully have two different sources so it cannot be said that I have chosen sources which will produce the answer that I wanted. In his paper, Langmore summarises the position as follows:

The monetarist approach of recent years, even when modified by electoral pragmatism, has failed to reduce inflation significantly and has suppressed economic growth, causing higher unemployment. The assumptions underlying Australian monetarism are misguided.

In his article Langmore does draw a distinction between what might be termed extreme monetarism as practiced by Reagan and also by the Thatcher Administration and that which is being practised in Australia, but, nonetheless, the underlying theory is the same. The plain fact of the matter is that the modified monetarism present in Australia at the moment would not have been modified if Treasury had its way. God knows, the Federal Budget was bad enough for the average Australian but it would have been far, far worse had the Federal Treasury had its way.

Contrary to the State Treasury paper, Langmore does in fact identify the current causes of Western economic disorder. He finds them, as does Galbraith, in the inflation that took off in the 1960s. Langmore says:

The causes were complex. Rapid economic growth in many countries increased inflationary demand-pull pressures. Rapidly rising demand for commodities, to which the Vietnam War and the Russian harvest failure of 1972-73 contributed, led to sharp increases in commodity prices. U.S. deficit financing of the Vietnam War led to balance of payments surpluses in other countries, some of which did not manage their money supply effectively, so enabling faster inflation. The results of the formation of OPEC on oil prices are well known. Money wages began to grow more rapidly in many countries in the late sixties partly to compensate for increasing tax payments as employees moved into higher tax brackets. The collapse of the system of fixed exchange rates added to uncertainty and contributed to growing inflationary expectations.

There is one thing which I consider to be absolutely essential, which is that Western democracies should group together and produce the equivalent of a Bretton Woods agreement so that this never-ending procedure of currency revaluations and devaluations can be held under some reasonable and modest control. Langmore went on to explain:

Most Western Governments responded by imposing contractionary policies and the boom collapsed in 1974-75. Inflation fell but remained much higher than in previous decades and unemployment snowballed.

He continued:

In countries which have adopted monetarist policies there is little or no growth.

That is appropriate in Australian terms. He continues:

In Britain average real income has fallen for two years, unemployment has risen to 11.5 per cent and even inflation has increased.

We can bear in mind that the one positive argument for Friedman economics is that if nothing else happens, inflation can be held down. Even that predication has not been true. He further states:

The U.S. is still to feel the full impact of Reaganomics—the pincer of Friedmanite monetary policy combined with regressive and militarist, though in part expansionary, supply side fiscal policy. The principal results so far have been 10 000 000 unemployed people, widespread deprivation, historically high interest rates and a military establishment whose greed for funds has grown even as it has been fed. Australia was one of the innovating countries with monetarist doctrine, though Fraser's pragmatism has saved him from the excesses of his doctrinaire, regressive ideology.

However, ordinary Australians have still suffered. It is interesting to turn to John Kenneth Galbraith in his landmark interview with *Der Spiegel*. I have referred to this article in the House before wherein Galbraith urged a massive reduction in U.S. military spending and the elimination of tax cuts to bring down the Budget deficit, to reduce interest rates, and enhance world-wide economic growth. The professor, who must rank as one of the great economists of the last two centuries, characterised Friedman as an economist of the eighteenth century. To use his precise words:

Friedman is hurting capitalism more than I do. He is an eighteenth century economist. He assails assertions that heavy social welfare spending is responsible for high Government deficits.

Galbraith takes the realistic viewpoint that although he is conservative, and would not share a lot of Langmore views, there is a necessity for Government intervention in many areas. Significantly, Galbraith's position was summed up this way:

Professor Galbraith rejected again the Administration's supply-side economic theory as a cover designed to secretly funnel more money to the rich.

We are well aware of what has been going on in Australia. He continues:

Ronald Reagan was elected with the backing of the richest people in the United States. These people want above all one thing: to pay less taxes.

Do not we know that in Australia? I will come to that in a moment. He continues:

But since one cannot admit openly in a modern 20th century society that one wants to do something for the rich, one consequently has to cover it up.

Again, how true that is. It further states:

The way the administration portrays its policy is: 'We are doing something for the rich but not for the rich people's sake because it encourages these lazy people to a bigger effort'.

The lazy people are, of course, the ordinary people in the community. He further states:

The present made to the rich is concealed behind the words incentive to effort. President Reagan, he asserts, is an advocate of the theory of helping the rich in the belief that their spending will assure growth and thus indirectly help the poor. Professor Galbraith says he stands for an alternative way of thinking, aimed at helping the poor without using the rich as go-betweens.

Certainly I agree with that approach. Let us turn, having looked at the international scene and having noted that although Fraser has adopted a more pragmatic approach to his extremely conservative and regressive ideology, nonetheless, he is matched in fundamental belief with both Reagan in the United States and Thatcher, to look at the real situation in our own country.

The facts are that, ever since Mr Fraser took office, unemployment has risen rapidly and has remained high. In March of this year 460 000 people were officially described as unemployed by the Australian Bureau of Statistics. Of course, we all know that the methods that the bureau uses are such as to disguise certain of the unemployed from the figures. In that same period interest rates on housing loans had risen by 4 per cent in the last two years and other interest rates by more. Taxes are at their highest level in Australian history, yet social security payments and community services have not been improved and, in many cases, have deteriorated. In fact, I can say quite clearly that in real money terms the average wage-earner is worse off now than he was seven years ago and the person relying upon social security, except in certain isolated instances, is worse off than he or she was seven years ago.

Really, it is hard to take seriously any longer Mr Fraser's purported statement that he has a way out of the predicament in which we find ourselves in Australia. I certainly agree with the State Treasury paper which says that South Australia is locked into Federal policies. The other point I want to make is that in this same period of record unemployment and record taxation, we have had a record lack of real growth. In fact, the real g.n.p. grew by only 2.9 in 1980-81 on Federal Government figures. That is the crux of the whole problem. That highlights the failure of the existing policies. One cannot escape from high unemployment and high inflation without getting a real growth into the system. Again it is interesting to see how others in the community have reacted to the Federal Budget. I will deal with this briefly before returning to our own State Budget.

I felt, as the speaker following the Leader of the Opposition, that I should attempt to put into a different perspective what the Premier put before us as a supposedly completely independent document from the Treasury. I make quite clear that that is no reflection on Treasury officials by me. I believe we have excellent Treasury officials in this State. However, I wonder how much of the draft document was sent. I ask a big question on that. It is interesting to note, in the *National Times* analysis of the Budget on 22 August of this year, that Brian Toohey (one of its regular columnists) summed up the matter in the following way:

The pervasive mood underlying last Tuesday's Budget is one of helplessness. The economy is careening towards the cliff edge and the Government has taken its hands off the wheel. The prospects for unemployment are the worst since the Depression. There is no improvement in sight for either inflation or interest rates. The message is one of decay instead of growth. Yet the Government, in a new phase of fatalism, has washed its hands of any responsibility for the direction of the economy.

Instead, in the Budget it has contented itself with palliatives for many of those hurt by an economy on the rampage.

The tax cuts, mortgage rebates, and pension increases are fine of themselves, even if motivated by a none-too-subtle attempt to massage the electorate into a forgiving mood.

What is disturbing is that there appears to be no economic strategy behind the Budget. Its overall impact on the economy appears to be zero. The rush to the precipice is allowed to go unchecked.

That is putting in another way what the financial editor of the *Age* said. He stated that it was one of the most extraordinary Federal Budgets on record in that the Government simply threw up its hands in despair and said, 'We just do not know what to do except to try to kid people into a situation where we can go to an election and hold on to the reigns of power for another three years in the hope that something might come out of it.'

Since then we have had the Costigan Report, which has produced some explosive revelations, with a lot more to come. I want to repeat in this State the challenge that the Labor Party has made, namely, that the Government, not through the Department of the Corporate Affairs Commission but through an independent inquiry, set up an investigation immediately concerning what is going on in South Australia. Let the Government heed what the Prime Minister said on radio last night when he invited members of the Labor Party who were part of these corrupt schemes to leave the Party. Mind you, I think he was playing a dangerous game there, because he would be seeing them leave by the train load. However, I will refer again to that matter later.

The reality of this whole situation is that the State Government realises that because of the impact of the Costigan Report the Federal Government's strategy has now changed so that the State's Budget (again, like its Federal counterpart) is a palliative, designed to trick people and put them into the mood, along with other things which I will refer to in a moment, for an election in late November or early December. The Opposition is well aware of that prospect, is well prepared for it, and is waiting for it: it is about time things were changed.

In regard to the Costigan Report, it should not be thought that Mr Costigan is a rampaging radical. Far from it: he is a very serious minded, very highly regarded Melbourne silk. He is a person who has astonished those who appointed him by doing his job too well. I point out to the entire House that the reality is that it was not unreal on the part of those holding high office to take into account the fact that the headquarters of major companies are normally in Sydney and Melbourne, and are on the gradual increase in Brisbane. Therefore, one would expect that investigators would be homing in on those centres. To me, it has now become quite evident that it was obvious all along that, if one were running these tax avoidance schemes, Perth was the place in which to do it. Another place in which to do it is Adelaide—an obvious place in which to do it.

My answer to the question of whether it is happening here is 'Yes'. In a very short survey of my own profession I found out that there were at least a dozen big firms in this city existing on nothing but tax avoidance schemes alone, that is, the whole of their practices are made up of tax avoidance schemes, and they are quite proud of it. I spoke to one gentleman in particular (I will not mention his name), who was quite honest about the whole matter. He could not see anything wrong with it. What horrified him was the question of retrospectivity, the fact that the Prime Minister had been forced into a situation of ordering retrospective application. The learned gentleman to whom I refer had dashed straight to Canberra to lobby Senators from South Australia to stop this dreadful thing happening, because, of course, it would explode in the face of this

man's firm and in the faces of those people who have been cheating the public.

Let there be no doubt about this matter. According to the Hayden figures, between \$10 000 000 000 and \$15 000 000 000 has been removed from the legitimate tax funds of this nation. Working on the lower figure, it means that South Australia has lost \$1 000 000 000, and we know how desperately South Australia needs that money. I do not make this assumption, and I just put a question mark alongside it, but let us assume for a moment that Mr Hayden is 50 per cent wrong and that the figure is not \$10 000 000 000, but \$5 000 000 000: the fact is that this State would have lost \$500 000 000 of desperately needed revenue. Something must be done about this mess. It will not go away, and I say that any reputable Government in this State, on either side of politics, should immediately launch an inquiry.

It cannot be done through the Corporate Affairs Branch of the Attorney-General's Department for the reason that that branch has been so downgraded it is no longer capable of doing it. It is in the same disgraceful situation as that of the Department of Business and Consumer Affairs, which has also been downgraded. Therefore, independent consultants such as McCabe and La Franchi are required. As far as I know those gentlemen are available. Let us get them over here to check out the matter. After all, Adelaide is a much smaller city and the allegations can be brought home and the people identified. The words of wisdom of Professor Alfred McCoy were, 'If you have a criminal or corrupt person, the best way to turn the heat on him is to put publicity on him.' I think it is worth repeating that very wise advice.

So far as the State Budget is concerned, the Leader said just about everything that could be said about it. In the first place I note that it is a very dishonest document. It is dishonest in a number of ways which were set out by the Leader, and I will not attempt to exhaustively list those matters. The fact of the matter is that in the Budget documents, as in previous documents, an attempt has been made to convince the electors of South Australia that they have been given what was promised to them in 1979. That is wrong, it is blatantly wrong, and blatantly dishonest.

Secondly, it is part of a contrived and elaborate manoeuvre to set up what the Liberal Party hopes will be a favourable electoral climate in late November or early December of this year. We on the Opposition side are well aware of the tactics, which are first of all to produce a dishonest document such as the one now before us, to get the press on side and to get the people convinced that the Government is handling the economy well, to try to persuade them (if that is possible, but it is a very tough job) that what was promised in 1979 has been given. The next step is to go out and to barn storm so that the Government (to use the words of one of the authors that I mentioned earlier) can massage the people a little.

For instance, we know of the impending opening of the Hilton Hotel, which I might point out was not established by the present Government. Also, there is the impending opening of the international airport, for which the Government can legitimately take credit. We also know of the junkets that will go on between here and Singapore and between here and Auckland. We know of the trade fair, or whatever it will be called, to be held at the airport in mid-October. One can piece all these things together and simply say that the Government, under the cover of all these dishonest moves, is now proceeding well on its way to again attempt to con the people of South Australia. I do not believe that it will succeed in that venture.

I have very little time in which to conclude my remarks. One matter to which I have been drawing attention in this

House for a little over three years now and which I again draw to the attention of the House concerns the question of compensation for injuries resulting from criminal acts. This year \$650 000 has been allocated. Last year \$642 000 was spent, after \$500 000 was allocated. The reality is that people in the community are sick and tired of the situation whereby victims of crime (who are really just the victims of a lottery in the same way that work accident victims are victims of a lottery—they happen to be in the wrong place at the wrong time) are receiving peanuts, and I refer to the fact that they can receive a maximum payment of \$10 000. Tom Loftus, in his article in the *News* of Wednesday 25 August, set out the whole thing in its context very well.

This Government, before the last election, told the people of South Australia that it would make the streets safe for the people of South Australia to walk in. What a joke! The crime rate, since this Government has taken office, has escalated by a staggering figure, an unbelievable figure, of nearly 200 per cent increase in serious crime. I have always been the first to say that the Liberal Party was stupid anyway to attempt to point the finger at governments of the day as being the major contributing factor towards the increase in crime. The reasons for the increase in crime rates are terribly complex and I have dealt with them before.

What I do want to point the finger at the Liberal Party for is this: having noted the escalation of the crime rate, having noted that more and more people are being hurt, having promised that it would do something for the victims of crime, it has done nothing. I blame it even more when, as Tom Loftus points out in his report, the real difference between a criminal injury situation and a road traffic or worker situation is that in the case of a criminal injury situation the victim has to rely outright on Government funds. In the case of the work accident or the road accident, the victim is able to rely on insurance funds.

I point the finger at the Liberal Government because it has failed to take up the challenge that I have offered three times at least in this House. By the introduction of a very small surcharge on every wage-earner in this State we could supply compensation for the victims of crime at the existing level of workers compensation. I have not had the figures checked since the new workers compensation figures came into effect on the 1 July this year, but my old figure was in the order of \$1 per year per wage-earning South Australian with a \$1 for \$1 contribution by the Government. A scheme administered by the State Government Insurance Office would profligate such a result, and Tom Loftus was perfectly correct in saying that society is very harsh indeed when it treats the victims of crime in such a manner. He calls them 'the forgotten victims of crime', and indeed they are.

How unfair it is that one can be injured at work, through no fault of his own, or injured on the road through no fault of his own and be compensated because there is an insurance scheme. Yet, if one goes to the rescue of someone who is attempting to rape a woman or someone who is attempting to rob a bank or to beat another man senseless in a bar-room brawl and if, by going to their rescue, that person is beaten or shot and suffers serious injuries, he will receive this ridiculous figure of \$10 000. And let us not assume that the \$10 000 is received for anything except the greatest level of injuries. As my time is almost complete I would merely like to say that I have attempted to put the Leader's remarks, which I fully support, in an international and national context. I completely agree with him that we are dealing with a most dishonest document which should shock the House and the community.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Baudin):** If one turns one's attention to the section of the Budget which deals with land, one notes that the Minister of lands had voted to him, in

the 1981-82 Budget \$20 297 000 and that the proposed expenditure for this year is \$21 357 000 despite the additional responsibilities which now come to the Minister of Lands, because he now carries the title of Minister of Aboriginal Affairs. Earlier today the Minister indicated to us that there had been some increase in staffing available to the Pastoral Board. It is pretty obvious that there is to be no further increase in staffing in the light of those figures that we have before us. I believe that the people of South Australia, and all of those who are concerned for the health of our pastoral lands, owe a debt of gratitude to the *Advertiser Extra* reports, to whom I referred early today in Question Time, for the amount of information that they have been able to obtain concerning the condition of the pastoral lands and problems that have existed from time to time over the years in the administration of these lands.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** And how well they have—

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** Let me remind the Minister of Agriculture and his absent colleague, the Minister of Lands, that the matters before the South Australian public at present are not matters dreamed up by politicians or by a couple of reporters. Indeed, they are matters which have been conveyed to those people by the head of a Government department and the Chairman of the Pastoral Board (Mr Vickery). If we turn our attention to the report in the *Advertiser*, I will detail to the House some of the charges brought forward by these reporters (Robert Ball and Julie Gregory), based as they are on statements by Mr Vickery and on documents made available to these people. A passage from the report in the *Advertiser* states:

Investigations by *Extra* also show that:

The board has failed to implement its policy of reducing the number of sub-standard leases it has identified as too small to make a living.

This failure has forced many small pastoralists to overstock to stay financially viable.

The board has been loath to enforce penalties against pastoralists because of a system which requires Ministerial approval.

Most board members refused to involve themselves in a top-level interdepartmental inquiry (the Vickery report) which led to the recent ill-fated Pastoral Amendment Act Bill.

The board traditionally aligns itself with the pastoral industry and has at times failed to make decisions on breaches of the Act.

The board has failed to act on a 1979 report from one of its members urging immediate policy action over the future of at least twenty stations found too small to be economic. This report adds that finance from Government drought relief schemes to such stations "may serve only to perpetuate the problem . . ."

The board lacks technical and budgetary resources adequately to monitor land and ensure proper management.

Responsibility for arid land management is divided among several Government departments, resulting in a fragmented approach to such issues as degradation and vermin control.

And the report goes on to say (and I hope this is wrong):

It is also believed that moves are under way to reintroduce the recently defeated Pastoral Act Amendment Bill.

Elsewhere in this report other statements are made, some being direct quotes from Mr Vickery, others as a result of observation and a good deal of investigation. There is little doubt that one of the problems is that the stocking levels which have been set by the Pastoral Board, in many instances, are too high. It is believed that about 75 per cent of those levels, on average, would be a reasonable stocking rate. The problem, as Mr Vickery mentioned to these journalists, is that the maximum tends to become the minimum; that people stock up to their rate. Who could blame those who are saddled with an uneconomic area?

This of course brings us to the other point of the argument, and that is how slowly the board has moved to amalgamate uneconomic units, though it is the stated policy of the board that it should do so. There seems to have been no proper machinery adopted to ensure that this should be the case. I can assure honourable members opposite that people who

know the land well know that the statement that the Minister made this afternoon is really quite laughable. Of course, the general condition of the arid lands is always affected by the climatic conditions. In the arguments over the Pastoral Bill, to which I have previously referred, the whole matter was obscured by the impact of seasonal conditions on pastoral lands as opposed to tenure conditions on pastoral lands.

There are those who argue that a change of tenure, say, in relation to certain leases in New South Wales, has had an enormously beneficial effect on the condition of their lands, when, in fact, it could be demonstrated that the change of tenure had been followed by very good seasons, and that that had had that effect. I will concede that it is sometimes difficult to separate, on the one hand, the impact of weather conditions and, on the other hand, the impact of tenure and the way in which that affects the management of the arid lands.

But there is little doubt that a significant area of the arid North is degraded and that it has been degraded for a long time. There is also little doubt that too little has been done to reverse that unfortunate trend and that it is up to the Government of the day, whichever Party is in power, to reverse this drastic trend. We will wait with a great deal of interest to hear the statement of the Minister of Lands when he obtains the report from his departmental head on Friday or sometime this week. To give him his due, no doubt the Minister will have to present that report to cabinet on Monday and then some sort of statement will be required.

What I say to the Minister of Agriculture and his colleagues is that something rather more than a purely cosmetic approach is required. For example, regarding the legislation which was introduced into this place not so very long ago, I am told that some people in the industry are very, very disappointed that the Government fouled it up by writing the change of tenure conditions into that legislation. There is no doubt that there were things in the legislation that would have been of some benefit to the industry, but it was all mixed up with the apparently ideological hang-up that this Government has in relation to land ownership. Of course, we know what eventually happened to the Bill because the Minister insisted on trying to get it through the Upper House.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** He was mucked up by the Labor Party, and you know it.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** I am afraid that members of the Government are demonstrating that they have learned absolutely nothing from the exercise that we went through a while ago. All of the evidence that was available to us as decision-makers in this place from people who are professionally involved with the arid lands, from people who know what has to be done, was that the tenure question should be left alone. There was no problem for pastoralists in relation to the administration of the lands, because of the nature of the present tenure system. Many other things have to be done.

First, the Pastoral Board should carry out its policing function. In relation to the introduction of the breathalyser and random breath testing, it was said that one or two well publicised prosecutions would have an enormous deterrent effect: it is being said now in relation to the administration of the arid lands that one or two well publicised prosecutions would have a similar beneficial effect on the industry as a whole. As I indicated earlier today in illustration of the question that I put to the Minister, people in the pastoral industry, in effect, are saying, 'Why should we have to do in our neighbours? Why should we have to draw to the attention of the board these problems and the overstocking that is occurring?' It is the board's responsibility and it must be given the resources necessary to do the job.

It is quite obvious to me that the additional resources to which the Minister has referred, and which will not be further topped up (if the figures in the Budget can be believed), will not be sufficient to do the job. This brings me back to one of the statements that was made by the Extra team—the statement about the division of responsibility for arid land management and the fragmented approach to these issues. One of the matters to which the Minister referred in his reply to me earlier today was the problem of the degradation of land caused by feral animals and by the native species. Of course, there have been problems from time to time in this area, and the goat problem is well known. However, this Government has made clear to me on one or two occasions (and I once received a very informative answer from the Minister of Agriculture) that, in fact, considerable inroads have been made on the goat population, particularly in the Flinders Range, and I am gratified about that. I am also told that, although rabbits have been a problem from time to time in the arid North, they do not appear to be a serious problem right now.

In any event, let us accept the contention that there is competition for scarce resources between feral animals, the native species, and domestic stock of one sort or another. That is merely to highlight the problem: it does not answer it, which is what the Minister seemed to be assuming this afternoon. If, in fact, there is degradation to an area because of native species, this Government or someone else has to make the decision about what are the implications of that for us and in regard to the management of the arid lands. Does it mean that we reduce the native species or the stocking levels? At present, of course, the machinery is not available to take account of that, because the Department of Environment and Planning tries to handle the problems in regard to the native species, and the Minister of Lands and his department are responsible for the setting of the stocking levels.

I asked a question this afternoon about the possible radical reconstruction or even disbandment of the Pastoral Board, and that has long been Labor Party policy. We believe that it would be better that both of these matters, the overall ecological balance and the stocking and human development and exploitation of the region, should be administered by the one department. That would certainly mean a drastic change in the Pastoral Board as it is presently constructed. I throw out that suggestion to the Government to take up. The Government can do what it will with that suggestion. I believe that the Government will do very little and that it will see the present Pastoral Board as being an appropriate way of administering those lands. If there is any doubt, I would suggest that those doubts have largely been dispelled by the revelations now before us, and I understand that there are more to come.

This is an important matter. When I first came into the shadow portfolio of environment and planning, it became pretty obvious to me before very long that the two most sensitive areas, for a variety of reasons, were, on the one hand, the Adelaide Hills, where there is a classic impact of suburban dwellings and the highest rainfall of this State, containing a good deal of what is left of the States sclerophyll forests, and that sort of thing, and on the other hand the arid lands: I recognised that they were the two areas that would occupy a great deal of my attention. It is becoming increasingly clear that, of the two areas, problems in relation to the arid lands are more important.

On the wall in my office there is a map of the remaining natural vegetation areas of the agricultural lands: there is no complementary map, as far as I am aware, for the area north of Goyder's line, and there should be. Landsat imagery makes all of this possible now.

There should be a proper inventory of the natural resources of the pastoral and arid North of the State. That inventory should be immediately available to those responsible for the administration of the pastoral aspects of the North. It is not immediately available, because (as we are told in this report) of the fragmented nature of the administration as it exists at present. I will be returning to this theme as this Parliamentary session unfolds but, as I have said, we have had highlighted to us an enormous problem, a problem of neglect going back many years, and one which, now that it has been revealed in its enormity, cannot simply be swept under the carpet.

We will not be seeking to in any way evade the issue, although some of the trouble occurred during the time of the Labor Government Administration. I invite this Government also not to evade the issue but to take it up and properly address it, because, after all, it is proper that the pastoral lands be exploited. I am not one of those environmentalists who believe that we should keep all human activity out of such areas, but let the Government think of pastoral activity in much the same way as in a largely bipartisan way we think of exploitation of the resources of the sea, the fishery.

We have an elaborate and sophisticated system for trying to ensure that the resources of the sea are not seriously depleted. We understand that the ocean's capacity to be able to replenish its own resources is limited; there is a point beyond which we cannot go. The same is very much true in the arid lands, and Dr Lange, of the Botany Department of the university, who has been tireless for years in exposing these problems, first drew to my attention at a public meeting the parallel that can exist between, on the one hand, the elaborate and rather costly machinery we have for ensuring that there is not over-exploitation of our ocean resources and, on the other hand, the rudimentary and under-funded machinery we have available for control and administration of the pastoral lands. I want to refer now to other things in the Budget, but I serve notice on the Government that I will be returning to this theme again and again in this session.

A little while ago, perhaps rather thankfully, I took off the hat I had been wearing as acting shadow Minister of Transport for the Opposition and, although I found the matter interesting, I am not sorry to see my colleague the member for Spence taking over that responsibility. I do not know that I made too much of a noise about the area when I had it. One matter that I highlighted in this Chamber was the fact that the amount of information available to the general public in relation to the public transport system was not all that marvellous. In particular, I instanced the fact that the metropolitan transport map was out of print and people simply could not get it. I would like to illustrate that problem in an anecdotal sort of way.

Recently I wanted to visit my parents, who live only at Prospect, but, of course, I live down in the wilds of Morphett Vale. It was on a sitting day but I had a little time in the morning. I did not bring my car to town, so it was a matter of using public transport. I worked out from the North Gawler time table that I had at home that there was a train that left for Dudley Park at 10.2 a.m. I got to the station at about 10 minutes to 10, looked up, and there was no scheduled 10.2 train stopping at Dudley Park.

I said to the Man in Blue, 'Can I have a North Gawler time table?' He said, 'I am afraid you cannot have one, because they are out of print.' That is something for the Minister straight away. Not only is the State transport map out of print, but the North Gawler railway time table is also out of print. I do not know whether the member for Salisbury has lost his time table or whether he has the information in his head, but there are not any more time

tables, if the honourable member or any of his constituents want one, until there is another print. I said, 'What about this 10.2 train?' He said, 'That does not go. You must have been dealing with an out-of-date time table.'

I looked at the board and noticed that an express to Dry Creek was going in about four minutes time. I asked whether I could catch the express train to Dry Creek and catch a train (the 'milk run' that comes from Northfield) back to Dudley Park, stopping at all stations. He said, 'Yes, you can do that, but do not jump on the wrong train, because I think there is an express train coming in from North Gawler, last stop Dry Creek, before yours, so check.' I thought that, when I got to Dry Creek station, I would look at the time tables that they have plastered up on the iron shed, or whatever it is made of, and check.

I got to Dry Creek station and found that there were not any time tables up on the station. I do not know that there are time tables at any of the stations any more. I understand the problem. It is vandalism, a real cancer in our society, and it is difficult to know exactly how to address it. However, perhaps with a little more expenditure, with some sort of clear plastic or perspex around the front of these time tables, they may last longer than they have done in the past. There were a few people on the station platform, so I asked them. One lady said that she thought that the next one coming through was from North Gawler, and that was the one she was going to catch. She also said there would probably be one from Northfield two or three minutes after.

There was, and a young fellow who had been sitting on the platform said that he had been waiting for more than half an hour for a train that was going to stop, I think, at Ovingham or North Adelaide on its way to town. I must say that the trains were on time. I am not seeking to suggest that our trains run late or that there is a bad service. I am merely saying that information about them is hard to get. In due course, the train took me to Dudley Park, and I was able to visit my parents.

**Dr Billard:** You would like the new signs on the buses, then?

**The Hon D. J. HOPGOOD:** Let us come to buses, because that is how I finally got back in here. I worked out from the earlier time table what time I would have to walk back to Dudley Park to catch a train to town but, seeing I had been caught out by the same time table, I thought that there was no way that I was going to rely on there being any longer a 12.1 service to get me back to town, so I thought that the best thing to do would be to catch a bus. My mother dug out a time table, from which one has to do a calculation as to when the Wingfield bus would get somewhere in the vicinity of Bosanquet Avenue or LeHunte Avenue, or wherever the stop is, because the time table did not get down to that detail.

It seemed that I had just missed one and that it would be some time before I was able to get another. I decided to wander along Churchill Road to the Bosanquet Avenue stop. When I got there, there was the historic old sign to the Dudley Park station. I recalled that, in my youth, there had been a train time table there, so that those at the bus stop, with no bus coming and no way of knowing when the bus would arrive, would be able to examine this train time table and see whether it would be worth while whizzing to Dudley Park station and catching a train, which would perhaps give them 10 minutes start on the bus.

However, that time table was not there either, so I waited until a bus eventually arrived. Possibly, that was on time: I do not know, because I had no way of knowing when the bus was coming. If you are the member for Salisbury and regularly commute in on the same line day by day, or if you are the member for Baudin, regularly commuting from Lonsdale station, there is no problem. One gets used to the

way the trains run. On the other hand, if a person wants to use the bus or a train service that is unfamiliar, it is difficult to make use of these services.

**Dr Billard:** Or if you are a tourist.

**The Hon D. J. HOPGOOD:** If a person is a tourist, that is even more difficult. It is important, with what is a fairly good public transport system, particularly for people in the mid-ring and in the inner-suburban area, although it has some shortcomings for my constituents and probably for those of the member for Napier, that people know how to find their way around this system.

I think that train time tables should be put back on metropolitan railway stations and that bus time tables should be available in bus shelters. Where there are signs to railway stations, there should be a time table there and, certainly, time tables that are given out through the Man in Blue or wherever else should be up to date; they should not be out of print, and the metropolitan transport map should always be available to those people who want to find their way around the system.

It is difficult to seduce people from their motor cars and get them on to public transport. Once they have made the jump, they tend to stick to it. They get used to the system and how to operate within it. However, to get them out of motor cars is difficult and, if there is any excuse at all for using the motor vehicle, people will tend to do just that. It is a matter of having the information readily available and making it as simple as possible.

People have told me that they need a Ph.D to be able to understand time tables, particularly bus time tables. There are good and proper reasons why bus time tables have to be more complicated than train time tables—

**Dr Billard:** Is that why they called you?

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** I think one needs something better than a Ph.D sometimes to be able to understand these things.

I want to conclude on a matter of environment and planning, which will take up more of my time later in this debate, in grievance, and in other ways. That is a matter that I raised in the Budget debate last year and one that really has not been resolved to my satisfaction or, I would imagine, to the satisfaction of the people who have the whole environmental movement at heart. I refer to the capacity of the Minister of Environment and Planning to be able to acquire open space where it becomes available. I have searched through these papers and again I can find no amount of money set aside that would give the Minister a contingency fund for such acquisition.

No-one is suggesting that, after the great deal of acquisition of open space that occurred under the Labor Government in the 1970s, monstrous amounts of money are necessary, but from time to time land becomes available which is under native vegetation, which is offered to the Government, which the landowner does not want to put under a heritage agreement, and which the Government should have the capacity to purchase. In the last session I highlighted the matter of Newland Head, on the South Coast, and the clearance that occurred there despite the fact that the land had initially been offered to the Government. It is not only a matter of natural vegetation areas: it is also a matter of the amount of money that is available for open space in the metropolitan area.

If one looks at the Budget provision for the Minister of Local Government, one sees reference to what I have always called the money under Public Parks Act. Last year \$300 000 was voted, I believe that \$200 000 was expended, and this year \$100 000 is voted. That is an alarming and unfortunate trend in this area, one upon which I am sure other colleagues will be expanding later on.

In my own district there is the on-going problem of the major district open space, the estuary of the Onkaparinga, and what is to happen there. This Minister of Environment and Planning has talked about \$7 000 000 being needed eventually for the development of that area. He is certainly not going to get that from the Public Parks Act, nor is anyone else, when only \$100 000 is made available for that sort of purpose, either for the acquisition or the development of such areas.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury):** Before starting on the comments I wish to make, I must say I was intrigued to find that Ministerial responsibility has been expanded to cover the need for the art of seduction as proposed by the previous speaker in relation to beguiling people to leave their motor cars and get on to public transport.

I wish to speak this afternoon about the education lines of the Budget, and a number of comments need to be made on them. First, I would like to make the following summary, as I see it, of the figures proposed in the Budget papers. As I see it, the vote for the Minister of Education has increased by 12.9 per cent, made up of a 13.1 per cent increase in the education lines, a 20.7 per cent increase in the technical and further education lines, and only a 1.1 per cent increase in the miscellaneous lines. That is quite intriguing. We need to pursue that matter considerably more in the Estimates Committees to find out why the area of miscellaneous, which covers so many important areas of expenditure, such as pre-school education, should have such a low growth.

The matter is further exacerbated by the fact that it is in that particular line of the Budget that appears most of the funding that has gone to the non-government schools by way of per capita grants. That has grown by 17.5 per cent in the past year, so that in that 1.1 per cent growth a significant amount has already been taken out on one sub-line of its own. Another area that needs to be commented on is that the capital under the Public Buildings Department has increased by only 2.7 per cent for the Education Department but it has increased by 16.3 per cent for the technical and further education sector, which certainly exceeds the c.p.i. for the past year and possibly approximates the building cost index for that period.

The other relevant figure by way of this initial summary is that in the Minister of Public Works lines in regard to maintenance, minor additions, alterations, furniture, furnishings, equipment services, and other expenses for school buildings, the amount has gone up by only 4.8 per cent. That is a summary of the lines as they affect the Ministry of Education.

I would like to go back over some years to summarise how this year's figures fit in with those for previous years and do so by a number of means. First, I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* without reading it a table that gives an indication of how spending should have grown if it had matched the rate of inflation as assumed by Federal and State Budget papers.

**The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Mathwin):** Can the member give me his word that it is purely statistical information?

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** Yes, Sir.

Leave granted.

#### INCREASE TO KEEP PACE WITH INFLATION

Year	To keep pace with inflation
78-79 .....	100
79-80 .....	110.2
80-81 .....	120.6
81-82 .....	133.1
82-83 .....	147.3

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** Those figures reveal that, using 1978-79 as a base year of 100, expenditure in 1982-83 should have been 147.3 per cent. In other words, there should have been a growth of 47.3 per cent, just to take account of the rate of inflation. What that says in another sense is that, if there is to be the same commitment in 1982-83 in real terms as there was in 1978-79, there should have been an increase of 47.3 per cent.

However, in the Education Department, as in certain other Government departments to a lesser extent, there is the important element called 'incremental creep', which is that creeping up of salaries as people go higher and higher on the pay scales within their particular department. That is more significant in the Education Department than in almost any other Government sector and, indeed, in this recent Budget \$6 400 000 is allocated for that purpose. In terms of assessing how many dollars in real terms are available at the classroom-door level to assist with the education that is actually being provided to our students, we need to take account of not just inflation but also of incremental creep. I seek further leave to have incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it a table monitoring the growth in inflation and incremental creep between 1978-79 and 1982-83.

**The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Do I have the honourable member's assurance that it is purely statistical?

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** Yes, Sir.

Leave granted.

#### INCREASE TO KEEP PACE WITH INFLATION AND INCREMENTAL CREEP

Year	To keep pace with inflation & incremental creep
78-79 .....	100
79-80 .....	111.8
80-81 .....	124.0
81-82 .....	138.5
82-83 .....	154.9

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** This figure shows that, to maintain the 1978-79 commitment by the 1982-83 Budget, there should have been a 54.9 per cent increase in the allocation made. So, while a Government that committed 47.3 per cent would, in terms of monitoring the c.p.i., have some grounds upon which to argue that it had kept pace with the inflation rate, it would still have eroded the position in regard to the moneys actually available to the classroom.

A further 7.6 per cent cumulatively was needed over that period to take account of that incremental creep. The last table in this set of three tables I wish to incorporate monitors the change in the vote as voted upon by this Parliament and presumably to be voted on by this Parliament in regard to this Budget. I seek leave to have that table inserted without my reading it.

**The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Mathwin):** I take it that the table is purely statistical?

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** Yes, Sir.

Leave granted.

#### Indices of actual expenditure

Year	Actual vote
78-79 .....	100
79-80 .....	105.4
80-81 .....	120.8
81-82 .....	133.6
82-83 .....	151.1

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** The vote we see in the Budget papers now for education (and I refer to the education line of the Minister of Education) indicates that the index presently is 151.1 per cent, with 1978-79 being 100 per cent. There has been a 51.1 per cent increase in the money allocation. That is in excess of inflation—that must be acknowledged—and I will come to that in a moment. However, it has not kept pace with the rate of inflation plus the rate of incremental creep. The outcome is that there has been a flow away in terms of real dollars available in the classroom of money available for that area.

To give an indication of how much that is (it may not appear to be much in the table now incorporated, reading as it does as being only 3.8 per cent), if 54.9 per cent were to be added to the 1978-79 education vote (remembering that that was the last Labor Government vote) we would have a figure of \$477 100 000 allocated to the Education Department, as opposed to \$465 400 000. We would have an increase of some \$11 700 000 that would need to have been allocated if we were to take account of inflation and incremental creep.

The point would be made that there has been declining enrolments and that that therefore would justify a decrease in the commitment to the education sector. However, two counterpoints need to be taken into consideration in that regard. One is the recommendation of the Schools Commission in its triennial report for the 1980-84 triennium wherein it says that the hiatus in enrolments in primary and secondary sectors should be taken advantage of to address unmet needs in the education sector. In other words, recognising that there are still some areas in which we have not achieved prime commitment, we should not erode the money available to education in real effective terms at the classroom door: we should use liberated funds to address needs that are still patently there.

The other equally significant point is that taken up by the Government belatedly some few weekends ago when it agreed to allocate \$2 000 000 to assist in the staffing problems that take place when we have declining enrolments which, in some schools, are matched by the anomaly of increasing class sizes. The Government believed that the arguments put forward some time ago, which it originally resisted, in fact finally had some merit. Indeed, we still have to allocate that sort of money. I believe that the Federal Government has made available \$5 600 000 to counter the effect of declining enrolments Australia wide because it, too, recognises that we simply cannot reduce dollar for dollar as student numbers reduce.

So, for those two reasons it is quite reasonable to suggest that the index figure of 154.9 per cent should have applied in the education vote rather than 151.1 per cent that is applying based on 1978-79 being 100 per cent. Another point may be made by other speakers in this Chamber, particularly members from the Government side if they choose to participate in this debate, which has not been noticeable to this point. Indeed, it has been surprising that no Government members have yet participated, as I would have thought they would be eager to defend the Budget put forward by their Leader. The absence of their comments may indicate that the Budget is indefensible but we, at this stage, have to guess as to the reason for the stony silence coming from the Government benches. If it so happens that at some stage one government member or another may be goaded into participating in the debate, they may make a point about the increasing share of the total Government expenditure allocated towards education over recent years. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* two further tables, which are purely statistical, without my reading them.

**The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Can the honourable member assure me that they are purely statistical?

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** Yes, Sir.

Leave granted.

#### EDUCATION BUDGET 1982-83

1. Education vote allocation as a percentage of the Payments authorised by appropriation acts:

Year	E.D. Vote	Appropriation vote	Percentage
	\$	\$	
77-78 .....	285 978 000	969 888 000	29.49
78-79 .....	308 005 000	1 035 448 000	29.75
79-80 .....	324 750 000	1 099 667 000	29.53
80-81 .....	371 980 000	1 189 814 000	31.26
81-82 .....	411 450 000	1 341 979 000	30.66
82-83 .....	465 373 000	1 501 866 000	30.99

2. Actual education expenditure as a percentage of the actual amounts spent by authorisation of appropriation acts:

Year	E.D. Expenditure	Appropriation Expenditure	Percentage
	\$	\$	
77-78 .....	299 184 870	1 012 750 738	29.54
78-79 .....	318 337 852	1 062 156 773	29.97
79-80 .....	348 392 864	1 168 168 990	29.82
80-81 .....	401 501 910	1 306 062 791	30.74
81-82 .....	434 095 790	1 474 203 436	29.44
82-83 .....	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** These two tables look at, on the one hand, the vote proposed for education by the Parliament and, on the other hand, the expenditure incurred by the Government on education. The Premier has said that much more would be spent on education than appears in the vote, trying to indicate that the Government will be giving away more than is usually the case. Past records show that the amount spent on education is almost always 7 to 8 per cent higher than the vote on education. That is simply because of wage increases that use up the funds made available for that very purpose in the budget. If we go back over the figures I have had inserted, there is seldom any evidence of an increase over and above that assessable margin of 7 to 8 per cent increase. Nevertheless, the percentages incorporated are significant for the following purposes.

It is interesting that 1980-81 is the peak year in terms of the amount of the total Government Budget allocated to education when it reached, according to the figures taken from the Budget speeches and the Auditor-General's Reports, 31.26 per cent. Since that time it has declined. Obviously, the rebuttal will come that the 1980-81 figure is greater than the allocation in 1978-79. In fact, it is 1.15 per cent greater. I remind members of the House, taking into account the incremental creep in terms of maintaining effective real dollars at the classroom door level, that that behoves the share of education to increase by minor percentage points in the Budget just to maintain the *status quo*. That is necessary, because of the incremental creep problem which will not resolve itself in the medium term until the middle or latter part of the decade when employment patterns in the department have altered somewhat.

In 1981-82 it declined to 30.66 per cent. This year's proposed figure of 30.99 per cent is a growth on last year but still a decline on the 1980-81 figure. The other set of figures which are equally interesting are those regarding expenditure actually incurred. One finds that there has been a decline in 1981-82 from 1980-81. One finds that the 1981-82 figure was significantly lower than a number of years previous, including all the way back to 1977-78. We cannot

pre-empt how much will be spent in 1982-83 but one can make the suggestion that it will be 7 per cent higher than the voted amount. That is the answer to the point about the share of the Budget that goes towards education. On the one hand, it is true that there has been some increases but they are not totally maintained increases. The figures show that it has not been totally maintained. On the other hand, there are certain imperatives that require there to be increases to maintain real dollars at the classroom door level.

Some other interesting points could then follow. I have spent the first half of my speech giving an overview of the Education Department lines, and I will touch on other lines later in my remarks. However, there are some other points of interest that can usefully be made. There is an interesting series of growth areas. If one goes through the growth areas that appear in the Education Department lines and other lines, one finds that the biggest growth evident in any line, to my immediate reckoning, is that which appears in the line for the Director-General's Office. It has increased by 35.8 per cent. It is followed by the second biggest increase, which is for the Office of the Minister of Education, which has risen by 30.7 per cent. For a Government that believes in and vaunts small government as an aim and believes in chopping away the centralised bureaucracy, it perplexes me why there should be such a massive increase for the Office of Director-General and the Office of the Minister which make any other increases pale in percentage terms.

There are other increases in the Budget, one of which was mentioned in the Premier's speech, namely, the increase concerning special education, expenditure for which has risen by a total of 24.1 per cent, if one takes account of all the lines in the Budget that refer to special education. I shall not nit-pick at that, because I believe that it is a commendable increase and that, indeed, it should have occurred many years ago. There are increases in special education allowances greater than we have actually had over many Budgets, so that is not to be criticised. It is timely, but perhaps one could even suggest that there is still much more to be done in future Budgets. I am sure that all members of this House will be looking very closely at the special education line.

A matter that we will need to find out about during the Estimates Committees concerns exactly how that money will be allocated. A number of members in this place have referred to the problem of transport for children who have special handicaps. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition referred to it a couple of weeks ago; my colleague the shadow Minister of Housing (the member for Napier) has referred to it, as have my colleagues the members for Price and Albert Park. Also, I have referred to this matter, and the fact that South Australia is unique in Australia in not providing aides on buses to assist with the transport of handicapped children. We will need to know whether funding for that purpose comes out of the allocation for special education.

The other area that is a significant growth element is the per capita grant to non-government schools which has risen 17.5 per cent. It should be remembered that last year the increase was 21.8 per cent, so they have had at least two years of very real growth in excess of inflation and in excess of the increasing enrolments that they have had, because there has been a Government commitment to increase payment of the per capita rate from 20 per cent of the Government school cost to 25 per cent. The Labor Party has indicated that it does not hold to that commitment. It does not hold to the commitment of going up to 25 per cent, and that point has been made clear on a number of occasions.

One reason why the Labor Party maintains that viewpoint is that we feel that we should not tell many other levels of

education that they must level peg their commitment, yet offer real growth rates of 21.8 per cent in one year and 17.5 per cent in another year to another sector. A point in regard to non-government schools that needs to be commended concerns the decision to go to a model standard school cost rather than using a statistical determination of the costs applying to Government schools. That may seem a strange move and it may seem strange that the Labor Party is commending that. However, the decision to do so wipes out the possibility of windfall profits or windfall gains to the non-government school sector. The decision is commendable. I believe that even with the Government living up to its commitment, its election promise, that is the reason why this year's increase was indeed less than last year's.

A number of areas have grown by less than the rate of inflation. The salaries component for adult migrant education has grown by less than the rate of inflation; so, in real terms it has declined. In regard to personal enrichment courses, the figure for hourly-paid instructors has increased by only 1.7 per cent, so, indeed, there appears to be the anticipation of a significant decline in commitment in that area. That is matched, on the other hand, by the recommendation or the estimation in the estimated receipts that the receipts for further education will go up quite significantly. Therefore, it looks as though we might be in for some hefty hourly increases in the stream 6 courses. I am sure that that will be poorly received by the many thousands of people who already participate in those courses.

Then, by way of further example, there are other institutions, such as Roseworthy College, which not only has failed to grow in money terms but has actually declined by 10.5 per cent. There will be a real reduction in commitment there. I believe that the Estimates Committees will have to be used to find out the full figures applying to the pre-school education areas and to compare this year's figures with those of last year. I have not yet had the opportunity to do that (I fear that the Minister may put me right on this), but it appears that there has been a decline in commitment there. I acknowledge the point that, in the absence of further information, which hopefully will be forthcoming in the yellow document, it appears as though it has declined.

A number of areas should be noted as well as the increases and decreases that I have spoken about. I refer to the relative position of primary and secondary education. Members would know, because I have informed the House on other occasions, that the Schools Commission has identified the fact that in relative terms right around the country the secondary sector has fared better than the primary sector in terms of growth in resources made available to it, and that the commission has recommended that be reversed: not that there be a reduction in the commitment of resources to the secondary areas but that, if funds are available from such things as declining enrolments, they be directed to the primary area to improve the relativities. I was keen, therefore, to see what is actually happening in the Budget in that regard. The situation is that (and this is in the Budget) the primary areas have grown by 14.2 per cent while the secondary areas have grown by 16.9 per cent (the two areas combined, by 15.5 per cent).

If primary areas had grown by 15.5 per cent rather than by 14.2 per cent, it would have had an allocation in total, over the four lines, of \$187 400 000, rather than \$185 300 000, which is a relative gain of \$2 100 000. The point could again be made in rebuttal that the primary area is that which is feeling the brunt of enrolment decline. However, I draw the attention of members to my earlier comments today about that; and, secondly, I repeat that if resources are liberated they should go toward that area, because, first, that is the Schools Commission finding on

the matter, and I am sure that, further, it is our own gut reaction to the matter; if there is a healthy primary school sector, that must make all other levels of education operate more efficiently.

Another area that concerned me greatly is that of Aboriginal education. It is true that for the first time an allocation has been made for the South Australian Aboriginal Education Consultative Committee in the amount of \$13 000, which I believe is some \$187 000 less than it thought was basically necessary. The other point, of course, is that the amount for the Aboriginal Foundation shows no increase at all. I believe it is shameful that not more has been done in the Budget to improve Aboriginal education.

May I also take this chance to comment on the absence of a certain school from the public loans programme. I would have thought that in light of the recent press publicity Koonibba Aboriginal school would have rated a mention in the public works programme, but nowhere does it appear. It cannot be said that one is being unfair, because the press highlighted this matter only a few weeks ago: the member for Eyre said last week that he had written to the Public Buildings Department earlier. So, this matter has been around for some time. Indeed, there are press reports concerning the Principal of the school saying that the issue has been around for some years. However, it does not appear.

Therefore, how high in importance and status is Aboriginal education in this State? I make one other comment on this. The small school development programme, which is a very imaginative programme, set up under the previous Government I may say, has done a lot of good work redeveloping the schools in this State, and I have had the pleasure of seeing some of those schools and what can be achieved. It is interesting, and tragic, to note that not one Aboriginal school has ever been incorporated into the small school redevelopment programme. Surely, from the reports about Koonibba, it is in a much worse state than many of the other schools ever were. I know that the point could be made that it was not put in the initial list of schools proposed in 1979, in the closing days of the former Government, and I make that criticism. However, we have had three years since then for that matter to be put right and not yet has it been done.

As my time is running out, I will quickly close on a series of other comments. First, maintenance has only gone up by 4.8 per cent. That is actually a decline in real terms if we take into account inflation. I cannot believe that our schools are going to need maintenance at a lesser rate than they did last year. The schools' maintenance needs are going to be at least the same and, therefore, an inflated amount should have been made available to that area, but that has not been the case. So, we are in danger of seeing, first, the run-down of some of our schools, matched by the fact that there is a decline in capital funds available for the redevelopment of some of those schools.

I repeat the point that the public works for education and public Loan funds have increased by only 2.7 per cent, which is much less than the c.p.i. and, if we take into account the cost of the c.p.i. rate of inflation, not the building materials rate of inflation, there is a loss in real terms of \$1 900 000. The TAFE sector has increased by 16.3 per cent, which, as I have said, probably matches the building materials rate.

On the building programme, I am again concerned at another absence, another omission, and that is the omission of any significant commitment for the holding schools. Members will know that I have had a number of Questions on Notice about this matter. It is a matter I have pursued for some time as, indeed, have a number of other members in this place. I refer in particular to the member for Napier, who has been most concerned about Munno Para Primary

School, in his own electorate. Munno Para Primary School has received its community activity hall but it is still a long way behind in its other development needs.

I make the point that schools like the Munno Para school, the Coorara school, the Moana school, if they have lived up to the enrolment projections, should have been given access to Category A status in terms of need for redevelopment so that they may obtain their share of the funds that are available. I made the point previously, and I repeat it on this occasion. The Premier told us that there has been a massive increase in the capital funds made available in this budget. Education is certainly not the area to have seen that. Education has declined significantly in capital terms over recent years and that is mirrored by members on the other side. I was at a meeting where the member for Mawson pointed out how funds had declined in their availability to the combined education sectors. But this year, when there was the opportunity for growth in capital Loan funds, education did not receive its share . . .

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

**Mr SLATER (Gilles):** I believe this to be a very dishonest, deceptive and deceitful Budget. No matter how the Premier or other members opposite try to gloss over the figures, in real terms it provides little or nothing to the average person within our community. I understand that members on the other side are not going to speak in this debate; which indicates to me that they are not able to defend their Premier and their own Government's Budget. I do not know whether there is any significance in that or not but it appears that that is the case.

We have come to expect this type of Budget over the past three or four years, and I say that it is one of deception. I note that the statement on the South Australian economy presented by the Premier for the information of honourable members on the occasion of the Budget for 1982-83 gives a historical aspect of the economy of South Australia but it also states on page 7 in clause 3, that the fortunes of the South Australian economy (in a national context) are explicitly bound to national economic events and, in particular, the Federal Government's fiscal and monetary policies, and national wage-setting decisions have an overwhelming influence on overall economic conditions.

I am not refuting that or denying that it is the case. While it is appreciated that the Western world and the Australian economic scene is certainly not buoyant and that State Governments are tied to overseas and economic trends, Australia's economic trends, I think it fair and reasonable that the South Australian community should obtain a truer picture of the situation rather than just a glossing over of the economics. The Government is a self-confessed private enterprise Government. I believe that the matter goes a little further than that. The Liberal Party is a Party of privilege and patronage and consequently we have come to expect that little or nothing will be given to the ordinary members of the community, and if anything is given, it is not given out of generosity.

It is the philosophical belief that people on the lower end of the economic spectrum are not deserving of anything more than scant consideration. We will have the opportunity to question further and seek information in some detail when we examine this Budget in the Committee stages. We will be able to ascertain at that time, perhaps more fully than in these papers, just where the areas of priorities are and the areas where cuts are being made, in particular the Public Service.

One fallacy that is being perpetrated by both the Fraser and Tonkin Governments is that the reason for the economic malaise that currently besets this country is the unreasonable

demands by employees and their representatives, the trade unions, in relation to wage increases. According to the Government's convoluted standards, any Budget is a real success if real wages fall and as a result the living standards of the population decline. After all, if low wages are an unqualified success, places like Bangladesh and parts of Asia, Africa and South America are shining examples of economic wisdom.

It is the prerogative of both State and Federal Governments to protect real wages and the living standards of the community, and this is more appropriately done not by cutting real wages but by economic growth. With productivity gains, this comes from growth, and wages and can do better than inflation without any effect on the profits of the private sector. Considering the Australian scene in total, which I suppose applies equally to South Australia, one sees that wage increases are not the cause of the serious economic problems that this country faces at present.

In truth, wages do not present the serious problem that we are led to believe. The proportional cost of wages to the national economy has actually decreased over the past seven years. Real unit wage costs to employers are lower now than they were when the Federal Labor Government was in office in 1975. The reality is that wage costs have been more than held in check. The fundamental problem, as I have said previously, is not wages but insufficient growth, where both wages and profits can increase while employment can decrease.

It may be too much to expect from a Government that embraces the sort of philosophy that the Liberal Government embraces that it may try a Budget directed towards the old fashioned virtues of stimulating both the public and private sectors to achieve sustained economic growth. It is important both financially and socially to maintain living standards. The present economic situation is proving to be disastrous for the average wage-earning family, particularly for young people who are trying to establish themselves in a home. Certainly, for those on the lower level of the economic scale, it is disastrous not only in terms of living standards but also, consequently, in terms of the welfare of the community.

I do not believe that I have to elaborate too greatly on the problems that are associated with unemployment and the problems that can be created in the family because the breadwinner or members of the family are not usefully employed. As I have said, unemployment brings not only financial problems but also a degradation of the individual human being. It is all right for the Premier, the Minister of Industrial Affairs, or anyone else to quote statistics on unemployment, as long as they do not figure in those statistics. It is a real fact that people who are unemployed, or people on welfare benefits generally, are certainly tremendously disadvantaged in our society at present, and there is nothing at all in either the Federal or State Budgets that will give those people any sort of relief.

Of course, we need a philosophy in our society that breeds compassion for the individual who, usually through no fault of his own, is being denied a share of the wealth of the country. This Budget exemplifies an attitude that prevails, unfortunately, in conservative Governments throughout the world. It seeks to provide palliatives rather than cures and, indeed, the person who suffers most, as always, is the average Joe Blow in the community.

Very recently (in fact, last week) I was invited to and attended an opening or a launching (I think that was how it was described) by the Premier of a scheme that is called Adelaide International, which was associated with a particular series of events that were due to occur, including the opening of the international airport and other factors. I understand that a multiplicity of events and functions has been arranged as a forerunner to the State's 150th birthday celebrations in

1986. Unless these functions are shared by all in the community, not by only a privileged few, they will not be community oriented and they will not be a success.

One may be cynical enough to believe that these events are being organised for the Government, the Premier in particular, to provide to the community a series of events that may be described more like bread and circuses in an endeavour to boost the Government's stocks prior to an election. One might adopt that cynical point of view, unless, of course, one saw that all of these events are directed to the community generally and are thoroughly oriented to the people of South Australia, not to a particular group or groups of people.

I turn now to a matter in which I have a particular interest, that is, recreation and sport and tourism. Let me say that both portfolios have been treated badly in the Budget allocation. The only increase in the Budget for recreation and sport is in respect of administrative salaries. Actual payments in 1981-82 were \$10 040 996, and estimated expenditure in 1982-83 is \$10 527 000. All of this increase is taken up by salaries and related payments.

As usual, the recreation and sport allocation is interwoven with transport matters. Sport and recreation is more of an addendum to the transport area and, as a consequence, it is incorporated and interwoven with the transport vote. In the actual Recreation and Sport Division line there has been a reduction from \$506 176 to \$414 000 with a significant reduction in the sports coaching scheme.

I am willing to accept that \$139 000 is provided for the South Australian Sports Institute, which I support, and perhaps the reduction to which I am referring is partly covered in the allocation to that institute. Overall, I believe that recreation and sport has been treated badly in the Budget. I had hoped that the Minister could have done a little better than last year, but in actual money terms, taking inflation into consideration, in the area of recreation and sport he has not done as well as last year.

It is interesting to note that payments to recreation and sport, from the Recreation and Sports Fund, from Soccer Pools, has certainly not come up to expectations. The actual payment received for the year amounted to \$712 563 (members will recall that during the Soccer Pools debate the Minister told recreation and sporting groups that Soccer Pools would provide \$1 500 000 for them in the first year). That aim has not been achieved.

It is interesting to note that the sum proposed for the coming year is only \$450 000, despite a change in the Soccer Pools game which will make it similar to the lotto bloc competition. The application form and the method involved are similar. I noticed that the Minister of Recreation and Sport attended the launching yesterday of the new scheme, which doubtless has his sanction. The aim of the game is to select six numbers from 36, the coupon being similar to the bloc lotto competition but for one minor difference: the determination of prize winners, although the points system has been eliminated, still depends on soccer match results.

The only other significant difference is the fact that the Lotteries Commission's operation pays to general revenue a significant amount for the Hospitals Fund. In addition, it pays 61 per cent of turnover to competitors.

Australian Soccer Pools Proprietary Limited pays only about 37.5 per cent of its takings back to participants. It has not been the success that we hoped it would be. Certainly, it has not come up to its promise so far as the recreation and sporting people are concerned. As a consequence, we will have to see how the new game operates and how successful it is. The Government obviously does not have a great deal of confidence in this new scheme, or it would have proposed that a greater amount of money than that

shown in the Budget would be received from the soccer pools fund in the coming year.

**Mr Becker:** The Minister is probably being conservative.

**Mr SLATER:** He is probably being very conservative. An amount of \$450 000 is mentioned, which is only a third of what was expected to be returned in the pools first year of operation. If one is prepared to look closely at the Budget, one sees that the Lotteries Commission returned significant amounts of money to Consolidated Revenue, or to the Hospitals Fund. Last year the Hospitals Fund received from lotteries, the T.A.B. and other racing (which are lumped together) \$23 304 344. The estimated receipts for 1982-83 amount to \$25 000 000. Lotteries, therefore, make a significant contribution to revenue. Most of the amount mentioned comes from the activities of the Lotteries Commission.

I think it is a sad situation when a statutory authority such as the South Australian Lotteries Commission has to compete with a private organisation which is getting preferential treatment (and it has received preferential treatment) in its activities. I will not go into the history of this matter, but I was concerned about 18 months ago that lottery agencies were not allowed by regulation, to offer for sale any other form of competition. Then the Government in one day changed those regulations in Executive Council to allow the soccer pools people to participate, along with lotteries, in the same agency. That created an unsatisfactory situation, indicating to me and to the public of South Australia that this Government has been giving preference and assistance, and in every way possible, to the soccer pools operation. I disagree with that. I think it is inexcusable. The Lotteries Commission has been so successful that it has been able to provide significant amounts of money to the Hospitals Fund.

I turn now to another area in which I have a special interest, the area of tourism. The tourism budget, despite comments by the Minister of Tourism which were reported in the press a day or so ago stating that there had been an increase in the tourism allocation, has been reduced. The Minister had the unmitigated gall to announce that there had been an increase in the Budget allocation for tourism. Although her statement was qualified and referred to one particular area, there has not been any increase in finance for tourism despite the fact that this Government, and the Minister, from time to time wax eloquent about their special interest in developing the tourism industry in this State.

I have said before and I repeat that it is more myth than reality, more promise than performance. The figures in the Budget speak for themselves. If one looks at page 97, showing a summary of estimates of payments from Consolidated Revenue, one will see that money spent in the area of tourism last year was \$4 180 000, while estimated payments for this year are \$4 300 000. This increase is taken up mainly by salaries, wages and related payments. The only area in which there has been a minimal increase is in regard to subsidies towards development of tourist resorts, which was voted \$319 000 last year, actual payments being \$308 000, with estimated expenditure for this year of \$331 000. So, there is a marginal increase of \$23 000 which does not keep pace with inflation. In all other areas of grants for tourism, under miscellaneous payments, the amounts are the same as those for last year. The real money terms take into account inflation, meaning that there has been no increase; in fact, there is a decrease in that area.

The Minister has claimed from time to time that great achievements are being made in tourism in South Australia. I noted in the *News* of 23 August 1982, an article by Mike Safe, headed 'Quick march to snare tourist dollars', which states:

Can Goldie, the gum leaf-chewing koala, attract more tourist dollars to South Australia than a casino? The Tourism Minister, Mrs Adamson, thinks so and now the Premier, Mr Tonkin,

appears to agree. Only three days after the casino plan was given the boot by the State Parliament, Mr Tonkin launched the South Australian Tourist Development Plan. Holding Goldie the koala at the Cleland Conservation Park launching yesterday, the Premier claimed a casino was not the 'be all and end all' of tourism development in South Australia.

He said the Government was completely behind the new plan which was a 'blueprint' for South Australia's tourism development for the next five years. However, there seemed a certain irony in the fact that days after the casino prospect was dumped, the Government should be beating the tourism development drum long and strong.

The Chairman of the 23-man tourism development plan task force, John Sharman, agreed the timing did seem ironic. However, he quickly pointed out the launch date for the plan had been set well before last week's casino vote.

Mr Sharman, Managing Director of the Grosvenor Hotel and a supporter of the casino proposal, said it was disappointing the move had been defeated. 'It would have been good to add to the tourism plant in this State, but certainly it's not the end of South Australia as a tourist attraction just because we have not got a casino,' he said. 'It's not going to stop people coming to South Australia. They may have stayed longer—another day or so—if we had one.'

That shows clearly that five-year plans, boards, consultative committees, and so on, need to be a little more co-ordinated to get results if we are to achieve any improvement in tourism in South Australia. I quoted figures only last week in this House which give comparisons between Budget allocations in this State and other States. They certainly were not comparable. I will not go over the figures again, except to say that South Australia was third to last on the list last year in its Budget allocation for tourism. It will be interesting to note, when the figures are available for this year, just what comparisons can be made with other States.

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

## CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

## APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Second reading debate resumed.

**Mr SLATER (Gilles):** Prior to the dinner adjournment I was referring—and I am pleased to see that the Minister is present in the House—to the Government and particularly the Minister of Tourism's endeavour to portray to the people of South Australia that the Government was giving great priority to the tourist industry of this State. This Budget confirms that that is more of a myth than a reality. I wish to refer to part of the Minister of Tourism's answer to a question asked by the member for Brighton last week. After hearing the usual platitudes about the tourist industry, I was interested to note one aspect of the Minister's reply, as follows:

It was estimated that in 1978-79 in the tourist industry in South Australia 11 600 people were employed. There are currently estimated to be 14 600 people employed in the industry. When we came to office, the industry was reckoned to be worth about \$223 000 000 annually to the State. It is now reckoned to be worth in the region of \$370 000 000 annually to the State. The plan itself sets targets for growth which, if they are capable of achievement, will certainly mean an enormous boost in employment over the next five years. Whereas we currently employ about 14 600 people in the industry, if we can achieve a growth target of 10 per cent, we will create additional jobs, so that the total number is 22 500. If we do not achieve that very high target of 10 per cent, but achieve a target of 7 per cent, there will be 19 600 jobs in the industry in South Australia by the year 1987.

I challenge the Minister to say where her estimated figures came from in relation to employment in the tourist industry, what those figures are based on and how the estimate of an

additional 3 000 employees in the industry can be justified. It is well known that the tourist industry is extremely diverse and complex and, in many instances, caters not only for tourists but for local inhabitants as well. Are these people referred to by the Minister casual employees, part-time employees or permanent employees?

*The Hon. R. G. Payne interjecting:*

**Mr SLATER:** It appears to me that the figures quoted by the Minister in that reply are nothing more than a wild guess without any substantiation.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** It's a figment of her imagination.

**Mr SLATER:** It is a fantasy rather than a fact and is certainly intended to give a false impression of the growth in tourism in South Australia. It is certainly true to say that the Government has not put its money where its mouth is in relation to tourism in this Budget.

**Mr TRAINER (Ascot Park):** I would like to spend the majority of my 30 minutes dealing with a few of the anomalies and dishonesties that seem to have crept into this Budget.

**Mr Gunn:** You are reflecting upon the officers of the Treasury?

**Mr TRAINER:** If there is any reflection, it is on the Administration that controls the Treasury. For a start, this balanced Budget does not seem to be terribly well balanced, even at a fairly elementary level of analysis.

The fact is that the Premier has apparently padded the Budget result by diverting the sum of about \$10 000 000 from the State Transport Authority and placing it in the Budget account. This is indicated in the fine print of the Financial Statement on page XXXIV:

Because of the pressures on the recurrent side of the Consolidated Account, the Government proposes to recall an amount of \$10 million previously advanced to the State Transport Authority from recurrent funds.

Note that that money apparently was tucked away in the S.T.A. by the Government in a previous Budget. Therefore, it would appear at that level of analysis that there is a deficit of about \$10 000 000 hidden there. In fact, as I will come back to later, there seems to be an even larger deficit than that.

One of the things that the Premier tries to do is to blame the Commonwealth Government for his own State-based financial problems. He says, for example, on page IV that South Australia is to receive a 12.2 per cent rise in Commonwealth funds this year. He says on page IV:

Excluding grants for certain purposes which the Commonwealth has yet to allocate between the States, total Commonwealth payments to South Australia are estimated to increase by 12.2 per cent in 1982-83 which is the highest increase of all the States, except Tasmania.

And he describes it as a 'favourable position'. I will say more on that later. However, I am advised that the Estimates of Receipts indicate that the growth in the total South Australian Budget receipts is to be only 10.9 per cent. Therefore, there must be, somehow, a lower rate of growth in receipts in those sources directly under the Premier's control, namely, State revenue sources. If the average works out to 10.9 per cent and that which comes from Federal sources has a 12.2 per cent increment, that growth under his control must be even lower. Indeed, I have been advised that the total recurrent funds from South Australian sources are forecast to grow by only 8 per cent.

Just for the moment, let us look at this relationship with the Federal Government and the Commonwealth payments to South Australia that appear in our 1982 State Budget. The Premier tries to establish two propositions in his Financial Statement. One is that the Fraser Government treats the States badly. The other is that the Premier alone stands

up like John Wayne in Burma against the Federal Government.

**Mr Slater:** John Wayne? There is no similarity between them.

**Mr TRAINER:** Nor to Errol Flynn, who also claimed to win the Second World War singlehanded. Now let us look at the first of those two propositions, first, that the Federal Government has treated the States fairly harshly in providing them with slow growing funds. It is rather interesting to note that the Prime Minister should be one of our Premier's scapegoats, because the Premier was urging people so much to vote for the current Federal Government in 1980. The public may recall those advertisements featuring the Premier's visage spread across the State, with his cranial area located somewhere around the Simpson Desert on the map and how, when there was a smaller swing to the Labor Party in South Australia than in other States, the Premier claimed the credit for it. It could well be that that smaller swing was based upon the fact that the 1977 results in South Australia were more favourable to the Labor Party than they were in other States and as a result there was a smaller base on which there could be an increment. Nevertheless, the Premier claimed the credit for it. He hitched himself quite clearly to the Fraser waggon of that time. Now, he does not want to be part of it.

Now let us look at the second of the propositions, that, while the States have been treated badly, our Premier is saying in effect how he has stood up for South Australia and has secured a better deal for us than has been secured by almost all other States. In quoting that growth rate in Commonwealth payments of 12.2 per cent, on page IV of the Financial Statement from which I quoted just now, Mr Tonkin seems to be referring only to general purpose and specific purpose funds in the Commonwealth Budget, and these appear for South Australia on page 175 of Budget Paper No. VII. However, the six States total for the same categories of funds show a 13 per cent rise in 1982-83, and that is on page 167 of Budget Paper VII. So, as a group, the six States get a larger rise than does South Australia. Yet, strangely enough, the Premier seems to rate 12.2 per cent as being higher than the average of 13 per cent. Those figures are hardly a confirmation or demonstration of the Premier's being particularly successful in standing up for his State.

Let us look at another one of his claims, his claim on page XXXII of the Financial Statement that the Government has avoided any rise in taxation rates. The fact is that Government policy moves will add \$12 500 000 to total tax collections during the current financial year, 1982-83. These policy moves include higher tax rates levied earlier this year. Total taxation collection will rise above half a billion dollars for the first time, and will rise, in fact, by 11.5 per cent, the highest rise in State taxes since the financial year 1976-77.

As the Leader of the Opposition pointed out quite clearly by way of the mass media and in his contribution this afternoon, the Premier has tried to distance the Budget from State taxation rises by having them at a different time of the year, so that they do not appear as announcements within the Budget documents. A similar approach has been taken by the Government in regard to State charges. The Budget revenues for 1982-83 reflect the massive rises in State charges that have taken place in recent months. As I have said, the Premier has tried to distance the Budget from these rises by putting them up over a 12-month period rather than having them appear as announcements in the Budget. All members have had people coming to their electorate offices complaining about so many of these rises, particularly about water rates, sewerage costs, hospitals bed charges, and so on.

It is true that the Budget does not contain any announcements of any increases in taxation rates, but those increases have taken place nevertheless. The fact is that the Budget incorporates substantial extra revenues that have come from those recent rises in tax rates and so on. These were increases which were not announced in the 1981 Budget and which reflect discretionary fiscal moves by the Tonkin Government since that time.

The Premier has tried to make the Budget look more benign than it really is by, as the Leader of the Opposition pointed out this afternoon, distancing the tax increases from the Budget, just as the Premier has done with State charges. In recent months, for example, two tax rates have been increased, neither of which was announced in the 1981 Budget, but which still happened. I refer to increased motor vehicle registration charges which were instituted as of 28 April this year and increased licence charges under the Business Franchise (Petroleum Products) Act which took place as of 1 May this year.

The Premier has laid claim to having a low tax Government, but in fact, it is a high tax Government, and the Budget, as are most other Government measures, is most deceptive. A question that could be asked is whether the Premier will further increase the general pay-roll tax exemption from January 1982 to match other States if they increase their exemption, because traditionally we have always followed close behind. However, because of the deliberate action on the part of the Government, this State is now six months behind other States, which lifted their exemption to \$125 000 last January: we did not do so until July. While I am dealing with the subject of pay-roll tax I want to say a few words about the pay-roll tax rebate incentives which are used to encourage employment in particular parts of the State. Currently country areas receive a 100 per cent rebate (a rebate in land tax and pay-roll tax) which costs the State \$6 000 000 per annum and which is allocated to designated industries at the discretion of the Minister. However, the criteria that the Minister uses in designating particular industries have not been made clear. Nevertheless, some industries obviously receive this assistance.

Some semi-rural locations received a 50 per cent rebate. However, unemployment is actually higher in the metropolitan area than it is in the country: an overall State average of around 7.6 per cent unemployment conceals an urban level of 8 per cent or 9 per cent compared to a rural level of 5 per cent or 6 per cent.

Rebate incentives could well be directed to specific economic zones with much better effect than to arbitrary geographic areas, so that they could then be applied on a basis of greatest need and could be directed to supporting industries with a high potential for being job creative rather than being merely capital intensive. A few moments ago, I referred to the Premier's claim of having a low tax Government when in fact he has a high tax Government. I refer to the figures on per capita tax collections, using population figures as of 31 December each year.

In the last full financial year under a Labor Government, namely 1978-79, total tax collections can be calculated at \$384 844 000. Based on a population of 1.2997 million, that works out to \$296.10 taxation on a per capita basis. The estimated amount for the current 1982-83 Budget indicates total tax collections of \$552 370 000. On an estimated population of 1 334 700, the taxation level per capita is \$413.85. So, in the period between 1978-79 and 1982-83, the taxation level has grown from approximately \$296 per head under a Labor Government to about \$414 under the current Tonkin Liberal Government. Therefore, the total tax collection has increased in that period by 43½ per cent and the per capita level has increased by 39.8 per cent. However, our Premier claims to be a low tax Premier.

I referred earlier to the Budget deficit. On page XXXII of the Financial Statement, the Premier admits to a deficit under current activities of \$42 000 000, as follows:

The forecast for 1982-83 is for a deficit of \$42 000 000 on the year's operations.

However, it has been suggested to me (and I pointed this out a few moments ago) that that figure operates only after \$10 000 000 has already been withdrawn from the S.T.A. account in order, to use the Premier's words, 'to relieve pressures on the recurrent side'. So, in fact, the deficit under current activities will be closer to \$52 000 000 than \$42 000 000. Furthermore, that figure operates only after a figure of \$7 100 000 has been transferred to capital activities from the current expenditure which was normally used to cover motor vehicle purchases.

Therefore, that \$7 100 000 could also be added, which would mean that the apparent deficit under current activities would be much closer to \$59 100 000. In addition, there also seems to be a figure of \$4 000 000 that should be included to allow for the insufficient money that has been provided for water pumping costs. A figure of up to \$4 000 000 was not included in the calculation and that could take the figure to close to \$63 000 000. I refer to expenditure on electricity required for water pumping.

**Mr Slater:** It's a very dishonest Budget.

**Mr TRAINER:** It is indeed a very dishonest Budget.

*The Hon. J. D. Wright interjecting:*

**Mr TRAINER:** They have gone up, too. Let us look at the missing \$4 000 000 which has not been accounted for. I will quote actual figures, except for the 1982-83 Budget, which, of course, involves allocated figures.

**Mr Slater:** That's why members opposite will not get up and defend them.

**Mr TRAINER:** We have heard from no-one in the Government to defend this Budget. I heard the member for Salisbury say this afternoon that it is an indefensible Budget. Therefore, it is hardly surprising that members opposite do not want to participate in this debate.

The total water pumping cost for the State in 1976-77 was \$6 069 000. In 1977-78 it increased to \$7 578 000. In one year, that is an increase of 25 per cent. In other words, one must have a fairly reasonable amount salted aside to allow for dry spells, when pumping costs could absolutely skyrocket.

It is obvious that that happened in that year under a Labor Government, when the amount required leapt 25 per cent between one year and the next. The following year 1978-79 was a reasonable year, and the figure required dropped to \$4 414 000. In 1979-80, it dropped a little further still to \$4 365 000. In 1980-81, it increased to \$5 973 000, and in 1981-82 the amount that was actually spent increased to \$5 597 000. Most of the gradual increase that occurred over that period would be accounted for by inflation. However, it should also be noted that the amount that was voted in 1981-82 was \$4 800 000, yet a much larger sum, namely \$5 597 000, nearly \$750 000 more, was actually needed.

However, because of the current dry spell, we are going to face a much bigger shortfall than that. Only \$2 379 000 for metropolitan pumping and \$3 210 000 for rural pumping has been allocated. That total of \$5 589 000 is a smaller figure than the previous year.

**Mr Slater:** They must be all out praying for rain.

**Mr TRAINER:** That is hardly surprising. I think that they will be praying for more than that when the poll comes. They have actually had less budgeted for water pumping for the current financial year than was spent in the last financial year, even though they are facing the current drought. Let us have a look at what the Minister of Water

Resources said only a few days ago on 10 August 1982 in reply to a question. The member for Fisher asked about the current low levels in metropolitan water reservoirs, and in his reply the Minister stated:

What has been said in relation to the fact that the current holdings of the reservoirs are approximately 44 per cent of capacity means that significant pumping costs will be involved in the coming year. That does not mean, however, that that will reflect on charges made for water next year.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr TRAINER:** I will not quibble about that at the moment. The Minister continued:

Seasonal pumping costs vary quite dramatically. Last year the cost was \$1 500 000 because of the heavy winter rains we had, and the reservoirs in the Mount Lofty Range were at full capacity.

**Mr TRAINER:** It seems that the Minister was wrong there. I am advised that the figure was not \$1 500 000 but actually \$2 400 000. However, we will not quibble about that because that is not relevant to the argument that I am advancing. The Minister continued:

However, it looks highly unlikely that the reservoirs will be filled this season. Unless we have significant run-off in the next month or two, obviously the capacity for a natural run-off will not be any greater than it is at the moment. However, there is pumping capacity from the River Murray which will ensure that there will be no water restrictions within South Australia, and the cost of the additional pumping (which is anticipated to be anything up to \$4 000 000 in excess of the pumping costs of the last financial year) will be borne out of general revenue.

**Mr Slater:** And it's not in the Budget.

**Mr TRAINER:** It is not in the Budget; they are \$4 000 000 short there. While on the subject of water, I should briefly like to refer to a reply which I received from the Minister today and which rather surprised me. Question on Notice No. 28 referred to a series of consultants' reports on matters relating to the Murray River that had been prepared over the past decade or so. One part of the question I asked was, 'What was the consultant's fee for each report?' For some strange reason, a new policy has been adopted by the Government in regard to consultants fees, because the reply states that consultants fees are confidential between the consultant and Minister.

**Mr Slater:** They're hiding it.

**Mr TRAINER:** They are hiding something there. But, let us continue with this Budget and see whether we can find a few other things they might have squirrelled away somewhere. Let us refer to housing. The Premier may claim that he has boosted his housing funds significantly this year. However, some questions can be asked about certain suggestions in documents that there may be a cut-back in what has gone on housing. Let us have a look at page XVII of the Financial Statement. It states:

Funds set aside for housing needs were not used for this purpose. I find that a very strange statement, bearing in mind that 27 000 people are on the waiting list for Housing Trust accommodation. I do not know what Liberal back-benchers experience in their district offices in regard to people who come with problems, but I find that one of my biggest sources of worry is people who are desperate for Housing Trust accommodation. Perhaps in the more salubrious suburbs that some of the members opposite represent they may not be familiar with that problem, but I find it absolutely heartbreaking to have so many people coming in—

*The Hon. J. D. Wright:* Maybe they don't care.

**Mr TRAINER:** Possibly they do not. At least I like to pretend that they are men of charity and would care if they were aware of the problem, so I try to tell myself that it is because they do not realise the extent of the problem, not because they do not care. However, the member for Adelaide may be right: perhaps they do not care. Perhaps all they care about is surviving until the next election, and if that is true, they have a lot to worry about in that regard.

It appears that funds that were allocated for housing were diverted elsewhere. On page 120 of the 1982 estimates of payments, under the Treasury Department, 'Advances for housing', it was stated that \$3 500 000 was allocated for advances for housing in 1981-82 and that nothing was spent. However, \$16 500 000 has been set aside this year. That is most peculiar. I do not understand that at all. Obviously, when we discuss this matter in the Estimates Committee, quite a few questions could be asked about that missing \$3 500 000 for housing. Where did it go? No-one knows. However, on page X of the 1982-83 Financial Statement the Premier refers to \$9 500 000 that was saved on capital payments in 1981-82 and he points out that this included water, sewerage, and housing. It was stated:

Payments were below estimate by \$5 200 000. Savings in the areas of waterworks, sewers and irrigation, effluent drainage, harbor works, other Government buildings and housing amounted to \$9 500 000 . . .

How on earth, when 27 000 people are on the waiting list for Housing Trust accommodation, could the \$3 500 000 that was allocated for accommodation not be used, simply pushed aside, so that people are deceived with this Budget? Let us look at some of the winners and some of the losers in this Budget. For example, health is a loser: it seems that recognised hospitals will lose. There does not seem to be much there. Expenditure for health buildings has been slashed, and the Department for Community Welfare, apart from the 'Miscellaneous' line, seems to have been fairly deeply chopped. Yet these cuts have been made in the face of higher unemployment.

In that regard, I refer to the Federal Budget and some of its predictions on unemployment. The Federal Treasurer obviously expects an increase of 19 per cent in the number of Australians who are in receipt of unemployment benefits. In the 1981-82 Federal Budget, the allocation for unemployment benefits was increased by \$33 800 000, or 3.7 per cent. Obviously, that was a little over optimistic, because there was not a 3.7 per cent increase in expenditure on unemployment benefits: the actual increase that had to be paid was up by \$229 000 000, or 22.9 per cent.

Obviously, the Federal Treasurer is being a little more reasonable with his expectations for the coming months, because the 1982-83 Federal Budget allocated an extra \$342 700 000 for unemployment benefits, which is 28 per cent more than the actual expenditure last year—not 28 per cent more than what was put aside last year, but 28 per cent more than was actually expended last year. The average number of unemployment benefit recipients is estimated to increase from 322 000 to 395 000 in 1982-83.

That is a budgeted increase of 19 per cent. Not only is he somewhat pessimistic about what will happen to the number of people in receipt of unemployment benefits, but the Federal Budget also apparently indicates that there is no expected increase in employment during that period.

On page 61 of Budget paper No. 1, written by the Commonwealth Treasury, not by Mr Howard, Commonwealth public servants seem to support the political statement by the Federal Treasurer when they use the words that there, 'is a prospect of stagnant economic activity'. Apparently, economically, we are well and truly entering a new stone age. The Federal Treasury went on to state that this and the uncertain economic outlook further ahead can all be expected to encourage firms to greater efforts to economise in their labour requirements.

What a nice way to put it, to say that they are not going to want human beings any more! The Treasurer added that there was unlikely to be any growth in employment in 1982-83.

After acknowledging that potential workers will tend to

drop out of the labour force and become unrecorded or hidden unemployed, he concluded:

It is likely that there will be a marked increase in reported unemployment this year.

Yet, facing such a situation, one of the most important sections of our Budget is slashed. I refer there to the community welfare allocation. Finally, one can summarise the Budget as being about what we could expect from this Government: it is deceitful, defeatist, internally contradictory and it does little for the weak and poor in our community. Their needs will have to wait a few months more to be met after the almost certain election of a State Labor Government.

**Mr WHITTEN (Price):** I express my extreme regret and concern about the Budget that has been introduced by the Premier and Treasurer last Wednesday. This Budget does nothing at all for the State, except plunge it further into an economic morass. I was much intrigued last Sunday night when I happened to watch the channel 2 news and saw how bereft this Government was of any forward planning, in that it has had to recycle programmes which it introduced and which passed this Parliament about nine months ago. On Sunday night the Minister of Industrial Affairs announced that the Port Adelaide High School would be consolidated with the Port Adelaide Primary School.

I have examined the Budget papers and now refer to page 133, which refers to 'Port Adelaide High and Primary—Consolidation'. It refers to Parliamentary Paper No. 167/82 and an estimated total cost of \$1 305 000. It is expected that \$115 000 would be spent by 30 June 1982 and in 1982-83 a further \$800 000 will be spent.

My concern arises because this project was passed through the Public Works Standing Committee on 29 January 1982, yet the Minister of Industrial Affairs has had the cheek and audacity to announce last Sunday evening, 29 August, this project as a new measure, an undertaking that this Government was commencing.

Most likely, honourable members heard me speak about this matter in about March, when I expressed grave concern that the Government, after the Public Works Standing Committee decided and resolved, after hearing evidence from the Education Department and the Public Buildings Department, that the high school and primary school could be consolidated on the one site, and was to contain a child-parent centre.

I expressed grave concern in March this year that the Education Department had decided to not call tenders after evidence had been presented to the PWSC that there was direct need for this project to proceed. I feel sure that the attitude taken by the Port Adelaide High School and Port Adelaide Primary School councils had much to do with this Government's changing its views and calling for separate tenders to allow the child-parent centre project to proceed in the Port Adelaide High School area. I notice that an amount of \$1 305 000 is shown in the Budget papers for this project, although the PWSC approved an amount of \$1 095 000 for it.

Mention is made of an expenditure to June 1982 of \$115 000 at this school. I look at this school frequently and cannot see where work valued at \$115 000 has been carried out. Another \$800 000 is to be spent in the 1982-83 year, and the date of completion is given as August 1983. If one adds those figures the total is not correct. There is something crook here, probably because this Government is crook, and I think it falsifies figures wherever it can.

There have been reports in the press recently, including one in tonight's *News*, stating that this is the city's driest winter in five years, and I turn to the figures in the Budget in relation to the cost of pumping water to Adelaide's

reservoirs. I notice that a 25 per cent cost increase for 1982-83 will result in the spending of \$7 000 000, an underspending of \$1 400 000. The Premier and Treasurer has budgeted less for metropolitan pumping in the 1982-83 year than he did for the 1981-82 year. If it has been such a dry winter, and if our reservoir holdings are so low, surely, with the increased cost of electricity (and you would well know, Sir, from your constituents that there has been a sharp rise in the cost of electricity), the State Government will have to pay more to pump water into our reservoirs to maintain the metropolitan area, but the amount allocated for metropolitan pumping in the Budget is less for 1982-83 than it was for 1981-82.

As recently as 10 August, the Minister of Water Resources said that up to \$4 000 000 extra would be required to pay for pumping this year. If \$4 000 000 is required, why is the Premier and Treasurer allocating less money for pumping in this budget than he allocated for the past 12 months? I cannot see how these figures line up. I will be pleased if the Premier can explain these figures, although I do not think he can explain them to the satisfaction of the majority of members of this House.

Although the Premier claims that he is boosting significantly funds for housing, why is it that, on page 17 of his Financial Statement, there is reference to funds set aside for housing needs not being used for this purpose? If there are funds to be set aside for housing, why are those funds not to be used for that purpose? I think this Premier of ours talks double-talk in an endeavour to baffle people in this House (and outside of it). He does this all the time.

There are references to the Advances for the Housing Account and the need elsewhere for funds for 1981-82. It would appear that housing funds allocated were diverted. On page 120 of the 1982 Estimates of Payments it is shown that \$3 500 000 was allocated as advances for housing in 1981-82, but that that amount was not spent. In the Premier's 1981 Financial Statement, reference is made to \$3 500 000 in the Budget for housing. On page 10 of the 1982 Financial Statement the Premier refers to \$9 500 000 being saved on capital payments in 1981-82. These included water, sewerage and housing. A detailed analysis suggests that a \$3 500 000 cut in housing was a plausible component of the \$9 500 000 total.

**Mr HEMMINGS:** Mr Acting Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**Mr WHITTEN:** I was expounding on the serious financial situation in which the State finds itself. It causes me great concern when I look in the press and find that we have come back to the 1930's and now have soup kitchens in Adelaide. Most members of this House would not remember the soup kitchens. I have only vague memories of them, but I know that it is degrading for people who have to go to soup kitchens in order to exist. The press this morning states that at least three soup kitchens exist in Adelaide at the present time. I am also concerned, looking at a Sydney newspaper, to find that soup kitchens exist there. I believe that this is caused by the financial mismanagement of the Federal Government and the Liberal Government in South Australia. People are degraded, they must line up, they do not have sufficient money to buy food, and they are unable to get sufficient work to buy the food they need. The editorial in the *Advertiser* this morning headed, 'Sister Consolata', states:

The story of Sister Consolata, the Sydney nun who has been subjected to abuse while handing out free food to the poor and unemployed at Kings Cross, is a disturbing reminder of the divisiveness being engendered the world over by the creeping epidemic of unemployment.

I have read quite a deal of the history of the district in which I live and which I have the honour to represent. I refer to Port Adelaide.

**Mr Hamilton:** It is well represented, too.

**Mr WHITTEN:** Thank you for the compliment. What happened in the Port Adelaide area during the depression years of the 1930s, when soup kitchens were set up, I see happening in Adelaide now. I feel that we have not progressed at all in more than 50 years; we have gone back because there are so many people who cannot live in dignity and have to go to charities for handouts. This is disgusting.

**Mr Becker:** The Daughters of Charity have been doing it for years in Hutt Street.

**Mr WHITTEN:** I give full credit to those organisations endeavouring to assist people unfortunate enough to be unable to look after themselves. I give full credit to Sister Consolata, who set up the soup kitchen in Sydney. I condemn those people who have subjected Sister Consolata to such abuse: it is disgusting that some people will treat a woman, who is endeavouring to assist the underprivileged, in such a way.

In today's *Advertiser* one can see what is happening in this State. There is a photograph of Pastor Geoff Lohmeyer serving lunch to regulars at the West End Baptist Mission in Wright Street. They do a good job. One person served was a 50-year-old Aboriginal pensioner, and in the *Advertiser* it says that he 'tucked into his bangers and mash' and said that it was 'real grouse'. I am sure that that person would have had a wonderful meal. I like bangers and mash (which, of course, are sausages and mashed potato), and I am sure that that Aboriginal person who is down on his luck would really like them, too.

These sorts of things happen in South Australia under a Liberal Government that is not able to provide work for people, and those people cannot live in dignity; they have to look for charity. Those charitable organisations that do a wonderful job in this field are the Salvation Army refuge in Whitmore Square, the Daughters of Charity hand-out kitchen in Hutt Street, and the West End Baptist Mission.

Yesterday a gentleman came to my office who had worked at Actil for 27 years, and he was crying. Actil has been a good company in South Australia and has done a great job in providing a lot of work for the South Australian people. Unfortunately, there was a fire recently which caused Actil to lay off many people. On Friday this gentleman received through the post a notice to say that due to the fire it was unfortunate that the company had to lay off a lot of people, but that he could start work last Monday morning on blue shift. Evidently, Actil have blue and red shifts. On Friday afternoon he was hand delivered a letter to say that he had now become redundant owing to the financial policies of the Federal Government and that Actil was no longer able to employ the number of people it had employed previously.

So, in the morning post there was a letter telling him to report to work on the Monday morning just past, on his particular shift and do his normal duties, but then, hand delivered to him, was a letter to say that he was sacked owing to the financial situation resulting from the fact that Actil was unable to sell its products and also to the tariff arrangements that the Federal Government had imposed.

This poor fellow is 61 years of age. He has worked there for 27 years and thought that he had four more years to work. He came in to see me and was crying. He said, 'I have been over to the C.E.S. (the Commonwealth Employment Service) to look for a job.' They said, 'You will never work again.' It is so callous to say, 'You will never work again.' This man has given 27 years to the company. I am not going to condemn the company for sacking him. They have given him the award provisions. They have given him one week's redundancy payment, one week's pay in lieu of

notice, and paid him superannuation. He said that he had accumulated many weeks sick leave and that he had never taken out any sick leave.

He gets no payment for that, of course, and I am not one of those persons who believe that people who are not sick should receive payment. However, he was bitterly complaining that he had many weeks sick leave that he had not taken. He said, 'There are times I have worked for Actil when I should never have been at work.' Here he is, with two cheques totalling \$2 900, which was redundancy payment money that he had earned, and he had been on short time, four days a week.

This is a situation that so many people are experiencing. That poor fellow will never work again in his life. He knows that he will never work. However, he is one of many thousands. He has no family to support, except his wife, and he will get unemployment benefits until he is 65, when he will get a pension. These people are not able to live in dignity. They have to go to soup kitchens. I have seen people in Port Adelaide going through bins to try to get bottles out of the bins so that they can go and get some deposits back on them. I have also seen people taking scraps out of the bins and putting them in their pockets. They are so ashamed that they hide under their coats the scraps they have taken out of the bins in the market, but that is how they have to live.

I am really disgusted to be speaking in this debate knowing that I am able to live comfortably, and that every other member of this Parliament is also able to do so. However, I feel sure that many members opposite do not realise the situation of those people who are unemployed and who are living in such bad circumstances.

The situation was brought home to me again yesterday. A lady came in to my office to say that she was living in a two-bedroom flat—two very small rooms and a kitchen. She is paying \$45 a week, and I can assure members that I know the area in which she is living, and it is a very poor area. I have seen the flat from the outside, and it is very small. However, she and her husband have been paying \$45 a week. Her husband is unemployed, and they have one little child who I suppose is 12 to 15 months old. The landlord came to her yesterday—Monday—and said, 'Your rent was \$35. For the last month you have been paying \$40. As from next week you will pay \$45.'

Therefore, in just two to three weeks her rent has gone up by \$10 per week. She said, 'How am I going to pay that? My husband is unemployed.' The child was sick and she had to have medicine for that child. She was crying, which made me feel that way because I was unable to help her except to tell her that I would endeavour to assist her with the Housing Trust if I could. I do not know what the Housing Trust could do, because I know that 22 000 people have their names down with the Housing Trust and are waiting for homes. People do not put their names down with the Housing Trust unless they are in dire circumstances, because if they have deposits for homes they will, as will most Australians, endeavour to buy their own home.

But there are so many of those people who have been endeavouring to buy their own homes but who, because they are unable to meet high interest rates, rather than get further and further behind, are endeavouring to sell their houses to obtain some money so that they can buy a few things to keep them going. Therefore, they become extra people on the Housing Trust list. I know that the Housing Trust is doing all it can, but it is not receiving sufficient funds. The Housing Trust has done a great job in Port Adelaide, but it could do a lot more. There is a lot of land that is owned by the Housing Trust near the Port on which homes could be built if money was made available to the

trust. But, unfortunately, the money is not being made available.

In the last few minutes that I have available I want to talk about what is happening in regard to unemployment in the Port area. There is an organisation called the Port Unemployed Self Help which is an organisation of unemployed people who have banded together in an endeavour to help and assist those who are unemployed. The organisation has had one grant from the Government which enabled it to pay the salary of a co-ordinator. However, the organisation now wishes to set up a craft centre to enable unemployed people to go to the centre and make craft articles—woodwork, leatherwork and this type of thing—that they can sell and obtain some extra money. The people concerned made an application to the Department for the Arts for the development of a community craft co-operative. They wanted what they call a community craft co-operative for which they would have machines and through which they would be able to buy leather and wood so that they could fashion things into articles and get some extra money. From what I have seen of the leatherwork it is high quality work.

However, for those concerned to set the project up properly they needed some sort of finance. They wrote to the Department for the Arts requesting some sort of assistance, and I shall read some of the letter. First, though, I refer to a letter to me wherein assistance was sought and a request was made for me to approach Mr Murray Hill, M.L.C., to put the situation so that those concerned might be able to get some sort of assistance. The organisation also wrote to the Port Adelaide council requesting some support, but mainly for the purpose of getting support from the council through the Government, through Department for the Arts, by way of the Minister (Hon. C. M. Hill).

I would think that Mr Murray Hill would endeavour to support people. I have found that he is a reasonably humane sort of person. I have found previously that he has assisted people in Port Adelaide where he has been able to do so. However, it appears to me that the present Government has come to a situation where it has decided that there is to be no money available for such purposes. Only the week before last I raised in this House the position in regard to the Port Adelaide Primary School, which wished to put on an historical event towards the end of the year called *Circa 1900* for which the Government had enabled them to use the old bond store, which is owned by the Government. The function was to have been about the history of Port Adelaide around the turn of the century.

Unfortunately, funding for the co-ordinator has been cut off. It appears that the same thing has happened to Port Unemployed Self Help Inc., because their funding has also been cut off. I have a copy of a letter received by that group from the Acting Director, Mr Chris Winzar. It is addressed to the Management Committee of Port Unemployed Self Help Inc., as follows:

Further to your application for assistance to the Arts Grants Advisory Committee, I regret to advise that the committee has been unable to recommend a grant towards your project during the first funding period of the 1982-83 financial year.

A large number of applications were received this year and in view of the relatively limited funds available, it was unavoidable that some would be precluded from receiving assistance. The committee will again be inviting applications in September for projects initiated in the first six months of 1983.

In September that group can apply for funding for October next year. It applied for funding this year for the second half of the year but it was denied. The same thing happened to the Port Adelaide Primary School, which was also told that no funding would be available.

It appears that the State Government in this Budget has done nothing at all for ordinary people. All the Government

has done is increase taxation, which is contrary to what the Premier said. Actually, there is an increase in taxation. Unfortunately, the main thrust of the Government's financial mismanagement is to increase charges for water, electricity and many other things. There have been increased charges all the way through, along with an increase in taxation, even though the Premier and Treasurer said that he did not intend to increase taxation whatsoever. When one looks through these documents one can see that there is an increase of at least 12.5 per cent in taxation. Who is able to pay that? There was a report in the press—

**The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Slater):** Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** I have sat in this place today and listened to my colleagues. After the dinner adjournment I was hoping to hear from a Government member. I would have thought that one of the Government back-benchers, or indeed all of them, would speak to this Budget. Those who have spoken already include my Leader, the member for Playford, the member for Baudin, the member for Salisbury, the member for Gilles (who made a good speech, I might add), the member for Ascot Park, and the member for Price. I would have thought that we might see interspersed some speakers from the Government side. It appears that they have been effectively gagged by the Premier.

Obviously, members opposite have been told not to stand up and say anything. If that is the case, I believe they are a disgrace to this place. I know, as my colleagues know, that members opposite also have problems in their electorates. They have problems with housing, community welfare, transport—a whole multiplicity of problems. We as Parliamentarians should be standing up and pointing out such problems. Indeed, members on this side have at least honoured their commitment to their electors. However, there has been not one word from members opposite—not a peep out of them. What a puerile performance! These so-called democratic people said in 1979 that they would represent their electorates and try to do the best they could. I would have thought that we would hear something from them about the Budget.

However, not one word has been uttered. Where is the member for Henley Beach, from whom we hear so much on other occasions? But, on the Budget, he says not a word—not a word about the community welfare or housing problems that he has in his electorate. I know that he has problems in his electorate concerning housing and interest rates. Incidentally, we still have not heard a denial from him. The honourable member has done a lot of huffing and puffing in this place about an alleged statement. My colleagues have heard it. It is not an alleged statement, because we know that it is true: he made a statement about housing interest rates, saying that people had got themselves into those problems and that it was their fault. We have not heard one word of denial or a suggestion that it was an unsubstantiated statement. The honourable member has not got the intestinal fortitude to stand in this place and say that he did not say it.

**Mr Becker:** Where did he say it?

**Mr HAMILTON:** He said it, and we want him to deny it.

**Mr Becker:** Where did he say it?

**Mr HAMILTON:** I am not prepared to say where he said it, but when four of my colleagues know, as well as I do, and when two of them have spoken to that person, we know that it is right. Why does he not stand up in this place and say, 'I did not say it', full stop. He does not do so because, quite frankly, putting it in cold terms he has not got the guts to do so. We know that he said it. I should have thought that we would hear from the member for

Mawson or the member for Brighton, but they have not uttered a word. I hope that they will speak in this Budget debate because, if they do not, in my view, it is an indication that they are not prepared to criticise their own Budget or to put forward views on matters about which they are concerned in their own electorates. They could at least say, 'We do not believe that the Government has gone far enough or that it has done enough in this area'. Perhaps they could even make excuses after raising those issues, but they have uttered not one word. Not one iota have we heard from those members although they have had the opportunity to stand here in this place, with alternative speakers from each side participating, but not one of them has done so. As I have said before, it is a puerile performance, and I assure members that their performance on this Budget will certainly be noted by our candidates in those marginal seats.

I return to the Budget, which is an ample demonstration of the so-called concern of this Government for the people of this State. In the time left to me, I will demonstrate some of those so called concerns. My leader today demonstrated what a dishonest Budget this is. It certainly is not a balanced Budget, as claimed by the Premier. For example, when one reads through the Budget papers one sees that the Premier has padded the Budget result by diverting, in one instance, \$10 000 000 from the State Transport Authority and placing it in the Budget Account. Page 34 of the Premier's Financial Statement reveals that. Moreover, the Premier tries to blame the Commonwealth Government for his financial problems, which is quite a change, I might add, from his attitude prior to 15 September 1979. I listened with a great deal of interest today when the Premier responded to a question from my Leader and when the Premier referred to the carping, criticism and the knockings, so called, from my Leader.

However, he has a very short memory. In fact, I interjected across the Chamber a number of times that he was a hypocrite: I really believe that he is a hypocrite, a man who stood in this place during the Dunstan era and knocked, carped and criticised all the time. He blamed the State Government for all the ills in the State, but, when the boot is on the other foot, it is a different story. It is now the fault of the Premier's Federal colleagues and of the world recession. However, that was not the case in 1979 and prior to that. It was the fault of everyone else bar the Premier's Federal colleagues.

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Albert Park has the floor.

**Mr HAMILTON:** Thank you, Sir. I need your protection. It is very interesting that the Premier is distancing himself from his Federal colleagues, the very colleagues whom in 1980 he implored the people of South Australia to support. 'Vote Liberal for South Australia', I think he said. But now, when the Premier is in trouble because of bad management, he wishes to place all the blame for his mismanagement of the State's economy on his Federal colleagues, the workers of this State and everyone else except himself. The Premier's other statements have not been forgotten by the Opposition. The Premier claimed that this is a balanced Budget. On page 4, he said that South Australia has to receive only a 12.2 per cent rise in Commonwealth funds this year.

**Mr Schmidt:** Are you comfortable there?

**Mr HAMILTON:** Yes, I am. I am pleased to see that the honourable member is concerned for my welfare. He seems to be more concerned about my welfare than he is about that of his constituents, because he has not spoken in this debate. I hope that he does so. It was further stated:

However, the estimates of receipts indicate that the growth in total South Australian Budget receipts is to be only 10.9 per cent.

This implies a lower rate of growth in receipts from sources directed under the Premier's control, namely, State revenue sources. Indeed, total recurrent funds from South Australian sources are forecast to increase by only 8 per cent.

*Mr Schmidt interjecting:*

**Mr HAMILTON:** I am reading from some copious notes that were handed to me. Adjusted from different payments to Canberra in respect of the former South Australian Land Commission, the growth in local recurrent funds is still only 10.5 per cent. That is another indication of this Premier's dishonesty. I have pointed out previously that the Premier was trying to blame all the State's ills on everyone else except himself and his mismanagement. Some time ago, one of my constituents approached me in respect of his business, in regard to which he was experiencing problems. This man lived at West Lakes, and, with all due respect to my other constituents in other areas, one could say that West Lakes is a more affluent and better housing area.

Digressing for a moment, I point out that when I was door knocking in the area I received comments about the Premier, his budgeting and the progress of his Government which were very enlightening, to say the least. I expected, in going through that area, to find that there would be more Liberal or Government supporters than was the case. There were many disillusioned Liberal supporters, but, whether or not my constituent is a disillusioned Liberal supporter, I do not know.

As I have said, in regard to the correspondence, this person contacted me, having written to the Premier concerning the problem involving the business, and stating that the person would inform me of the Premier's response to the letter.

**The Hon. D. C. Brown:** What was her name?

**Mr HAMILTON:** I will read it out. Just contain yourself. Do not get excited. You may do yourself an injury, and I would hate to see that. The letter dated 18 August 1982 comes from the Premier's office and is signed by the Premier. I will not read out the name of the person to whom it is addressed, but I will show it to the Minister of Industrial Affairs later if he wants to see it. I did not obtain my constituent's permission to divulge the name, and I had better err on the side of caution. However, these people live in West Lakes. The letter from the Premier states:

Dear Mrs X,

Thank you for your letter concerning interest rates and other matters. I sympathise with the difficulties you are facing at present. I cannot accept your argument that it has been a State Liberal Government which has created the hardships that you outline. At present there is a world-wide economic recession which has increased interest rates and unemployment in almost all countries. It is impossible for any regional Government to be isolated from the impact of such a world-wide economic downturn.

Australia is experiencing high interest rates because many lenders and investors must be able to compete on the national investment market. Until countries like Britain and the United States and many of the industrialised markets in Western Europe lower interest rates, it will be impossible for lending institutions such as banks and building societies in Australia to apply more reasonable rates.

That is a questionable one to which I may come back later. The letter continues:

One of the unfortunate effects of an international recession is an inevitable downturn in consumer demand. This has a particular impact on South Australia because of our reliance on the motor vehicle industry and the production of household electrical goods. Please be assured that the Government is doing everything it can. Again, thank you for writing to me.

The following correspondence came to me at my office today, undated, from the same constituent;

Thank you for taking the interest in the letter I wrote to Mr Tonkin. Here is a copy of the very shallow reply that I received. He could not even offer an argument. I guess I was treated with

the contempt he thought I deserved. Little does he realise the contempt that I have for him.

Thank you once again for all you have done in your caring for people and their problems. It is not all in vain. People do appreciate your interest.

That letter is an indication of the contempt for this Government held by one of my constituents who lives in the West Lakes area. That person is not without influence, not only in that area but also within various organisations within my electorate. It is no wonder that the Minister of Industrial Affairs shot a look at me across the Chamber because, if I was in his position, I would be concerned, too, for his Government.

**Mr Plunkett:** He will be contesting for the Premiership!

**Mr HAMILTON:** God help us! At page 32 the Premier stated that the Government had avoided any increase in taxation rates. The fact is that Government policy moves have added \$12 500 000 to total tax collections in 1982-83. These policy moves include higher tax rates levied early in 1982, but not all of this taxation goes into the Budget.

Total taxation, as the Leader indicated today, will rise to \$500 000 000 for the first time. That is, effectively, a rise of 11.5 per cent, the highest rise in State taxes since 1976-77. Once again, the Premier has tried to distance himself from State taxation rises. Budget revenue in 1982-83 reflects the massive rises in State charges in recent months. This is one of the greatest cons ever perpetrated on the people of South Australia. This Government stated that it would cut succession duties, etc.—promises, promises!

Members on this side of the House, and tens of thousands of people in South Australia, have found out that this State Government and this Federal Government give with one hand and take back double with the other. I will always recall the advertisement showing a fist full of fivers which appeared in a newspaper several years ago referring to the Federal Budget. Regrettably, many people in South Australia have felt the effects of the present Federal Government and this State Government as well. I wish I had an hour to speak on this subject, but time is running short.

**Mr Becker:** God help us!

**Mr HAMILTON:** That is a nice interjection by the member for Hanson.

**Mr Becker:** This is the most boring speech I have ever heard.

**Mr HAMILTON:** The honourable member wants to listen to some of his own speeches.

**Mr Becker:** At least I talk a bit of sense.

**Mr HAMILTON:** Then stand up and talk, but I do not think the honourable member will, because he has been gagged by the Premier. He has been told to sit down and sit back. So much for Liberal policies, so much for Liberal Concern in South Australia for the electorate! Members opposite have been gagged, have been told to sit down and be quiet, like little boys. Returning to cuts in recurrent expenditure; health expenditure has been cut by 9.5 per cent in real terms; community welfare by 4.9 per cent; corporate affairs by 4.7 per cent; and public works by 14 per cent.

**Mr Schmidt:** Put some sincerity into it.

**Mr HAMILTON:** Stand up, if you have the guts, and have a go. Industrial affairs has been cut by 1.7 per cent. These cuts have been made by a Government that says it is going to help the people of South Australia. We have seen the so-called help in so many areas.

**The Hon. D. C. Brown:** Did you make allowance for amounts coming from the round sum amounts not included under the lines?

**Mr HAMILTON:** If the Minister wants an opportunity to speak, he can get up and say a few words. I wonder whether he has been gagged. Let him stand and make his own statements. Let us look at what this Government has

done for housing. I was interested to see in the Federal Budget what has been done after all this hoo-hah about how it was going to help this Government.

*Mr Schmidt interjecting:*

**Mr HAMILTON:** It certainly affects the State Government and its finances. This is the Government that asked the South Australian people to support a Liberal Government in 1980. These cuts are affecting the housing industry in South Australia in particular. The 1982 Federal Budget fails to provide the housing sector with the stability it requires to achieve an adequate supply of housing to meet social needs, contribute to employment growth, and assist in economic recovery. Housing irregularities will be widened, housing finance will be dearer and more volatile, rents will rise and housing insecurity will increase. It is interesting, when one looks through the Federal Budget, to see the effect it will have on South Australia, because we will pay one way or the other, whether through the Federal or State Government, as a result of what is happening in both Federal and State Budgets.

The standard pension rate, which was 24.5 per cent of average weekly earnings in 1975, is at present only 21.9 per cent of average weekly earnings. When the pension is adjusted in November it will still reach only 22 per cent of average weekly earnings, a real decline in value. Pensioners will be granted fringe benefits only to find them cancelled out because there has been a cost of living increase to superannuation or a higher interest rate on money invested. Supplementary rent assistance, which certainly affects many South Australians, and which is paid only to the poorest pensioners, those with almost no other income and paying rent on the private market, will rise on 1 November 1982 from \$8 to \$10. This \$2 increase is a derisory amount compared to hand-outs to new home owners.

Last year 451 000 pensioners, of whom 257 000 did not own their own homes and had no income apart from their pensions, received supplementary assistance. Rentals at the bottom end of the market are rising at an annual rate of more than \$10 a week. A further glaring discrimination is a refusal to grant supplementary assistance to unemployed people paying rent. They are the ones that should be better looked after, not only by the Federal Government but also by the State Government. If they are not looked after properly, the people of South Australia are going to pay one way or another.

It saddens me to see that the increase given to the unemployed, particularly those between 16 and 18 years of age, was a paltry sum of \$4 which was granted to teenagers. They are living well below the poverty line. There is no recognition that many of these young people must live away from home for family reasons or to look for work. Nothing in the Federal Budget explains how a 16 or 17 year old is expected to live on just over \$5 a day. I would have expected the State Government to exert pressure on the Federal Government to assist the unemployed 16 and 17 year olds. However, I cannot recall hearing anything from the Government in that regard. I would have expected this Government to exert pressure on its Federal colleagues for a living-away-from-home supplement to make up the unemployment benefit to at least that of the 18 year old single unemployment rate.

In the short time I have left I will refer to some of the issues raised by my colleague, the member for Price, in speaking about community welfare. I would imagine that most members in this place, like I have, would have received, perhaps on average every week if not every day, many applications for assistance from community welfare. However, when one looks through the pathetic Budget, one sees that the community welfare allocation has been cut by 5 per cent at a time when unemployment is rising and poverty

is increasing in our community. I would have thought that one of the top priorities for this Government would have been to allocate more money to the disadvantaged within our community.

I remember the member for Napier only the other week in this place saying unashamedly how he had cried when he could not assist one of his constituents. I believe that many of us feel like doing that out of frustration because money is not available to assist the needy in the community, those people below the poverty line who are most in need of help. But, a 5 per cent cut in this area in the Budget speaks volumes for the so-called sincerity of this Government, a Government which stands up and makes pious statements about its concern, but, when it is asked to put its money where its mouth is, it is sadly found wanting.

I hope that back-bench members of the Government will stand up because, if they do not, it indicates, as I have said before, that they have been effectively gagged by the Premier. One can question the reason. Is it perhaps because those back-benchers might make a slip-up or might even be bold enough to criticise the Budget that their Premier brought down?

**Mr LANGLEY (Unley):** I admit that I have not read the whole of the Budget papers. I have been out in my electorate and have found that there is a certain amount of apathy concerning the Budget. Also, when door knocking in Florey one finds exactly the same thing: apathy. There is no doubt who will win the election in Florey next Saturday.

Wherever one travels, four or five things stand paramount in South Australian peoples' minds, and little has been done, about these things in the Budget papers: everything has risen. Yet, whatever the Premier may say, unemployment is a burning question in the community, and so is education. The Government has done many somersaults regarding education over the past 12 months, and I can assure honourable members that the Minister of Education is not held in high esteem by the people of this State.

If one talks to people in the electorate about interest rates, one finds that these things are going against the Government, because the Government promised to do so many things for the people of this State and it has fallen down all along the line. The Minister in charge of the House knows that as well as I. The people of South Australia know it as well. Recently a Mr Cummings wrote in the newspaper about the building industry being on the improve. If Mr Cummings talked to people in the building trade and found out how well that trade was going, he would find that many subcontractors and people in that field are falling away and are going bankrupt.

These are the areas in which the Government of this State, in its three years, was supposedly to help the people of South Australia; it has been a fizzer. Members opposite should walk around their electorates and find out what people think about the Government. I hope that those members have the stomach to let this Budget ride until March next year, and then see what will happen at the election if the Government goes that long.

I assure honourable members opposite that the Government would not win if it went to the polls now. Government members know that, and they will hang on as long as they can, but that will not worry me because I do not mind being in this House with my friends in Opposition, and I also have my friends in the Government.

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

**Mr LANGLEY:** On the very rare occasions that I have been to the Minister who is now in charge of this House, he has always been helpful. I do not have any bias against him; every person has a job to do. It did not help much when he went to the Goodwood Orphanage with the would-

be member for Unley standing beside him holding a cricket bat.

Government members and their colleagues would not know a cricket bat from a croquet mallet. I could tell by the way they handled it. You are supposed to put your hands in the right place, and they played with a soft ball because they did not like playing cricket with a hard ball.

**The Hon. D. C. Brown:** You've made a mistake—it was a hockey stick.

**Mr LANGLEY:** Whatever it was, the Minister did not know until someone told him. However, I have to say that it was a real joy to know how the Minister looked after the local member when I was out there. He did not play politics in any way at all. He did not know that the Liberal candidate would not be standing alongside him. I did pretty well, though, and I was able to talk to the people of my district where I get my votes. They will wake up one day to this.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr LANGLEY:** I am on the retired list. If I want any help from the Minister I will come and see him. If I ever have had a friend in this House it is the Hon. Des Corcoran, who was Premier before this atrocious Government came to power. The member for Hartley, as he is known today, made sure that when the Labor Government left office the financial affairs were in a good state. Money had been put aside for transport matters, including the project for the north-eastern area, part of which the member for Norwood represents so well.

Many proposals were ready to proceed, but look at what has happened! This Government continually transfers money from vital areas, which keep people in work, in order to prop up the Revenue Account. There is no doubt about that, and it has been shown over and over again during the term of this Government. That is the reason why so many people are out of work. The Government is always talking about getting jobs for people. The Premier says, 'We have 20 000 new jobs,' but 21 000 people have been put off. People are losing jobs all the time.

Whatever the Premier may say when he gets those good Dorothy Dix questions—and sometimes the members cannot even read the questions given to them... Question Time is not worth a bumper as far as I am concerned. It has all been said before, and it does not worry me at all. You get no publicity at all. We should have at least 15 questions an hour in the House, as there used to be. Now we get six or seven, and after 20 minutes we get about four. Whatever members may say in this House, we have the highest unemployment of any mainland State. If members look at the graph, they will find that the position under this Government is worse than it was under the Labor Government.

**The Hon. D. C. Brown:** No, it isn't.

**Mr LANGLEY:** If the Minister looks at the graph, I can assure him that he will find that he is wrong.

**The Hon. D. C. Brown:** What is unemployment at present—What 7.7 per cent! It was 8.2 per cent under your Government.

**Mr LANGLEY:** It was not always the highest like it is now. You can twist it as you please. It is the highest of the mainland States, and that is what counts as far as I am concerned. It does not alter the fact that if the honourable member—

**Mr McRae:** It's been higher for longer.

**Mr LANGLEY:** It has been higher for longer—there is no doubt about that. The Minister wants to twist it to suit himself.

*The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:*

**Mr LANGLEY:** The Minister cannot upset me at all. He should look at the graph that accompanied my recent speech.

In those days sometimes it was 2.1 per cent. But, whatever it was, at the moment unemployment in South Australia is

the highest of any mainland State, whether the Minister likes it or not. Is that any credential? Is the Minister going to use that? South Australia has the highest rate of unemployment of any of the mainland States. This State has never had a higher rate of unemployment since the Government has been in office.

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

**Mr LANGLEY:** If the Minister went outside, he would find out the facts. No doubt he has door-knocked his area of Davenport every time! The Minister would not know what was going on. I do not want to say what I said before about the Minister of Industrial Affairs, for certain reasons.

**Mr McRae:** Don't say it again or you might be named.

**Mr LANGLEY:** I do not want to be named. However, it has been said once and it has got out into the electorate.

**Mr Randall:** When are you going to get your \$1 000 a week job in tourism in Victoria?

**Mr LANGLEY:** The member for Henley Beach is now making some of his last interjections, so I do not have to worry about them. I have heard members opposite say that people are dole bludgers. I can assure members opposite that people in my electorate are willing to work, but many of them cannot get jobs.

**Mr Schmidt:** Who coined the phrase?

**Mr LANGLEY:** The member for Mawson also is making some of his last interjections, so we have no worries at all. I hope he gets his job back in one of the schools. I hope the Government looks after the honourable member; he will not be back in office after the election, and he will go back to his former profession. In regard to the statements made about dole bludgers, I point out that I have never known there to be so many people in my area who cannot get jobs. It is not their fault. As the member for Price said tonight, a fellow of 61 years of age is defunct—it is 'Goodnight, nurse' at that age. I can assure members opposite that if there were jobs people would be willing to work at them, but there are no jobs around. The member for Mawson should know better as there is unemployment in his own district. If there were jobs available people would be willing to work. Members opposite cannot blame the Opposition—Government members must blame themselves.

I have never known the people of the press to go so well: the slogan 'It's our State mate' has now been changed in my district to 'It's now a stalemate'. The slogan 'It's a great State' was another fizzer. They were misleading slogans, and they have not connected in any way at all. The State might be great, but I can assure members that the Government is not so great.

It will not be long before the next election when we will probably encounter those dirty, snide things that were put in the press prior to the last election, and the Opposition will then have further cause to criticise the Government. Unemployment, however is a matter that this Government will never resolve.

I now refer once again to one of the schools in my district, namely, the Black Forest school. Once again there is every chance that that school will not receive anything. I have said before and I will say again that the schools in my area were absolutely hopeless when I first came into Parliament in 1962. It took me several years to get those schools up to some standard. When the Labor Government was in power at least it did something to lift the standard of the schools in my district, and the Labor Government did not play a game like that which is now being played.

I think one school was built in that time and that was at Mount Gambier. Surely members on both sides of the House know that schools are not being maintained as they

should be. Contrary to what the Minister of Education has said, class sizes have changed.

**Mr Mathwin:** Which Government stopped cleaning the windows?

**Mr LANGLEY:** What a mighty thing. I have not heard the member for Glenelg mention McNally since his Party came to Government. Even if we did stop cleaning the windows, I have not heard any complaints. I have not heard a member opposite ask about that.

**Mr Schmidt:** What complaints have you got from down my way?

**Mr LANGLEY:** Has this Government changed since it came to power? No answer was the stern reply!

**Mr Mathwin:** It costs \$70 000 000 to build a high school now.

**Mr LANGLEY:** That does not matter. Money values have changed over the last few years. I do not think the honourable member can use that argument. I can recall the Minister of Education meeting with people from the pre-school area at the front of this building. I have never seen a Minister go to water so quickly. Within a week it was 'Good night nurse' and it was back on again. However, those people have not forgotten.

**Mr Schmidt:** They are not worried.

**Mr LANGLEY:** They will worry about it on election day, because they know that members opposite twist and turn and it will be on again. This Government twists and turns in relation to pre-schools. It was wonderful. Members opposite thought that they would turn the tide. However, people remember and they know what will happen if it happens

again. I have received a newspaper cutting about the Munno Para Primary School from the member for Napier. I am sure the Minister knows about that school. There is no doubt about it; it is shocking to think that a school could be in that condition.

**Mr Mathwin:** That is what this Government did; it spent \$400 000.

**Mr LANGLEY:** Yes, this Government did it. I have no need to worry. Members opposite cannot upset me. I have two lads who are schoolteachers. They could tell me a lot of things but I would not use them in the House. The member for Mawson will probably have to return to that profession very soon. I have received a document dated Wednesday 25 August. One thing can be said: whenever the Minister makes a statement it is marvellous the way he is rebuked by certain people who have facts. I am sure the member for Mawson has read this document—I do not know whether he believes it. The document refers to certain surveys. It is a factual document and I am waiting for the Minister to respond to it. According to these people and this document, what the Minister has said is not true. The Minister flusters and filibusters.

**Mr Mathwin:** What's not true?

**Mr LANGLEY:** It is about class sizes and so on. I have two statistical tables and I seek leave to have them inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

**The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Slater):** Do I have the member's assurance that they are purely statistical?

**Mr LANGLEY:** Yes, Mr Acting Deputy Speaker, they are.

Leave granted.

TABLE 1: Distribution of class sizes for South Australian sample (Australian average in brackets)

CLASS SIZE—PERCENTAGE OF CLASSES WITHIN CLASS TYPE OF SIZE:

JUNIOR PRIMARY	11	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-45	45
Single grade	— (0.8)	3.5 (1.5)	5.0 (6.1)	42.1 (24.9)	45.1 (47.7)	4.3 (18.0)	— (0.9)	— (0.1)	— (—)
Composite classes	5.0 (14.1)	8.4 (6.5)	19.1 (13.9)	39.2 (32.1)	27.6 (27.9)	0.6 (5.0)	— (—)	— (0.1)	— (0.3)
Open space/grouped	4.5 (8.5)	— (0.2)	16.0 (16.8)	33.2 (29.2)	45.6 (30.4)	— (9.4)	— (0.7)	0.6 (1.3)	— (3.4)
Special/opportunity	40.1 (63.8)	34.6 (25.2)	— (3.6)	— (0.9)	25.2 (6.4)	— (—)	— (—)	— (—)	— (—)
TOTAL	4.5 (6.4)	6.1 (3.4)	14.5 (9.4)	37.7 (27.4)	35.7 (39.4)	1.4 (12.8)	— (0.6)	0.1 (0.2)	— (0.3)
PRIMARY	11	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-45	45
Single grade	— (—)	0.6 (0.2)	1.2 (1.8)	7.7 (10.4)	84.3 (52.7)	6.2 (33.6)	— (1.3)	— (—)	— (—)
Composite grade	8.9 (7.5)	6.6 (9.6)	7.8 (12.3)	28.9 (23.1)	44.4 (35.5)	3.3 (11.0)	— (0.4)	— (0.3)	— (0.3)
Open space/grouped	2.7 (3.3)	— (—)	— (5.9)	15.2 (20.5)	74.0 (37.6)	6.1 (24.3)	1.1 (0.7)	— (0.3)	— (7.4)
Special/opportunity	32.6 (48.2)	36.7 (30.7)	— (9.1)	— (4.7)	30.7 (5.5)	— (1.9)	— (—)	— (—)	1.0 (—)
TOTAL	3.5 (3.2)	3.0 (3.5)	2.8 (5.3)	14.0 (14.7)	71.2 (45.9)	5.3 (25.7)	0.1 (1.0)	— (0.1)	0.1 (0.5)
SECONDARY	11	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-45	45
Up to Year 10	— (—)	18.4 (5.4)	29.9 (16.2)	28.1 (26.0)	26.9 (44.2)	5.7 (8.1)	— (0.1)	— (—)	— (—)
Years 11-12	17.1 (7.7)	10.3 (11.8)	22.0 (35.8)	31.3 (36.0)	18.0 (8.1)	1.3 (0.6)	— (—)	— (—)	— (—)
Open space/grouped	— (1.7)	— (12.6)	100.0 (19.1)	— (26.0)	— (30.6)	— (9.2)	— (—)	— (—)	— (0.8)
Special/opportunity	43.2 (64.9)	41.0 (10.8)	6.6 (20.0)	9.3 (2.1)	— (—)	— (2.2)	— (—)	— (—)	— (—)
TOTAL	5.6 (4.9)	16.5 (7.1)	21.2 (20.5)	28.6 (26.9)	23.8 (34.3)	4.3 (6.3)	— (0.1)	— (—)	— (—)

TABLE 2: Classroom conditions

	S.A. Average %	National Average %
Demountable buildings	33	15.3
Needing maintenance	25.6	23.2
Inadequately cooled	48.7	35.7
Inadequately ventilated	15.7	7.4
Inadequately heated	8.6	13.4
Inadequately lit	2.5	5.9
Exposed to excessive noise outside the classroom	8.8	8.5
Classes held in wrong rooms (i.e. classes held in rooms not designed for the kind of lesson being held).	2.1	3.7

**An honourable member:** They tell me you can run a duck out there.

**Mr LANGLEY:** I am glad the member interjected.

I do not want to be a fool and door knock in Davenport.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr LANGLEY:** I have been down one street in that district and I will go down more.

**Mr Mathwin:** Will you be covering the Glenelg District?

**Mr LANGLEY:** I have given the honourable member away. This is how members opposite canvass for votes: they say, 'How are you, dear' and they hand out pamphlets at shopping centres, because they would not be game to knock on doors.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr LANGLEY:** Kym Mayes and I have done a great deal of door knocking, but I do not know what has happened to the Liberal candidate. We are going well. I assure members opposite that there is no need to worry about election results in the Unley District and the Florey District. I only hope that the Minister of Industrial Affairs goes there, too, and goes to shopping centres and says, 'How are you, dear? Please vote Liberal.' Next morning will the council complain that there is a great deal of rubbish on the footpath?

**Mr Mathwin:** What about kissing babies?

**Mr LANGLEY:** One does not win votes by doing that. When there is a baby show, I am never the judge, because I could possibly lose votes if I acted as judge. I have here a pamphlet headed, 'Do you want another left-wing union leader in Parliament?' The pamphlet asks Florey voters whether they want an endorsed left-wing leader in Florey to join Mr Peter Duncan's growing influence on the Labor Party in Parliament. One could not adopt tactics that are much lower than the tactics seen in that pamphlet.

**The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Slater):** Can the honourable member link his remarks to the Budget?

**Mr LANGLEY:** My remarks relate to the electoral set-up. However, I will not deal further with this matter now. The Liberal Party always uses dirty tactics in such circumstances. I do not usually get down to personalities. What we have seen from the Liberal Party is another drop of dirt, and it is about time the Liberal Party stopped it.

I will abide by what you have said, Mr Acting Deputy Speaker. If members opposite want to sling mud, let them do so. I can stand the strain. They slung mud at me and said that I was Langley the larrikin from Unley, but I won by 43 votes overall.

**Mr Becker:** Not only that but also you are undefeated.

**Mr LANGLEY:** I will say that again. I do not want to miss an opportunity. I refer now to health. Cricket is a great game and I wish that I was playing now. I would become a professional. I played for South Australia for five shillings a day, but I got nothing from the Minister of Sport. I must go a little further in regard to health. There is no doubt that everyone needs good health, and that cannot be bought. The allocation for health has been cut and people will be in more and more trouble. There is no doubt about that. In many cases, people cannot afford health care. Some people have not done the right thing by subscribing to a fund. I cannot say that I have not spoken to the member for Mallee.

I am concerned about long-stay patients in hospitals. Members on both sides would have had experience of this situation. I checked out this matter and found that, after deductions are made from pensions, some people receive a pittance of \$2.40 to spend on themselves. Perhaps I am wrong and perhaps I am right, but these people have done a lot of good for South Australia, and possibly for Australia. However, because of illness, they receive only \$2.40 a week. In most cases those people are getting old and must be looked after by someone else. We have seen a perfect example of this situation since the Government came to power. As I stand here, the Premier stated that, as soon as the Liberal Party got into power, it would do something about the Julia Farr Home (the former Home for Incurables). I was present when he said that. But, nothing has been done at all. That home was built almost with the help of the people of this State, and there is no doubt about that.

As I said, good health is a great thing, but, if one does not have good health, there is no possible hope. One finds at the Royal Adelaide Hospital and at other hospitals that there have been cuts, cuts and more cuts, and I do not believe that that is right. Whatever members opposite may think, some people cannot help themselves. This situation occurs also in the District of Mallee, and I have spoken to the member for Mallee. I have not gone behind his back in any way at all. It is about time that the Government did something about health, particularly in regard to the Julia Farr Home.

Some people cannot do much for themselves, and in some cases they have no relatives. I am concerned about how well they are looked after. The Labor Government, when in power, did something for the people of this State. I remember that we gave concessions, and perhaps something

may be done in the future, but, for goodness sake, let us do something about the people who have made this State great and whose income, in many cases, has been eroded. It is ridiculous to think that this Government has been willing to make cuts in such an area. I only hope that something will be done this year, and when I get an opportunity I will state that the Government has made cuts in this important area.

If one goes to these places, one can see it oneself. They do not even change the sheets over the weekend at Flinders Medical Centre. These may be little things, but they are all part and parcel of the matter.

**Mr Randall:** Ease up!

**Mr LANGLEY:** The honourable member tells me to ease up, but I have absolute proof.

**Mr Randall:** That's not true.

**Mr LANGLEY:** I am telling the honourable member that it is true. I know, and I have a letter to show it.

**Mr Randall:** I would like to see it.

**Mr LANGLEY:** Of course the honourable member would. I am worried about the way in which the Government is looking after our pensioners and about the way in which our hospitals are being run and what is happening. The Hon. Dr Cornwall in another place at all times is keeping the Minister of Health under threat and is doing an excellent job. By going outside, I know what people are saying about him and what is happening.

In conclusion, may I say that this will be the last opportunity I will have to speak to the Budget, and I want to say one thing: I do not think it will work, and the people do not think it will work. I hope the Government goes to 8 March when we will see what will happen to it, then it will be 'see you later'.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN (Minister of Industrial Affairs):** After a speech like that, I am urged to move, so that we can hear much more:

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

Motion carried.

**Mr HEMMINGS (Napier):** The last comment from the Minister of Industrial Affairs shows exactly the way in which the Government sees this Budget. Not one government member has been willing to defend the Budget that has been put before this House.

**Mr Becker:** Nothing has been raised by the Opposition.

**Mr HEMMINGS:** Not one member has been willing to say that the Budget is good for the economy of this State. There has been plenty of laughter, but it has been shallow and hollow laughter, because Government members know that the Budget prepared by their Premier and Treasurer does nothing for this State. In my five short years in this House, this is the first time that I have ever known when not one Government member has been willing to defend what the Government has put before the people.

**Mr Becker:** Did you speak in the Budget debate in 1978-79?

**Mr HEMMINGS:** The member for Hanson is being goaded into action. Perhaps on Thursday he might be able to scrape something together from the Budget papers to defend his Premier, but other Government members will not even try. They have nothing to say.

**Mr Hamilton:** They've been gagged.

**Mr HEMMINGS:** That is right: Government members have been gagged. The word has gone around that you, Mr Acting Deputy Speaker, will not speak, even if you want to speak, because Government members have been gagged. Having dispensed with the contribution from the Government side, let me now look at the media, which has said that this is a responsible Budget, a toe-the-line Budget,

which is good for the people, and everything else. It is unfortunate in this society today that the media is willing to accept the line that conservative Governments are putting forward that we do nothing, that we just cut down on everything and claim that that is responsible.

**Mr Max Brown:** They won't pay their journalists money, either.

**Mr HEMMINGS:** Well, I think that that line reflects the selfish attitude of society today. Those who are in work say that they are not worried about the unemployed, the needy, and those people in poverty because it is not happening to them. The press and the conservative Government carry on that process.

**Mr Randall:** That is pretty unfair.

**Mr HEMMINGS:** It is not. If the member for Henley Beach thinks that that is unfair, let him go to the Speaker, put his name down and speak in this debate. He does not dare do that, because he knows that at the next election he is going to lose his seat and that anything he says tonight will make matters worse. The member for Henley Beach is the worst example of a sit in, lazy politician who does not care about the people he represents, because he knows he is going to lose his seat at the next election. This Budget does nothing for those people who are in real need, despite the grandiose terms used by the Premier about toeing the line, and holding the line. It does nothing at all.

*Mr Ashenden interjecting:*

**Mr Trainer:** No, 1.7. That's safer than you would be on 20. You couldn't even find a candidate until a few weeks ago, and look at the idiot you—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I understand that the honourable member for Ascot Park has already made his contribution. The honourable member for Napier.

**Mr HEMMINGS:** This is a Budget for the complacent, the middle class, the rich, and people who do not care about other people's problems. I will now try to outline exactly where this Budget falls down. My particular responsibility lies in the areas of housing and local Government. I will make a few comments about the Premier's Financial Statement, which, at page 3, states:

Australia experienced a better than average economic growth up to the September quarter of 1981, but conditions deteriorated fairly quickly thereafter. The unemployment rate at the end of July 1982 was 6.6 per cent of the labour force compared with 5.5 per cent a year earlier.

That Sharp deterioration nationally was not matched in South Australia, where the unemployment rate actually fell from 8 per cent to 7.6 per cent over the same period.

If one is attuned to the Premier's thinking and reads that statement (and I am sure there are not many members on this side who are attuned to his thinking), one realises that the Premier is saying that he is happily prepared to accept that 7.6 per cent is acceptable to this State.

**The Hon. D. C. Brown:** That is a Treasury document, that was not the Premier.

**Mr HEMMINGS:** We will forget the smart alec remarks from the Minister of Industrial Affairs. The Premier is accepting the fact that South Australia is happy to accept the fact that 7.6 per cent of the people in the state are unemployed.

I do not accept that. In my own electorate 13.5 per cent of the people are unemployed. Something like 25 per cent of people under 21 years of age are unemployed. The Premier is perfectly happy with that situation. He does not really worry about it.

**The Hon. D. C. Brown:** Where does he say that?

**Mr HEMMINGS:** He is saying it on page 3 of the Budget. If the Minister of Industrial Affairs is prepared to get out his Budget papers he will see it.

**The Hon. D. C. Brown:** You quote it. Where does it say he is happy with that?

**Mr Keneally:** The whole Budget says it.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr HEMMINGS:** In my area some people have no chance whatsoever of getting a job, yet the Premier and Treasurer says in his Budget that he is perfectly happy with the fact that 7.6 per cent of the population is unemployed. He has even gone one step further and said that he is perfectly happy to accept that the public sector will be further retrenched and will face a greater strain on employment figures. It is no wonder that not one member opposite is prepared to endorse those figures.

I am sure that the members for Henley Beach, Brighton, Mawson, Morphett, and Todd are in real trouble and are unhappy with the Budget. However, they dare not say anything about it. We have a situation where the Premier and Treasurer is perfectly happy.

*Mr Trainer interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Ascot Park has already had the call.

**Mr HEMMINGS:** Let us look at the area of welfare housing. I would be the last person to say that this Government has not raised the level of building in public sector housing. I do not call it welfare housing but rather public sector housing. The Premier has raised it to an all-time level.

**Mr Randall:** That is good.

**Mr HEMMINGS:** It is good. More homes were built last year. Because of the \$800 000 which has been given to this State by the Commonwealth Government 2 180 homes are proposed to be built this year. However, let us not get fooled by numbers. Why, last year, was the Government able to build—I think it was—

**Mr Glazbrook:** 1 815.

**Mr HEMMINGS:** It was 1 815 homes. I accept the figure from the member for Brighton.

There were three main reasons why the trust built those houses. The trust was able to borrow money from the State Government Insurance Commission, and the Public Service Superannuation Fund and through promissory notes legislation passed by this House. That was very dear money: money that the trust could not really afford.

I have it on good authority—and the member for Henley Beach may laugh—that the South Australian Housing Trust did not want to borrow that money, but that this Government forced it to take out those loans. So, the trust built a record number of houses last year. This year an additional \$8 500 000 was advanced to this State from the Federal Government, which gave that money to the State with no strings attached and said that it was to be used to the best of the Government's ability to help the people of the State.

This Government, hell bent on using the trust for welfare housing, decided to put that money into that area. So, we are to get more housing. Where could we have spent that \$8 500 000? We could have used it in three ways: first, to provide second mortgages for people using the State Bank who would not be eligible to get a first loan, but possibly with extra assistance could get a second loan; secondly, for those people who want to bridge the deposit gap, therefore enticing them out of the rental market and into private homes; and, thirdly, for providing extra assistance with first mortgages.

But this Government decided that all the money was to go to public sector housing. That will literally achieve nothing. Despite last year's figure of 1 815 and this year's projected figure of 2 180, the application list for trust housing is lengthening and the waiting list now has more than 27 000

names. All this Government is achieving, in effect, is making this a State of people who cannot afford to buy their own homes and who rely on the South Australian Housing Trust to provide them with housing. Is that what this Government wants? This Government does not want that. If one reads its past history it has always promoted home ownership, but in the past three years it has done nothing towards that.

The Premier, in his Financial Statement, reinforced what I have been saying over the past three years: that the Federal Government has gone completely out of providing money for public sector housing. However, the recent Federal Budget made quite clear that those States that were prepared to move into public sector housing to try to ease the situation were to be given Commonwealth support. The Financial Statement, under 'Semi-government Programmes', states:

In addition to funds allotted to the State Government loan programme through the Loan Council, funds are available also to the State through semi-government borrowings under two separate programmes—the larger and the smaller statutory authorities borrowing programmes.

As from 1 July 1982, major electricity authorities will be free to borrow outside Loan Council constraints. Of course all State Governments and their electricity authorities will have a clear responsibility to ensure that borrowings are made on terms and conditions which have proper regard for the economy as a whole. Overseas borrowings will still require the consent of Loan Council.

For the larger authorities, Loan Council sets a limit on the total borrowings for a year and within that total leaves it to the State Government to set priorities. The limit for South Australia for 1982-83 is \$32 900 000, including the special allocation of \$4 500 000 for water filtration. After adjusting for that special allocation and the new borrowing arrangement for the Electricity Trust, the 1982-83 limit is \$2 600 000 (10 per cent) above the limit set in 1981-82.

The Government proposes to allocate that amount of \$32 900 000 as follows:

	\$ million
South Australian Housing Trust .....	30.4

One would say that, despite my criticism about semi-government borrowings, which imply high interest, that is not a bad idea. Actually, it gives more money to the South Australian Housing Trust to build more homes. However, when one looks at the Federal Budget, a point not picked up by this Government is that the Federal Treasurer made available sums of money to the State Governments to provide extra money for special housing needs. This Treasurer, our Treasurer, our beloved Treasurer, our beloved Premier, is saying that the South Australian Housing Trust will have to use semi-governmental loans. I do not know the interest rate on semi-governmental loans, but I am sure that it must be more than 10 per cent.

The Premier professes to be so concerned about the problems of public sector housing that he wants to provide more homes (as he stated in his Financial Statement). Government back-benchers are sending out leaflets galore about what they are doing for welfare housing and everything else (I have seen the ones from the members for Henley Beach, Brighton and Morphett) but if the Government is so concerned why has no-one ever picked up the actual offer that the Federal Treasurer made to the State Governments? The 1982-83 Federal Budget states:

... a State may nominate further amounts from its works and housing programme for welfare housing, provided that the State in question maintains its 1981-82 level of expenditure on such housing from its own resources. Such nominated additional amounts would be advanced to the State on relevant terms and conditions applying to other Commonwealth welfare housing loans.

If the Government is so sincere about trying to reduce the total number of 27 000 people waiting for Housing Trust accommodation, one would have thought that it would take up that offer immediately.

**Mr Glazbrook:** It has.

**Mr HEMMINGS:** But the Government hasn't.

**Mr Glazbrook:** Yes it has.

**Mr HEMMINGS:** The member for Brighton says that the Government has, but he does not know, as he is a fool.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I would suggest to the member for Napier that he not speak in those terms.

**Mr HEMMINGS:** Well, Sir, I am only speaking the truth.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I would suggest to the member for Napier that he not answer the Chair back. The Chair endeavours to be most tolerant. I suggest to the honourable member that there is a standard that the public expects members to display in this House, and I suggest he apply himself in a more reasonable fashion, or I will deal with him. The honourable member for Napier.

**Mr HEMMINGS:** Thank you, Sir. At present the Government is forcing the Housing Trust to take semi-governmental loans, to take loans through the S.G.I.C. and through the State Superannuation Fund, whereas the Government could be taking advantage of the offer from the Federal Government. The Federal Government's offer is as follows:

The loans are repayable over a 53-year period and carry an interest rate of 4.5 per cent per annum. Under the new arrangements noted above, the States are able to nominate additional amounts for welfare housing from their works and housing programmes to be provided on these loan terms and conditions.

One would have thought that, if the Government was so concerned about helping those people who cannot afford to buy their own homes or who cannot afford to stay in the private rental market and who have to go to the Housing Trust, it would make use of the money available. However, there is nothing in the State Budget to indicate that the Government is prepared to pick up that offer.

There is nothing about that at all, despite what is said by one member opposite, whom I mentioned earlier. There is nothing in the State Budget which indicates that the Government is prepared to take up that offer. The Government has received a windfall of \$8 500 000 above its normal allocation. That money has been allocated for public sector housing. That is very important. Our dear Premier and Treasurer has signalled in his Financial Statement that he is prepared to get out of public sector housing.

Members opposite may laugh, because they are not worried about public sector housing. They do not deal with the people who require that type of housing. It is members on this side who deal with these people. The Premier says in his Financial Statement:

In several major areas, especially welfare, housing, health and local government, the Commonwealth has failed to give any substantive response to views put to it by the State Government.

In effect, the Premier is saying that next year it will not even want to—

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

**Mr PLUNKETT (Peake):** I was amazed to sit in this House today and listen to those members who have spoken to the Budget, especially those who have stood up and defended it, because there have been none. In fact, very few members opposite have been present in the House at all. What is the reason for that? I will give the House a few reasons. There are a few members opposite present at the moment, but there were no members opposite present earlier, because none of them were prepared to open their mouths. I do not know whether they now have a little bit of dutch courage, because they now appear to be prepared to come into the Chamber.

Members opposite have not been in the Chamber today, and when they have been present they have not even been prepared to make interjections. There have been very few

interjections today. Members opposite have not even been prepared to speak to the Budget. In fact, I am told that no members opposite will speak to this Budget, and I do not blame them. It is the first time that I have really agreed that members opposite know what they are doing. They know that this Budget is crook. In fact, it is dishonest. It is the most dishonest Budget that has ever been handed down. Members opposite are not prepared to defend this Budget.

I think the member for Hanson is accepted as someone who knows his facts and figures, but he has not been prepared to interject or get up and defend this Budget. I think he is correct in remaining silent. I think the member for Hanson has shown good judgment in not getting up and making a fool of himself by trying to defend the Premier on a Budget that cannot be defended. I think the Premier's 1982 Budget is very dishonest. The fact is that the Premier has padded the Budget by transferring \$10 000 000 from the State Transport Authority and placing it in the revenue account. This is revealed in the fine print of the Financial Statement.

I refer members to page 36 of the statement. That fact will come out in the lines. Twice this amount was tucked away in the State Transport Authority lines by the Government in previous Budgets. I now turn to areas where the Budget is dishonest. First, it is interesting to see what has happened in relation to motor vehicles.

I suggest that members have a look at this document because it will come up when the lines are dealt with. The item affects some bookkeeping changes subject to adjustment. For example, motor vehicles is now under 'Capital payments'. Let us hear what members opposite think about them later, when the lines are dealt with. They might be able to explain how that item came to be shifted. I do not doubt that some reason will be given.

I would like to go further and look at the State Budget and also the Federal Budget, because they are associated. If I am asked how I connect these Budgets, I point out that the Premier and his Liberal Government have always supported the Fraser Government. I notice this time, however, that he has not quite supported the Fraser Government completely. There was an article in the *Financial Review*, I think on 8 August, headed 'The Federal Budget at a Glance'. We see there that beer prices are up 15 per cent.

**Mr Randall:** That would worry you.

**Mr PLUNKETT:** And 4 cents a middy. The member for Henley Beach says that that would worry me. He might not know how many glasses I drink, but if he checked up he might find that I was probably the lightest drinker in this House. So, that is another thing that he does not know. This is where the Government has got at the enjoyment of the worker and the pensioner.

**Mr Randall:** What about cigarettes?

**Mr PLUNKETT:** Yes, the honourable member mentions cigarettes—up 20 per cent.

**An honourable member:** A good idea.

**Mr PLUNKETT:** Twenty-four cents a packet. I would have to agree with that interjection. I could not care less if cigarettes went up \$2 a packet. I think that cigarettes are detrimental to a person's health. I am in a position to know, as I smoked for 35 years, so I do not really dispute that.

I now come to the part that was claimed by some of the newspapers as being the first budget to assist family allowances, which are up 50 per cent for the first and second children, including supplementary allowances—\$10 each child for families on a low income.

**Mr Randall interjecting:**

**Mr PLUNKETT:** That is not the situation as I have it. In relation to the interjection from the member for Henley Beach, I would like to inform him what this means. The increase of 50 per cent for family allowances is the only increase in family allowances for the first two children since

August 1976, and that will apply from 1 November 1982. It was supposed to apply from 1981. It raises the payment for dependent children by 50 per cent, raising the monthly payment for the first child from \$15.20 to \$22.80 and for the second child from \$21.70 to \$32.55. This will help the 74 per cent of families who received nothing in the last Budget, which gave increases only to the families that had three or more children.

**Mr RANDALL:** I rise on a point of order. You, Mr Deputy Speaker, were earlier concerned that the honourable member indicated to the House that he would spend some time in referring to the Federal Budget. He has spent the past five minutes talking about the Federal Budget, and I believe that this debate is about the State Budget.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Traditionally, the Chair gives a great deal of latitude in Budget debates. However, I suggest that the honourable member link up his remarks to the State Budget.

**Mr PLUNKETT:** I most certainly will, Mr Deputy Speaker. It is a pity that the member for Henley Beach did not link up his remarks. I will refer to increases in charges in South Australia.

Pensioners have received an increase, and family allowances have also increased, but not as much as they should have. I now refer to some areas that the Premier overlooked completely in regard to the State Budget. Under Liberal Government Budgets, rents have increased considerably, as have electricity charges. I do not know whether members opposite have constituents who are hard up, but I suggest they do. Last Friday 15 people telephoned me and five of those people have since written to me in regard to increasing electricity charges. In some cases the charges have doubled, from \$60 for three months to \$120, or from \$140 to \$180.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr PLUNKETT:** Members opposite have not addressed the House, because they are afraid to defend a dishonest Budget. However, they are interjecting now. I do not know whether they have looked through the Budget, but I suggest that they do so, because I will ask a lot of questions later.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I hope that the honourable member is not imputing improper motives to the Treasurer. The Chair has been most tolerant, but I do not believe that the honourable member should continue to make comments that reflect directly on the Treasurer.

**Mr PLUNKETT:** I would like your guidance, Sir. I have addressed Mr Tonkin as the Premier. I have said that the Budget is crook, and I think that is not an unparliamentary word. The Budget is dishonest. I would like your ruling as to whether or not I am out of order.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The honourable member is quite entitled to be critical but, when being critical of the Budget, he should not continue to reflect on the Premier. The honourable member may continue.

**Mr PLUNKETT:** I will try to be a little more careful, Sir. I see that the member for Henley Beach has his pen out. It may be that a few members opposite will have the guts to say something in this debate. I now refer to the increases in water and sewerage rates. What does that have to do with the Budget? I wonder whether the constituents of members opposite have to pay higher water rates, higher interest rates, higher electricity rates, higher train and bus fares, and higher bread prices? All of those things have to do with the Budget. I would like to hear a few members opposite tell us what they are doing to encourage this Government to do something about the situation.

Even though it is a Federal matter, plenty of people who live in Mount Gambier are affected by the newly-announced rail cuts. How do Government members think those people will find their way to the city when they want to? It was announced in the paper last week, but perhaps Government

members do not ever bother to read papers. I do not believe that they do, judging from the way that they act in this place at times. What about telephone charge increases? Do they affect the people? Government members should not tell me that they do not in any way affect State charges. Telecom may be a Federal concern, but any increase in charges affects every person in this State.

What about postage charges? Any person who wants to write a letter to, say, his child who may have moved away or who perhaps lives in another town is faced with a cost of 27c for each letter. What about those increased charges? I will let Government members think about those matters for a while. I now refer to the Minister of Industrial Affairs, who has had a bit to say tonight by way of interjection, although he has not had the guts to get up and speak. I refer Government members to the situation applying a few months ago when my Leader put out the South Australian Economic Future, Stage 1. There was much criticism about that from the Minister of Industrial Affairs, the Premier and a lot of Government members. Briefly, I would like to point out what they were criticising.

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

**Mr PLUNKETT:** I am on my feet now. I am here and the Minister can help me at any time that he likes, as soon as I have found the item about which I am concerned.

**The Hon. D. C. Brown:** It concerned the job creation schemes which we pointed out would cost \$90 000 000 odd.

**Mr PLUNKETT:** That is the Minister's opinion. I refer to the article headed 'Direct Job Creation through Local Government'. This is what my Leader and Deputy Leader announced and which was criticised by the Liberal Government. The document states:

Labor is aware that merely creating temporary jobs for unemployed people is not sufficient to improve their long-term job prospects.

I said that because I know there are so many fools on the other side. Many things are not permanent. How permanent is a permanent job? It can be just one week's notice.

*Mr Randall interjecting:*

**Mr PLUNKETT:** The honourable member's job is not very permanent, so he had better watch himself, because he will not be around much longer. That reflects the stupidity of Government members opposite when they refer to permanent jobs. Every day people who have been employed for 20 years are being thrown out of work. A man came to my office last Friday who had worked for 22 years in the first and only job that he has held since he came to Australia. This man, who had been sacked, was stunned. He asked me why he had been put off. I said that I could not tell him and that he should tell me. I asked him whether his employer had criticised his work, but he said, 'No, they did not criticise; they just had to reduce their work force.' He had been put off. Is that what Government members call a permanent worker? In regard to temporary work, if one can have a job for six months, it assists people who are out of work. The document continues:

People require job training [which is very important] to enable them to meet the demands of industry now and in the future. Training, in addition to employment, is vital if we are to raise the future employment prospects of those currently unemployed.

Do not Governments members think that is important? The document further states:

Labor proposes to introduce a regional training scheme through local government. Under this scheme local councils in a particular region form themselves as a group employer. The group employer employs or, where appropriate, indentures apprentices to itself and subcontracts or seconds them to individual employers for periods of three months to four years. The participating employer becomes a co-employer with the group employer. The scheme is modelled on a regional apprenticeship scheme which is at present successfully operated by the Western Sydney Regional Organisation of Councils in New South Wales.

The Regional Training Scheme has the potential to create new employment opportunities in South Australia. The scheme will enable many firms, especially smaller firms, to now employ and train apprentices. Other options, involving direct short-term Government job creation are being examined and will be announced later.

One would surely expect that the Minister of Industrial Affairs, along with his colleagues, would support such a scheme because he has not introduced one other scheme in this State that has been of any benefit to the unemployed.

The Minister criticised the Leader but never came up with anything to assist the unemployed. It is just bad luck for those people who are unemployed, and they can stay unemployed, as far as he is concerned. The Premier, in his Budget speech (and here is where I connect my Leader's remarks with what the Premier said—supported, I presume, by the Minister of Industrial Affairs, who has not said that he disagrees with the Premier), said that there were four priorities including the need to support the present building and construction industry to the greatest extent possible and the need to create long-term job opportunities, particularly for those seeking their first job.

What happened to those priorities? Payments on works were cut from \$226 100 000 in 1979-80, when the Liberal Government came to office, to \$196 900 000 in 1980-81 and \$180 900 000 in 1981-82. The bold initiative to create 7 000 jobs (which is what the Liberal Party said) now exists in name only, as the allocation has been cut repeatedly. There is a little bit about that in the Estimates. The 1980-81 Budget included nine priorities, one of which was a home handyman scheme for unemployed youths. What has happened to that priority?

I think that the member for Henley Beach knows the Henley council and was, in fact, a councillor there at one stage. He would recall that this scheme was accepted as being a pretty good one. I know that the Henley Beach council employed a lot of people under that scheme, because I was the A.W.U. organiser prior to coming into Parliament and I backed it. What has happened to that scheme? It may be that later, during the debate on the Estimates, a Government member, perhaps the member for Henley Beach, will tell us what happened to it. I can tell honourable members now that that scheme has been scrapped. Only \$2 770 was spent on it in 1980-81, which is a disgrace to any Government. Nothing has been allocated for that scheme in 1982-83.

I thought that Government members who were concerned about council employees would be on their feet giving reasons why the Premier has not supported this scheme. Members opposite always say that they support full employment. However, that is as far as it goes: they do not criticise the Premier or the Minister of Industrial Affairs, who has just taken himself out of the Chamber. I do not know whether or not he is embarrassed.

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** I doubt it.

**Mr PLUNKETT:** I would go so far as to say that he is embarrassed. Government members would find if they checked what I am saying that the Minister is very embarrassed, because he thought when he came to office that he would be able to change a few things. However, he has found that under the present system there is no way in which this Government can change things.

So, one finds that he is embarrassed. Nothing has been allocated for 1982-83. The priority scheme to create jobs has been struck within two years. It did not take long. What about the suggestion by the Hon. John Bannon or the Hon. Jack Wright for employment?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member should refer to members by either their district or by their designated title.

**Mr PLUNKETT:** There is a further scheme of nine priorities, including a vocational training scheme for disabled, through the Department of the Public Service Board, and there is provision for examination of the flexibility of the cost benefit of a justice information scheme. What has happened to those priorities? Now, only \$43 000 has been allocated to the scheme, which is less than the \$43 900 spent last year. This is the Government that was going to get rid of all unemployment three years ago, as stated in the filthy ads put in by a fellow by the name of Willetts. I notice he has now crawled out of the woodwork with his filth today and put his name to a pamphlet against the person standing for Florey. I do not know Willetts but he must be a real germ. This priority is to be cut in real terms. I refer to the \$43 900 spent on the disabled.

Reference is made to the justice information scheme in the 1982 Budget. We will look at that on the lines at a later time. I am preparing some members so they are able to try to defend the actions of their Premier. I do not think one will find that the Minister of Industrial Affairs will defend the Premier too much because I heard that he sees himself as the next Leader. He will be the next Leader of the Opposition after the election, which will be in either late November or early December, I am informed.

*Mr Becker interjecting:*

**Mr PLUNKETT:** The member for Hanson has come alive. He has been trying to save money to fight the next election. They say he borrowed some from the candidate who stood against me a few years ago. He said, 'Give us your money. We need it for the districts of Hanson and Henley Beach'. He said it was more important for them to have the money, so they immediately lost a candidate. Members opposite need not look surprised because the candidate who stood against me at the last election pulled out of the Liberal Party over it, because you grabbed all the money and said, 'Look after yourself', we have to look after our seats. They are a bit shaky. Our Premier has not done so well and our Government has done nothing and we have to be very careful'. It may be that the Minister of Industrial Affairs will get his opportunity to challenge the Premier for the leadership of the Party when it goes into Opposition after the next election. Whether he will be successful, I do not know. I suggest, members opposite are well aware of that.

Getting back to Electricity Trust increases, I presume that that would have some bearing on the Budget. People have to pay additional money because of extra bills they must pay. I would like to hear from some members opposite, and it is not too late for them to enter the debate. They have not had the guts to do so to date but there is nothing to stop them from still entering the debate. I would like to hear the member for Henley Beach. The only thing he can do is rubbish the unions. I have never heard him do anything except criticise trade unions. He used to be a trade union member, but has seen fit to give that away and come into this place as a Liberal member. I was going through the Electricity Trust report for the year ended 30 June 1982. It explains some of the reasons for the recent increases in electricity tariffs. It states, on page 2:

... substantial increases in the costs of new generating plant and high interest rates on borrowing as well as continual increases in labour costs. Because of these factors, electricity tariffs are now increasing in real terms, i.e., at a rate faster than inflation. This trend can be expected to continue for at least the next few years. I wonder how lower-paid workers, pensioners, married couples with high interest rates to pay, and the unemployed are going to get on in the future and meet these increases without assistance from the Government of the day. Members of the Government should be looking at these things, instead of interjecting and not being prepared to have the

guts to get up and speak on the Budget. Government members know very well that it is not a good Budget. It is a very poor Budget, but I would have expected the member for Hanson to speak. I accept that he is a person who comes from a bank and I would expect that he knew figures. I agree that the member for Hanson probably would know figures as well as most other members in this House.

I was disappointed in his not getting up and speaking on the Budget, as I have heard the same member speak his mind. The honourable member does not have to be stood over by the Party on the other side like the member for Mallee, who has apparently been told to keep out of the House tonight as the Government does not want him blowing up and spilling the beans. So, the Government asked the member to keep out of this place. They have left the member for Henley Beach in this Chamber. He often makes a fool of himself, and that makes no difference.

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** Who told you that?

**Mr PLUNKETT:** Well, I think the member for Mallee may have made it clear earlier in the day that he virtually had to get out of the road. It is around that he has been virtually told to keep his distance and not be in this Chamber.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr MAX BROWN (Whyalla):** I wish to begin my remarks in this debate by disclaiming the continual barrage coming from my colleagues on this side of the House when challenging members of the Government to get up and speak in this debate. Let us be perfectly honest about the situation. If I was in the position that members of the Government, particularly the back-benchers, are in on the Budget, they would not even get me into this House, let alone talking on the Budget. I understand why members of the Government loath to speak on this Budget. The fact is that it is a rotten Budget.

Having said that, I want members to cast their minds back to 12 months ago. I want to recall to the Chamber the press statement made in the *Adelaide News* of 8 September 1981 under the heading, 'Tonkin: We're sick but don't give up'. This statement was made by the Premier practically to the day 12 months ago. All I can say is that we have certainly deteriorated since then. If we were sick then, God knows what we are at the present time. The article said:

South Australia was 'a pretty sick State' and it would not improve if people did nothing about it, the Premier, Mr Tonkin, said today.

I assume from that statement at that time that what the Premier was saying was that the people of the State had to do something about the shoddy situation, but not the Premier. The article went on—and it is rather interesting to refer to it:

Speaking on radio, the Premier said people were leaving South Australia in search of better prospects in other States and further tough times were ahead. 'It isn't something I like but this happens from time to time and it is happening now in South Australia,' he said. 'The population goes with the jobs and opportunities and we just have not had those opportunities in the past four or five years.'

That was from the Leader of this Government 12 months ago, and I am suggesting that if we look now in real terms at this Budget the position has worsened, as that situation of 12 months ago is even more evident now.

Just side-tracking a little, my colleague who has just sat down said that the increases in beer prices were worrying him. I have reached the stage where I believe that, with the increases in the price of beer, for example, workers no longer can afford the luxury of drinking beer; they ought to turn to champagne.

This document that we are debating at this late hour gives no relief whatsoever to my electorate, and little relief, if any, to the rest of this State. My electorate is now not one of industrial activity; it is not one of 'get-up-and-go'; it is

not one of anticipation of relief being around the corner from the terrible recession that has hit the city of Whyalla. It is an electorate of despondency. I make no apologies for such a statement, because that is the situation. That despondency, I believe, will grow.

One remembers the 1979 cry of the Premier, just prior to his unexpected election, 'Stop the job rot'. Again, I refer to a press statement at the time employers joined together to launch the campaign of 'Stop the job rot', just as they combined forces to begin the television propaganda that we see so often in television programmes, 'It's a great State, mate'. All I can say is: it was a great State, but it has been considerably depleted now. This Government came in on a policy of 'Stop the job rot' and has done exactly the opposite since it has been in power. The report states:

Major employer groups in South Australia will launch a massive publicity campaign against the State Government within the next forty-eight hours.

This was the Labor Government. The report continues:

Their slogan is 'Stop the job rot.' The campaign is being backed by six employer groups covering more than 380 000 workers.

That was the campaign we saw when this Government came into being. I believe that it was a successful campaign; it hoodwinked the people of this State. I think that they honestly believed that this Government would stop the job rot, that it would create jobs, that it would find 7 000 jobs and, within 24 hours, 14 000 jobs; it would do all these things.

One remembers also that this Government said, 'We will take away those repressive laws of paying death duties.' I have some very reasonable doubts as to whether the taking away of that so-called 'repressive law' of not paying death duties has had any significant effect on anyone in my own electorate.

I recall very vividly the Government saying at the time that it would cut red tape and get on with the job of helping small business. Perhaps I should pause there to reflect on the situation pertaining to my own electorate in which there are some 1 300 unemployed people. Further, the prospect of the major industry there, the steel industry, in regard to my electorate, is negative.

I would say that one would not have to worry about inheriting a family home under the present Government's policy, because the way things are going, I have some doubt about whether at the moment the question of there being a family home exists, or whether it will exist in the near future. One does not have to look any further than the high interest rates which are absolutely crippling young married couples.

I refer to the Government's lack of real concern. Sure, members in this place get up and say that they are worried about the recession and about unemployment, but they do nothing about the situation, and the Budget does nothing. On the Premier's admission, there will be some 700-odd jobs lost because of the Budget. In regard to the question of a family home, I point out that most families cannot afford such a luxury.

I refer again to the Government's intention to cut red tape and its intention to assist small business. I refer to what the Leader of the Opposition said some time ago about the question of small business. The Leader stated:

There have been over 2 300 bankruptcies in South Australia during the past two and a half years.

That is what the Leader said at that time, and I have every reason to believe those figures would be correct. The Leader further stated:

This is more than double the national rate. Bankruptcies have reached record levels during the term of the Tonkin Government, averaging nearly four bankruptcies for every working day.

That is a shocking state of affairs. In regard to the situation in the electorate of Whyalla, I have searched for certain figures and I have found that there have been no less than sixty-eight bankruptcies since January 1980. It seems to me that going bankrupt under the present Government has developed into being the thing to do, or perhaps I should describe it as being fashionable. It is a situation that has developed under the present Government, despite the fact that the Government stated quite seriously, I presume, and quite clearly, certainly, that it would stop the red tape and that it would assist small people to become more solvent.

I would suggest that quite the opposite has happened. The Government does not seem to understand (or does not want to understand) that, when job opportunities are lost, redundancy becomes the order of the day. With bankruptcies becoming a common occurrence, communities such as the one that I represent pay an extremely high social price, which in turn to some degree is passed on to the Government, because all sorts of aid is then required.

God knows, there is no doubt about that in my own electorate. I will instance some of the forms of the particular aid that I have referred to: first, unemployment payments. There are 1 300 unemployed persons in my own electorate, and I suggest that each one of them receives at least \$60 a week. That is a very meagre payment. In fact, I believe that it is way below the poverty line. However, a total of \$70 000 a week is paid to these people in my own electorate because they are unemployed. Because they are unemployed they are producing absolutely nothing, and the cost in relation to social welfare in my electorate is enormous in many different ways.

Because of that, I suggest that some family units are failing miserably and are breaking down; marriages break down; children's welfare must be looked at quite seriously; welfare housing demands increase quite rapidly; and there is a need for temporary women's shelters and family shelters. I could continue in this vein.

All of these things are costing this Government and the Federal Government a huge amount of money simply because we are unable to grapple with the real problem of unemployment in our society. Because of that unemployment, I suggest that the Government is required to subsidise transport and housing, and it is supposedly required to subsidise water rates, to which I will refer later if I have time. If we had more time to look at these things I suggest that we would finish up with an enormous list. I mentioned the question of water rates, and I will spend a little time on the matter, because I have been heavily involved with it in my own electorate. The current increase in water rates is enormous, and I believe that it is playing a significant role in increasing the problems of those people in my electorate who can least afford more problems.

Since this Government came to power the fact of the matter is that, among other increases in State charges, the increase in water rates has been the most significant. I suggest that what has happened, particularly in relation to ordinary householders (and I will refer to Housing Trust tenants because they would be the best example), is that this Government has continually increased water rates and, in turn (and more importantly), has decreased the allowable water usage; so much so that currently, despite a reasonable percentage rebate, Housing Trust tenants are being hit with ever-increasing excess water bills. I refer to a specific case and a lady whose name I will not mention. She came to my office only recently.

She complained quite bitterly about her excess water account. Before I consider that matter in any depth, however, I point out a very significant situation. In 1977, the charge for water was 16c per kilolitre. In 1977 that lady used 253 kilolitres, and her account for excess water, without a rebate,

was \$40.48. In 1982, her account for excess water is at the rate of 32c per kilolitre (the rate has doubled in five years), she used 538 kilolitres in excess (which also doubled), she has a 20 per cent rebate that is allowed by this Government, and she still has to pay \$137.60 for excess water. That is the kind of tax relief that this Government puts up!

Perhaps I should refer to the situation in its entirety. In April 1976, the charge was 14c a kilolitre (cheaper than in 1977), and 307 kilolitres was used, at a total charge of \$42.98. In 1977 the rate was 16c a kilolitre, 253 kilolitres excess water was used, and the charge was \$40.48. In 1978, the charge was 19c a kilolitre, 162 kilolitres was used, and the charge was \$30.78. I might add that that was during the period of the Labor Government. Now we come to 1979. The charge then was 22c a kilolitre, 62 kilolitres in excess was used, and the charge was \$13.64.

However, in 1980, all of a sudden, the rate increased to 24c a kilolitre; my constituent used 338 kilolitres and paid \$81.12. In 1981 the rate was 27c a kilolitre, she used 420 kilolitres in excess, and paid \$113.40. That is an increase of about one and a half times. This year, the rate has again increased, and my constituent received a 20 per cent area rebate.

**Mr Slater:** What is the allowance each year?

**Mr MAX BROWN:** It does not say. In answer to the honourable member's interjection, I point out that residents in Housing Trust properties pay only excess water rates, above the allowable limit. The allowable usage has been decreased, and the cost for excess water has been increased. It has become a very vicious tax situation. I examined the matter and had discussions with the Housing Trust. I replied to my constituent's letter on 29 July, as follows:

I have investigated the problem raised with me by yourself with respect to excess water account with the South Australian Housing Trust. The trust assures me that they have in fact gone through the past history with respect to water usage and unfortunately there is no record of anything which could have caused excessive wastage of water. I point out that currently the South Australian Government is making the question of water rates very severe.

I make no apology for saying that. The letter continues:

I think it must be understood that what is happening on the question of water rating is that allowable usage before excess applies is decreasing and the amount of rate relating to payment for water is increasing; put them both together and the cold hard facts of the matter are that everybody living in a normal home is going to be hit very severely with respect to the cost of water.

I went on to say that I had taken up this matter on numerous occasions but that the position was getting worse and would continue to get worse. Having dealt with that matter, I want to deal with what can be described only as the gem of them all, although I do not yet have all the facts on the case. Recently, I received a telephone call from a lady living in a Housing Trust dwelling who bitterly complained that she had received an excess water bill of \$30.80.

True, it does not sound much, but I investigated this case and went to see the lady concerned. This old lady of 83 years lives by herself, and members can imagine how much water she would use, especially as she had a very small garden. I took up the matter with the Housing Trust and was told that the trust could not understand the situation and would certainly investigate it and bring me down a report. My reply to the old lady was as follows:

At this point of time I have been able to convince the trust that they ought to have a re-examination of your set of circumstances. On this basis, I would advise that you make arrangements as early as possible to have dialogue with officers of the trust...

I felt that that was where the situation would end. Lo and behold, as recently as last Friday, on my return to Whyalla I received another phone call from this charming old lady of 83. The House would not want to know but, despite the

trust's assurance that it would be investigating the matter, it has given her a final notice to pay the account or else.

This old lady was quite explosive over the telephone and explained to me that there was no way on earth that she would pay her excess account of about \$30. In fact, she is willing to go to gaol over the matter, even at 83 years of age. If it were not so serious, one could really have a first-class laugh about the situation, because it is a ridiculous position—

**Mr Slater:** Is she qualified for the pensioner concession as well?

**Mr MAX BROWN:** She gets the pensioner concession, yet is still up for \$30 excess. The situation is absolutely ridiculous. Has the Government got to go to that length to indirectly tax people? That is what it is all about. If that is the case, God help us! Indeed, I do not know where we are going.

Before I leave this particular line of insanity, I would like to say this: I can recall, in common with other members on this side of the House, that in the Dunstan era, under 10 years of the Labor Government, year after year, members of the then Opposition claimed that we were fleecing people because we increased water rates and house rents.

**Mr Slater:** They usually complained about people living in Burnside.

**Mr MAX BROWN:** Yes, they would not know what the water rates were or what house rents were. I can say only that if they thought we were good at that sort of thing in relation to indirectly taxing people I am convinced, even if no-one else is, that the Dunstan Government was only an amateur.

**Mr Slater:** Or benefactors.

**Mr MAX BROWN:** Benefactors, call them what you like, but they were not as good at charging people indirect taxes as this Government is—no way!

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** Don't give us a hard time.

**Mr MAX BROWN:** My stars said today that my luck would run out at 11 o'clock and who should walk into the Chamber but the Minister of Agriculture. That shows how beneficial the stars are.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** And what a welcome he's received.

**Mr MAX BROWN:** I was talking about excess water rates, and here is a Minister who has absolutely nothing to do with excess water rates and who knows nothing about them.

**Mr Evans:** He would like a lot of water on his farm land at the moment.

**Mr MAX BROWN:** No-one in this House can convince me that this Minister has anything to do with excess water rates.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** You are wrong again.

**Mr MAX BROWN:** No, I am not wrong. I have only a few minutes at my disposal, unfortunately, because I have a lot of other matters I could talk about. However, I will briefly refer to an editorial that appeared in today's *News*. What a gem of an editorial it is! If I had written an editorial like this when I was in the trade union movement the *Adelaide News* would have picked me up as being a communist, a red ragger, or something else. That editorial states:

If Mr Fraser had cared to take an even harder line, he might have noted that the B.H.P. management has given in to unreasonable 38-hour week demands and failed to come to terms with soaring costs.

All I can say is that I have dealt with the B.H.P. company for a long time and have never seen it give in to anything, not a thing. Never mind about the *Adelaide News* running that sort of rubbish, it had better get into conference with its own employees and work out what it is going to do about their demands.

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

**Mr CRAFTER (Norwood):** I rise to support the remarks made this afternoon by the Leader about the State Budget and particularly about the effect that that Budget will have on the South Australian community during this financial year. Undoubtedly that expose of this Government's economic strategy will guide many people in casting their vote at the imminent State election.

The comments the House has heard from the member for Whyalla were quite pertinent to some of the comments I will make, because he was expressing in a graphic way some of the problems people in our community are having because of increased taxation, indeed, taxation that falls on those people who own their own home. To set the record straight, I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* a table relating per capita State taxation for the period 1978-79 to the estimated per capita taxation for the 1982-83 financial year.

**The SPEAKER:** Do I have the honourable member's assurance that the material is purely statistical?

**Mr CRAFTER:** Yes.

Leave granted.

#### TAXATION STATISTICS

	Total Tax Collections	Population (Estimated Resident)	Taxation Per Capita
	\$ million	\$ million	\$
1978-79 (Labor) .....	384.844*	1.2997	296.10
1979-80 .....	423.574*	1.3051	324.55
1980-81 .....	444.894	1.3128	338.89
1981-82 .....	495.551	1.3259	373.75
1982-83 (estimate) .....	552.370	1.3347**	413.85
	+43.5%		+39.8%

\*Our calculation.

\*\*Estimated in Commonwealth Budget Paper No. 7 P 19.

**Mr CRAFTER:** This table indicates, as honourable members will see when they read it in due course, that there has been an increase, since the last full financial year, of the Labor Administration in this State in per capita taxation from \$296.10 to an estimated \$413.85 for this financial year, an increase of 39.8 per cent.

Indeed, that has been a substantial hike in State taxation. That has particular relevance in relation to the Budget allocation for the Department for Community Welfare. Over one-quarter of that department's Budget allocation is for concessions for taxes on home ownership, that is, water and council rates. The position that has now arisen in this State, because of quite substantial increases in State taxation on home ownership and the proportion of the welfare budget going to that purpose, which raises serious questions indeed. I do not propose to canvass all those questions this evening, but I raise what I see as an important matter that must be dealt with quickly; otherwise, the welfare budget will indeed be consumed by this area. I can see that there is a need to extend further the benefits that flow to home owners so that those on fixed incomes and very low incomes can maintain their home ownership.

The welfare estimates are indeed sad reading. We find that over the period that this Government has been in office there has been a steady decrease each year in real terms in the expenditure on welfare. At the same time, there has been a greater demand for welfare services. We have seen a steady increase in the numbers of unemployed and a massive increase in the numbers of people who are unable to afford health insurance. Indeed, it has been estimated that some 4 000 000 in Australia are now uninsured for

health care. Also, increasing numbers of people, particularly young people and single men, are homeless.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** Have you had a look at the number in that category in New South Wales?

**Mr CRAFTER:** I am talking about national trends, because many of these people travel from State to State. Indeed, many people have left this State because of the difficulties that they have had in finding one or other of these essential components to a dignified existence in the community.

**Mr Lewis:** You will admit that they will come back for the next election.

**Mr CRAFTER:** I doubt very much whether many of these people have got the sort of mobility that transients had in the 1970s.

**Mr Lewis:** They seemed to at the time of the Norwood by-election.

**Mr CRAFTER:** I am afraid I missed the honourable member's fine point. The point I am making is that the planned expenditure for the Department for Community Welfare does not address itself to any of these major trends in the community. The problems of housing alone are quite enormous in our community, with some 26 000 people now waiting for public housing. In the main, they are limited to families. That, indeed, is an indication of the extent of relative poverty in our community.

A book that I read as a young person in the 1960s had a marked influence on my thinking with respect to disadvantaged people in our community. The book, written by John Stubbs and entitled *The Hidden People*, clearly identified groups of poor in our community. At that stage it was estimated that about 500 000 people were living below the poverty line in this country. The report, released a few weeks ago by the Australian council of Social Service entitled *Living on the Edge* estimates that 2 000 000 people in Australia are now living below the poverty line.

Stubbs' book identified these groups of people: the old, the young, families, victims of crime, certain categories of women, men (particularly the elderly), the disabled, certain categories of migrants, and groups that he called misfits. Perhaps this is the group to which the member for Mallee was referring. Many people in my electorate are living in what is more commonly called the alternative lifestyle: people who reject many of the institutions of society and who are angry indeed with the attention given by the Government and other institutions to what they see as the most important aspects of society.

Another category about which Stubbs talked was the poor who live in country towns. I am not sure whether the member for Mallee identifies with those people, but they are a very real and pressing group of people, and no doubt there will be more of them if our current unfortunate climatic conditions continue. Stubbs also referred to another group of people who live in the slums of our cities as a result of inadequate central planning and forethought in the provision of housing.

Of course, the migrant community particularly are victims of poor planning and have lived in ghettos for far too long in our cities. None of these matters is addressed in this incredibly tight budget allocation for the department that has the responsibility for disadvantaged groups and for trying to eliminate poverty in our community.

I believe that the Department for Community Welfare in the coming year will be lucky to hold on to the flood of demands for its services and to maintain some sort of staff morale in that department, let alone try to tackle some of the very real and growing concerns in the community. The Department for Community Welfare has slowly decreased its staff during the life of this Government and, indeed, in the past two financial years has decreased its staffing establishment by 50 persons. It is my estimate that this Budget

will result, as did last year's Budget, in a further staff reduction of about 25 workers in that department. I suggest that probably many of those employees will be weekly paid. So, there is not only in money terms, but also in terms of staff within the department, a very real reduction, and that must mean a reduction in the services that are available to the community.

I go back to some of the groups within the community that are identifiably poor and look at some of the responses, in money terms, by the department. The first group to which I referred was the aged, and I note that there has been a massive decrease in expenditure available for senior citizen centres. The Premier's speech advanced a theory that perhaps there was not a need for such centres when there was a three-year planning programme. I would have thought that demographic trends in our State would indicate that there will be a growing need for facilities for the aged.

The decrease in funds for senior citizen centres in real terms is a massive 70.7 per cent. I will be interested to hear, in due course, explanations from the Minister as to why that amount of money has been reduced. The problems that have arisen in this State as a result of unemployment have not been addressed and there is, as other members have said, a much higher incidence of unemployment in South Australia than any other mainland State in this country.

Once again, the Budget does not come to grips with this problem. It rejects out of hand any job creation programmes, any innovative schemes of this nature, even the home handyman scheme that was suggested by the Premier, I think, in his second Budget. This was a scheme to assist the unemployed, particularly the young unemployed. We have seen that slashed, of course, and even the miserly \$15 000 that was allocated for that purpose last financial year was not spent. Now councils have to create some scheme or other to try to fill that void, because at that level the need is so acute and so visible that even a small response from the council is appreciated by the community. Often, of course, councils with limited resources have little effect on the substantial unemployment in their areas, and I know that that is the case with the councils in my area, where unemployment is very substantial.

The substantial cut in real terms is in the Department of Community Welfare itself. As I have said, it is a cut of almost 5 per cent. It is not possible, really, to compare the 'Miscellaneous' lines from year to year, because of the substantial transfer of responsibilities from department to department. However, it is, as I have suggested earlier, possible to look at this substantial area of rates and tax concessions and the additional line of transport concessions for the unemployed, which, for some inexplicable reason, does not appear in the 'Transport' lines, although other concessions to other disadvantaged groups do appear in those lines. It is interesting that, in the concessions to the unemployed for travel on public transport, there is a decrease in the Budget, so presumably the department is predicting that fewer unemployed will be travelling on public transport or it is going to tighten the availability of that subsidy to the unemployed, and I suggest that the latter is the course that undoubtedly the Government will follow.

The aspect that is perhaps of most concern in terms of the many statements that the Government has made about its concern for the family is the cut-backs that it has proposed in what I would have thought were fundamental services in times of economic stringency amongst families and individuals. One I know that has helped many people in my district has been the budget advice service. It has an effect on many people who find themselves in incredible financial difficulties and their families, particularly upon marriages, and a great

deal of harm can be done in the community if financial difficulties are allowed to run unattended to. The budget advice service is a service that is very much of advantage to creditors and debtors alike.

Here we have in this Budget a reduction of 4 per cent in real money terms of money allocated for the service. Obviously, that will mean that fewer people will be able to take advantage of what I consider to be an essential and very successful programme. Similarly, the amount of money for the family maintenance programme conducted by the department has been reduced. Therefore, we see that there is a very real possibility that there will be diminished services in very essential areas of community welfare in the year ahead.

The question of unemployment is one that perhaps pervades all our discussions on welfare in our community, because there is so much fear in the community about the long term effects of unemployment, not only amongst the unemployed (particularly amongst young employed) but also amongst families and educators and others in the community who provide services.

I recently attended a conference involving an interesting cross-section of people in our community who discussed the future of this State. It was a unanimous decision amongst those people that one of the pressing matters that had to be resolved concerned unemployment. Indeed, a great deal of understanding and tolerance was shown towards those people who were suffering unemployment, particularly young people. Indeed, many very valuable discussions came forward, together with some innovative thoughts on job creation schemes and the roles of the public sector and the private sector in trying to resolve this problem.

Indeed, I believe that this has precipitated in the Liberal Party itself a lively debate concerning the role of the Government in directing job-creation schemes. The Premier, in his discussion paper on the South Australian economy, which accompanied the Budget papers, mentions briefly the problems associated with youth unemployment. Those comments indicate that there is indeed a quite massive problem in our community. The Premier stated:

The number of people aged 15-19 in full time employment and those looking for full time work in South Australia in the June quarter 1982 were both estimated to be slightly lower than a year earlier. The South Australian full time unemployment rate for 15-19 year olds rose marginally from 21.2 per cent to 21.4 per cent while the Australian rate increased from 14.6 per cent to 17.9 per cent.

It can be seen that we do indeed have a problem that must be attended to. Unfortunately, neither the Budget nor in particular the community welfare budget, addresses the problem at all. Indeed, unemployment is not mentioned at all in the Premier's reference to the expenditure of various departments. Indeed, the Premier's attempt to explain away the reduced expenditure in this area under the heading of 'Community Welfare' is quite disappointing.

One of the things that concerns the people to whom I referred a moment ago is the relationship between criminality and unemployment. I shall refer to just one area as an example of this nexus, and I refer to the report from the Office of Crime Statistics in the Attorney-General's Department, November 1981. The report was compiled from statistics from the Supreme Court and from the District Criminal Courts in this State from 1 July 1980 to 30 June 1981. I refer to the section dealing with offences against property. It states:

There are many more offences and the largest number of defendants are in this category. In all, 975 defendants faced charges for offences against property.

The section then lists the total number of cases heard for the offences in the relevant category. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it a statistical chart detailing those offences.

Leave granted.

#### OFFENCES AGAINST PROPERTY

Robbery	
armed	32
other	30
Arson	14
Breaking	
burglary	9
house break and enter	203
other break and enter	356
Other property	
larceny	142
embezzlement	39
false pretences	41
fraud	11
forge and utter	37

**Mr CRAFTER:** The report further states:

The offences against property fall into two clear groups. Robbery and breaking in one group and arson and 'other property offences' in the other. Those charged with one of the breaking/robbery offences tend to fit the commonly held view of offenders in this state. They constitute the majority of offenders, comprising 603 of the total 1 541 persons charged. Of the known cases, the defendants are young, the average age being only 22 years with approximately 80 per cent of defendants being 25 years old or younger. There is a higher proportion of Aborigines in this group than for all other offences. A very high figure of approximately three-quarters of these defendants are unemployed and most are single.

I think those statistics are very sobering indeed. They represent only those persons who were actually convicted before the courts, indeed, before the higher courts of this State. We can expect that there is a much higher real incidence of offences of this type in the community, but many of them are not reported or do not lead to convictions in the courts. The cost of crime in the community is a real problem that is facing insurers and consumers in so many aspects of life. It is something that is borne by the whole community. I suggest that it is the responsibility of Government to take what steps it can within its budgetary limitations to establish preventative programmes, particularly in this area. I think that that must lead to a discussion of how unemployment is tackled in our community.

The other matter to which I will refer very briefly is the question of land rights for the southern Pitjantjatjara people or the Yalata community in this State. Briefly, this is a matter of great concern to me. I must admit that, along with many other people I am concerned about this problem. I am very confused about the Government's policies in relation to land rights. It appears that we are heading for a situation where there will be different laws for different clans in this State. The roles played by the Attorney-General, the Minister of Mines and Energy and the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs seem to be very unclear. Who actually speaks to Aboriginal communities about these matters and their respective roles on behalf of the Government is also very unclear. I think that must be clarified very quickly. The role of legal advisers to Aboriginal communities must be understood very clearly, not only by the Government but also by the community.

Information that has been put before me in recent days indicates that the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs in this State clearly rejects the concept of the lawyer-client relationship between an Aboriginal community and the lawyers they choose to represent them in negotiations with respect to land rights. I would have thought that the case with respect to the Yalata community was very clear. It seems that there is a lot of support in the South Australian community for

the concept of land rights. The member for Eyre would know much better than I that this land is very barren. Indeed, it has not been settled by white men and has been occupied only in recent decades for the testing of atomic weapons and for other experiments. I do not think that it can be denied that this land has a particular relationship with the southern Pitjantjatjara people.

I hope that the Government will introduce legislation at the earliest opportunity to clarify some of the matters that I am raising. Hopefully, I am raising them on behalf of a wide cross-section of South Australian people. In raising this subject I must admit that I am quite disappointed that it has been necessary for the southern Pitjantjatjara people to compromise to the extent that they have on this matter which is fundamental to their survival as an intact clan. It seems that they have not taken any of the more popular myths adopted by militant groups fighting for land rights. They have been prepared to conciliate and discuss; in fact, they have been very patient over a very long period of time.

They are not interested in accruing large sums of money. Of course, they are interested in protecting their lands, particularly those parts that have a great deal of religious significance. They have gone about this matter in a most responsible way. It seems that the events of recent months have quite shattered their confidence in the statements hitherto made, particularly from the Premier, and the actions of this Government and previous Governments with respect to land rights. Indeed, the goodwill that has been built up by this State and the importance that other Aborigines right around Australia lay on the laws of the State indicate that it is most important that this matter be dealt with quickly, expeditiously, and sympathetically, and that we do not develop a system of *ad hoc* land rights laws in this State, that we do not accept a position of the lowest common denominator, or a system of brow-beating communities into a position that would be advantageous for vested interests. With those remarks, I must say that I look forward to obtaining more information about the matters I have raised during the Budget Estimates Committees.

**Mr GUNN (Eyre):** I support the Budget, and in doing so I note that this is the first time that total receipts have exceeded \$2 000 000 000. When they were speaking to the documents before us, I found it a pity that some members opposite did not apply themselves to the Budget documents a little more thoroughly instead of going off on a wild tangent, as we received from the member for Peake and from other members who did not really address themselves to the matter before the House. I would have thought that, if members were so concerned about the manner in which this Budget was drafted, they would have come forward with alternative proposals about how extra funds could be raised and where they should be spent. Instead of that, we had a very negative exercise conducted by members opposite.

One sees from the Budget that the largest amount in the individual lines of receipts is \$231 000 000 for pay-roll tax. I think we all recognise that that is an undesirable form of taxation, but, unfortunately, where else can we raise that sort of revenue if we are to meet the Government's responsibilities? The revenue from stamp duties is \$119 000 000. That is not a very pleasant form of taxation, one for which I have no love, but when we are locked into a constitutional situation such as we have, the States, as surely members opposite realise, have a very limited range of revenue areas open to them.

If one examines the money that the State collects, one sees that \$552 000 000 is collected, and we receive \$947 000 000 from the Commonwealth, so that the greatest input into the State Budget is from Commonwealth allocations. Obviously, one day the Parliaments in this country

will sit down in a rational fashion and design and work out a formula for the supply of funds to the States and the Commonwealth that will stop the annual bickering that takes place between the Governments.

For as long as I have been a member of Parliament, all Premiers have appeared to be dissatisfied, no matter how much money they get from the Commonwealth. Of course, some people take the attitude that the Commonwealth is a willing cow to be milked and that it has unlimited sources of revenue, which it should hand over at will. Of course, we all know that that is nonsense. The Commonwealth does not have enough money to go around, so it is a matter of trimming our cloth according to the available funds. In an electorate such as mine, I could justify without any fear whatever the expenditure of an additional \$40 000 000 or \$50 000 000 every year.

It would be on roads, on water, and I could name a number of areas. The people west of Ceduna have been crying out for water supplies, as have the people of Terowie. I refer to the problems facing my constituents at Coober Pedy who are paying \$45 for 1 000 gallons. I think it is \$50 that is paid for water carted from Woomera to Andamooka, and I could go on. I am concerned about the need for upgrading schools, and of course I am also concerned about the shortage of housing.

Certainly, one of the matters that this Parliament and the Commonwealth Parliament will have to address in the near future, because it is descending upon us at a rate which we have not realised yet, involves caring for the aged. We will have to be in a position to provide facilities, not just in the metropolitan areas but in the local community where people have lived all their lives. People should be able to remain in those communities where they can have nursing home care, elderly citizen cottages and pensioner cottages. These facilities are needed, and needed rapidly.

We will have to look closely at our allocation and start planning soon. The amount of money which is currently available does not meet the need. I refer to places like Streaky Bay. Great concern has been expressed to me about the need there. Good schemes have been entered into where local government has been providing the land free of charge to the Housing Trust, which is constructing the sort of accommodation that is required. Excellent facilities will be built at Quorn, opposite the hospital, and there has been good co-operation thus far.

I am sorry to say that the bureaucracy has, as usual, taken much time to process the necessary documents. It always amazes me why these things take so long. Therefore, when one is considering a document such as this Budget, one has to be responsible and constructive. I was amazed, when I watched the Leader on television after he had heard the Budget and had had a couple of hours to examine the document, to see that he did not look comfortable when he was asked a few pertinent questions about what he would do if he were Treasurer. The Leader went around the subject for a short time, but eventually said he would increase the deficit: he would put off until tomorrow the paying for his spending programme.

However, the House knows that the banker has to be paid. One can only put the evil day off for a short term. This Government has been criticised because it has taken some firm decisions on expenditure. One thing that this Government can explain to the people of South Australia is that it has been responsible. It has no Monartos hanging around its neck, yet it is still paying for Monarto.

The \$3 100 000 allocated in this Budget for Monarto could have been spent on welfare housing or assisting unemployed people, and it could be going towards some other constructive projects. The Opposition cannot say that this Government has not had its hands tied by the previous Government.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** What about the Land Commission?

**Mr GUNN:** I am coming to that. We then had the most foolish financial agreement entered into regarding the Riverland cannery. I am not saying that we should not be involved, but I believed that the people who were involved in negotiating that agreement on behalf of the Government clearly indicated that they had no business experience or understanding in relation to that project. We have now reached a stage where we are spending hundreds of thousands of dollars every month but, unfortunately, there does not appear to be a light at the end of the tunnel.

**Mr Slater:** Are you saying we should have let it go down?

**Mr GUNN:** I am saying that, when the arrangement was entered into, there should have been a more careful analysis of where we were going and what the end results would be. There was the most foolish buying of equipment that was 50 years old. I suggest to the House that, if the managing director of a large company in this State committed his company to buying machinery of that age and quality, he would be fired by the board, and quite properly so.

Eventually people did that with the former Government—they got rid of it. We also had the fiasco of the Frozen Food Factory, which cost the Government a lot of money which could have been better invested on behalf of this community, resulting in a far better return for the people of this State. We had the Land Commission, which was another disaster. It would not have been so bad if the people of the State, especially the needy, had received some benefit from that. But what have they received? Nothing! What I want from the Leader is one or two simple explanations and undertakings. We have been told by speaker after speaker from the Opposition side that members on this side of the House have not been allowed to speak on this matter. Members on this side are quite free to speak. I remind the member opposite (the only Opposition member present at the moment) that when the member for Norwood was speaking there were only two A.L.P. members present in the House.

Not only on Budget debates, but on nearly every matter that came before the House during the Dunstan era, members opposite were not allowed to say what they wished, and a number could not have done so even had they so desired. There was one member who went through a whole session of Parliament without once having his name recorded in *Hansard*, so, if the member for Peake wants to cast his shots wide let him look at the record before he embarks upon that line again.

What I would like from the one member in the Chamber representing the Labor Party is for him to say whether he or his Leader can give an unqualified assurance that they would not, in Government, increase charges and taxes and would not introduce any new charges or taxes. Their track record over the 10 years they were in Government was not good in this regard. We have already seen one example of disagreement relating to that particular subject when the member for Elizabeth resigned from the shadow Cabinet after seeking an undertaking from his Leader about transport costs, which he could not get.

We all know that Governments cannot operate without money; that is one of the unfortunate realities of life. They have to increase charges to meet ongoing commitments, but where Governments can be responsible is by making sure that departments and instrumentalities operate effectively and efficiently, and that their services are provided in the interests of the people and can be justified. For years we have been told in this State that New South Wales is the place and that it has the policies we should adopt. We have had Mr Wran, that white knight, charging through New South Wales doing wonders. What has been the result of

five years of Wranism in New South Wales? He has virtually bankrupted that State.

Let us now look at an article which appeared in the *Sunday Mail* and compare his track record with that of this Government. I think that any fair, impartial observer would have to agree that this Government stands far above him. We inherited a situation unlike his. He inherited a situation where there had been 10 years of good Government and good, sound, reliable financial control. This Government took over from a Government which had had no regard for the financial affairs of this State.

What has happened in New South Wales? The Premier's list of lapses ranges from the recent introduction of petrol tax after years of saying he would never tolerate it. We have had the member for Norwood talking about land rights, but this Government stands alone in this nation for what it has done in that field. Mr Wran has talked for five years and done nothing. He has raised electricity costs, water rates, petrol tax and vehicle fees. Public Service jobs have been axed, and moves are afoot to cut nurses' pay. Such measures can hardly increase Mr Wran's popularity. Fares on public transport have soared after his Government won widespread publicity by initially cutting them by 20 per cent.

The member for Peake may be interested to hear that the New South Wales power system has been on the verge of collapse for 15 months. That is because of the policies of Mr Wran, the person whom the Leader and his colleagues have held up to the people of South Australia as a shining white knight. They have said that the way to run things is by following Mr Wran.

*Mr Keneally interjecting:*

**Mr GUNN:** It is all very well for the member for Stuart to interject. Let him get up and make a contribution. I am not interested in what he has to say. He is normally on some negative line. We have been told that we should increase public expenditure and that that is the way to solve all problems. I was interested—

**Mr Keneally:** You have just told us 15 things that you want done in your electorate.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Stuart has not yet received the call.

**Mr GUNN:** When one examines the Federal Budget figures, one sees an interesting comparison between interest rates and inflation in a number of industrialised countries to the end of 1981. I would like to quote some of them. Japan had an inflation rate of 2.6 per cent and a prime lending rate of 6 per cent. West Germany had an inflation rate of 5.6 per cent and a prime lending rate of 14 per cent. The United States had a 8.9 per cent inflation rate and a prime lending rate of 15.75 per cent. At the end of 1981, Australia had an inflation rate of 10.1 per cent and a prime lending rate of 15.75 per cent.

The highest of the lot was in France, where they had an inflation rate of 14 per cent and a prime lending rate of 16.85 per cent. That clearly indicates that the sort of policies that the Leader has suggested have not worked and will not work. I seek leave to have a purely statistical table inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it. It is contained on page 45 of Budget statement paper No. 1.

Leave granted.

Table 15: International Comparisons of Interest Rates and Inflation at end-1981

	Inflation rates (a) (per cent)	Long term government bond yields (b) (per cent)	Prime lending rate (per cent)
Japan .....	2.6	7.9	6.0
West Germany .....	5.6	9.7	14.0
United States .....	8.9	12.9	15.75
Australia .....	10.1	15.0	(c) 15.75
United Kingdom .....	11.3	16.0	15.5
Canada .....	11.4	15.3	16.5
France .....	14.0	16.4	16.85

(a) Changes in implicit price deflators for GNP or GDP in the six months to December 1981 compared with the previous six months expressed as annual rates. Because of the unavailability of a GDP deflator for the United Kingdom, the implicit price deflator for private consumption expenditure has been used.

(b) Long term government bond yields at end-December 1981, as follows:

Japan—Central Government bonds;  
West Germany—Public sector bonds, 7-15 years;  
United States—Government bonds and notes, 10 years and over;  
Australia—Treasury bonds, 10 years;  
United Kingdom—Government bonds, 10 years;  
Canada—Federal Government bonds, 10 years and over;  
France—Public and semi-public sector bonds.

(c) Estimated base lending interest rate charged by major trading banks on overdrafts \$A 100 000 or over.

**Mr GUNN:** I believe that that document is worthy of consideration by members. We heard earlier tonight about the wicked things that the Government is doing in relation to electricity charges. Any member who has been in this place for any length of time knows that no State Government, since the Electricity Trust was established by Sir Thomas Playford, has ever had the authority to direct the Electricity Trust in relation to the amount that it charges for electricity.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr GUNN:** The Government of the day does not have the authority to direct the Electricity Trust. The honourable member knows that. I suggest that he read the Act. We have been blamed, but one should remember that the Dunstan Government first brought into effect the 5 per cent levy on Electricity Trust sales to go to the Treasury. This year, I am happy to tell the honourable member, the amount is estimated to be \$18 500 000. As the member who represents that part of the State where coal is mined to help generate electricity, I am most concerned that first and foremost we have adequate supplies of electricity. I hope that we never get to the stage of having political interference in the management and control of the Electricity Trust as has occurred in New South Wales that will run the organisation down to a point where it cannot maintain its levels of production. I am concerned, as are many of my constituents, about the comments on page 2 of the Electricity Trust Report, which, under the heading 'Natural gas', states:

The generation of electricity in South Australia continues to depend heavily on natural gas, 80 per cent of the trust's total generation in 1981-82 being from this fuel.

It goes on clearly to indicate the foolishness and the quite irresponsible manner in which Premier Dunstan and his colleagues negotiated the agreement for the sale of our gas. I believe that the Government is quite right in setting out to attempt to renegotiate those agreements. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 11.50 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 1 September at 2 p.m.

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 31 August 1982

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

## INSTITUTION of ENGINEERS

19. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. What response has been made by the Minister or Cabinet to the submission of the Institution of Engineers, Australia, in particular to its contention that 'the current stringent funding of tertiary education will have serious short and long-term effects on the standard of professional engineering education...?'

2. What action has been taken by the Minister in the light of the reported threat to accreditation of the Engineering Departments of the University of Adelaide resultant upon levels of funding made available to them?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:**

1. I have given a reply to submissions on engineering education received from the National and South Australian Presidents of the Institution of Engineers. I also provided the institution with extracts from comments on the submission made by the University of Adelaide and the South Australian Institute of Technology. In my reply I pointed out that the responsibility for the funding of universities is held directly by the Commonwealth and that the internal allocation of funds is a matter for the university, to which I had directed the institution's submission. The university's allocation to engineering is therefore based on its own assessment of internal priorities.

2. Accreditation of university courses is in the province of the University Council, and I understand that the council is presently considering proposals to ensure that the engineering course's standing with the professional community is not prejudiced. In the case of engineering courses at the South Australian Institute of Technology I am advised that

the Tertiary Education Authority of South Australia, in recommending funding for the institute in the current triennium, has taken into account the relatively high costs of such disciplines as engineering; further, the institute itself reports that a differential in favour of engineering has been built into its internal allocation of funds.

## MURRAY RIVER

28. **Mr TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. How many consultants' reports on matters relating to the Murray River have been commissioned since 1965 by the Engineering and Water Supply Department or other State authorities?

2. What was the nature of the work undertaken by each consultant?

3. What was the authority or group of authorities which commissioned each report?

4. When was each of the reports:

(a) commissioned; and

(b) completed?

5. Which firm was engaged on each of the studies?

6. What was the consultant's fee for each report?

7. Why was the consultant engaged in each instance?

8. If tenders were called, was the lowest tenderer engaged in each case and, if not, why not?

9. Was the report made public in each case?

**The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD:**

1. Twelve.

2. See attached table.

3. Minister of Water Resources.

4. See attached table.

5. See attached table.

6. Confidential between consultant and Minister.

7. Outside skills and/or manpower were required.

8. The lowest acceptable tenderer was engaged in each case.

9. See attached table.

Consultant	Nature of Work Undertaken	Commission Date	Completion Date	Report Made Public	Approving Authority
Trojan Owen & Associates	River Murray Salinity Probe Investigation	23.3.76	6.5.76	No	Minister of Works
Trojan Owen & Associates	River Murray Salinity Investigation	14.5.76	28.9.76	No	Minister of Works
Trojan Owen & Associates	Implementation of public participation	16.2.77	10.1.80	No	Minister of Works
Dr C. R. Twidale	Noora Basin Environmental Impact Statement	24.1.78	20.2.78	Yes	Director-General and Engineer-in-Chief
Kinnaird, Hill, de Rohan & Young	Noora Basin Salt Disposal Study	25.8.78	28.2.79	Yes	Minister of Works
Kinnaird, Hill, de Rohan & Young	Murray River Overview Study	28.5.79	5.6.80	No	Cabinet
Kinnaird, Hill, de Rohan & Young	Lower Lakes Study Stage 1	24.4.79	19.11.79	No	Director-General and Engineer-in-Chief
Caldwell Connell	Katarapko Island Environment Study	15.5.80	14.12.81	Yes	Minister of Water Resources
AMDEL	Economic Impacts of Saline Water Supplies on Municipal & Industrial Use Stage 1	22.8.79	23.6.80	Yes	Cabinet
Maunsell & Partners	River Murray Irrigation Overview Study Stage 2	17.3.81	In progress	N/A	Cabinet
AMDEL	Economic Impacts of Saline Water Supplies on Municipal & Industrial Use Stage 2	21.1.81	In progress	N/A	Cabinet
Coffey & Partners Pty Ltd	Investigation of Saline Mitigation between Lock 2 and Lock 3 River Murray	23.4.82	In progress	N/A	Cabinet

### CARCINOGENIC SUBSTANCES

60. **Mr L. M. F. ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Are any substances categorised by the South Australian Health Commission as being carcinogenic and, if so, which and what regulations pertain to each of those substances?

2. What requirements exist for employers to report the use of such substances and incidents which expose workers to these substances and, if any, how are such reports required to be submitted and to whom and what penalties exist for failure to make any such required reports?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:**

1. The South Australian Health Commission is aware of known and potential carcinogenic substances but does not maintain a register of such substances. The regulations under the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act require that employees are not exposed to these substances in such a way that their health might be adversely affected.

2. No such requirements exist.

### CONTRACT TEACHERS

71. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** will ask the Minister of Education: What proportion of full-time equivalent new appointments in each of the past five years have been on contract in (a) the primary sector and (b) the secondary sector?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** Data on the number of teachers on contract is not available in summary form for the years prior to 1980. For the years 1980 to 1982, the available data does not permit a determination of the full-time equivalent number of contract appointments.

The table below provides an estimate of the number of f.t.e. persons given contract appointments in 1980, 1981 and 1982. The number has been determined by dividing the total number of individual contracts by 1.5, the estimated average number of contracts per person.

		Contract Appointments	
		Persons	Proportion of total f.t.e.s
1980	Primary .....	570	57 per cent
1980	Secondary .....	550	69 per cent
1981	Primary .....	700	78 per cent
1981	Secondary .....	670	77 per cent
1982	Primary .....	880	82 per cent
1982	Secondary .....	840	79 per cent

It should be appreciated that almost all of the contract appointments are made to fill temporary vacancies—mainly teachers on long service leave, and that in each of the past three years the finance made available for this has greatly increased so that a larger number of contracts have been provided, to the benefit of otherwise unemployed teachers.

### WATER RATES

76. **Mr BANNON** will ask the Minister of Water Resources:

1. What was the proportion of all domestic consumers of water liable for excess water payment in each year from 1978-79 to 1981-82? How was the excess water allowance calculated in each year and what was the allowance in each year?

2. What proportion of all properties paid the minimum water rate in each year from 1978-79 to 1981-82?

3. What proportion of all properties paid the minimum rate for sewerage in each year from 1978-79 to 1981-82?

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

1. The proportion of domestic consumers who incurred additional water rates in the years from 1978-79 to 1981-82 is shown on the table below. A property's water allowance is calculated by dividing the annual water rate based on the capital value of that property by the ruling price of water. As the annual water allowance varies for each property depending upon its capital value, there is no 'standard' allowance.

2. See table below.

3. See table below.

Details	1978-79 per cent	1979-80 per cent	1980-81 per cent	1981-82 per cent
Domestic consumers who incurred additional water rates.	49.7	49.0	58.8	60.8
Properties charged minimum water rate.	Not available	14.6	17.6	18.4
Properties charged minimum sewer rate.	Not available	6.9	8.1	8.1

### MULTIPLE BIRTHS

91. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: What is the billing policy adopted by hospitals under the South Australian Health Commission concerning multiple births, why is such a policy applied, and what provisions exist to ensure that no parents are financially disadvantaged by such billing merely as a consequence of the occasion of a multiple birth?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Accounts are raised in accordance with guidelines determined from Commonwealth legislation as interpreted by Commonwealth Department of Health circulars.

2. The policy is applied to ensure that financial disadvantage does not occur in these circumstances.

3. The Commonwealth eligible free treatment provisions and the fact that hospital charges are matched by the basic hospital benefit table should ensure that there is no personal cost.

### BLOOD LEAD LEVELS

101. **Mr TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Has the Minister any information on blood lead levels for children attending St Anthony's Junior Primary School adjacent to South Road and the Emerson crossing and, in particular, have any tests been considered or actually conducted to determine the effects of any fall-out from exhaust fumes in that area and, if such tests have been conducted, with what result?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** No. I am not aware of any blood lead level tests for children attending the school, or of any consideration being given to conducting such tests.

### MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION

121. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. What changes have taken place regarding community languages in schools from the Education Department's point of view over the past two years?

2. What have been the levels of specific funding to Government and non-government schools, respectively, for multicultural education for each of the past five years?

3. What have been the levels of funding (by means of specific payments) made available to the Government from the Federal Government for these activities for each of the past five years?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The replies are as follows:

1. In the past 2½ years the Education Department has employed teams of seconded teachers to write Italian and Greek courses for primary and junior secondary children. While maintaining advisory services in Italian and Greek, advisers in Serbo-Croatian languages and Vietnamese were appointed. As well as this, in 1982 a number of salaries were allocated to regions, for schools seeking to maintain existing community language programmes.

2. Past information relating to the distribution between Government and non-government schools is not provided. It would include a great deal of time as the figures are not readily available.

	1979	1980	1981
Cash grants .....	17 000	63 200	199 900
Salaries—curricula writers and co-ordinating staff .....	24 100	53 500	95 300
Other expenditure .....	10 600	27 200	39 300
Total expenditure .....	51 700	143 900	334 400

3. The Commonwealth programme commenced in 1979.

	1979	1980	1981
Total funds from Commonwealth .....	51 500	143 900	323 500

### PEDESTRIAN SUBWAY

123. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: What significance did the existence of the pedestrian subway at Salisbury Railway Station (with its attendant problems) have for the decision to resite the terminating stops of post—7.15 p.m. services of routes 400 and 401 to John Street, Salisbury?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The terminal point for buses operating over 400 and 401 bus routes after 7.15 p.m. was transferred from Paternoster Row to John Street due to groups of youths gathering in Paternoster Row in the vicinity of the railway station and causing problems for bus operators in charge of buses waiting to connect with train services.

### TIME CLOCK

124. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Will the Minister taken action to have the time clock for route 411, presently sited at stop 48A, resited to another stop in order to reduce the hazard to traffic caused by its present location and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The time recorder clock located at up stop 48A Wiltshire Street, Salisbury is the only common stop for bus routes numbered 400-401 (after 7.15 p.m.), 411 and 501 prior to the Salisbury Highway, Winzor Street and Waterloo Corner Road junctions where these services bifurcate.

The State Transport Authority is negotiating with the Salisbury council regarding the construction of a bus bay on the southern side of Park Terrace (opposite the Peter Jackson Hotel). When this bus bay has been constructed

consideration will be given to resiting the time recorder clock to this location.

### TAFE

126. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What action has been taken by the Department of Technical and Further Education in response to the statement of the TAFE Council of the Tertiary Education Commission in preparation for the 1982-84 triennium that 'In South Australia . . . none of its colleges has recreational facilities and only three have staff-student lounges' in the light of that council's finding that 'it will be necessary to provide improved student service facilities, including counselling areas, an adequate library and modest recreational facilities'?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** In 1981 Regency Park Community College became the first TAFE college to provide outdoor recreational facilities—two tennis courts and a grassed football area were constructed. All colleges built after 1975 have to varying degrees facilities catering for indoor recreation such as billiards and table tennis. Staff-student lounges exist at Regency Park, Elizabeth and Gilles Plains colleges as quoted and have since been constructed at the Marleston and Port Adelaide colleges. One is under construction at the Noarlunga college. All new major TAFE colleges have student service facilities including counselling and in most cases extensive library accommodation. The provision of improved student service facilities is taken into account when renovations or upgrading occurs at existing colleges.

### PORT PIRIE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

127. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What plans are in hand or proposed for the replacement of the Port Pirie Community College, when and in what stages will such plans be put into effect and what will be the costs involved?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** A submission for the redevelopment of the Port Pirie College of Technical and Further Education has been approved in concept by the Technical and Further Education Council of the Tertiary Education Commission. The redevelopment will be dependent upon the decision of the B.H.A.S. on the upgrading of the smelter or on the introduction of a new industry to the town. It must be understood, however, even if a decision is made to redevelop the smelter or if a new industry is introduced there is no certainty that the Commonwealth will fund the project. The estimated cost of the redevelopment at January 1981, was \$6 697 000.

### STAFF LEVELS

129. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. In each of the past five years what have been the equivalent full-time levels of head office staff in the Department of Technical and Further Education?

2. In each of those years, what has been the percentage of head office staff to:

(a) teaching staff at colleges of the department; and

(b) all staff at the colleges of the department?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The replies are as follows:

## 1. Equivalent full-time levels of head office staff:

1977	1978	1979	1980	1981
141	165.5	211.4*	156.6	148

## 2. (a) Percentage of the head office staff to teaching staff at the colleges:

1977	1978	1979	1980	1981
11.71	12.95	15.94*	11.55	9.87

## (b) Percentage of head office staff to all staff at the colleges:

1977	1978	1979	1980	1981
7.64	8.6	10.54*	7.69	6.91

\* In 1979 some double counting occurred between head office and college based staff resulting in artificially inflated figures.

## ENROLMENT GROWTH

130. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. What projections were provided by the South Australian Department of Technical and Further Education to the Tertiary Education Commission (or the TAFE Council of that commission) for growth in enrolments in each stream of study to 1984?

2. What differences in presumption relevant to South Australia account for the variation between those projections and the ones finally adopted by the TAFE Council?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Statistics provided by the Department of Technical and Further Education to the Tertiary Education Commission can be obtained from the Parliamentary Library in 'Submission to TAFEC for the Triennium 1982-84' (May 1980), pages 107 and 108.

2. The Technical and Further Education Council does not finally adopt enrolment projections for particular States. The Tertiary Education Commission 'Report for 1982-84 Triennium, Volume 1 Part 4, Advice of Technical and Further Education Council' (February 1981) contains a summary of the aggregate of State projections to 1984 and also the Technical and Further Education Council's own projections of enrolments to 1984, at national level. The assumptions on which TAFEC's projections are based are clearly stated; they do not include references to particular States.

## FIRES

137. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. How many fires in business and private premises, respectively, were deliberately lit or suspected of being deliberately lit during each of the years 1980 to 1982?

2. What are the police and insurance companies' estimates of such losses during each year?

3. What procedures are adopted by the police for collecting data on arson cases?

**The Hon. J. W. OLSEN:** The replies are as follows:

1. 1980-445  
1981-519  
1982—Not available.

2. The time and effort required to provide this information is not considered warranted.

3. The initial crime report relating to each offence contains specified data necessary for the investigation of the crime.

Selected data from this source document is then stored on the computerised crime statistics system.

## Mr B. LENTIC

140. **Mr ABBOTT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health, representing the Minister of Community Welfare: Is it the intention of the Department for Community Welfare to transfer Mr B. Lentic from Magill Home and, if so, why, and to where will he be transferred?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** It is not the intention of the Department for Community Welfare to transfer Mr B. Lentic from Magill Home.

## DENTAL HYGIENISTS

147. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What proposals have been made regarding the possible training of dental hygienists from Iraq in South Australian educational institutions, what action has resulted from those proposals and how will costs related to such proposals be borne?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The replies are as follows:

1. In a letter to the Ambassador of Iraq, Mr Faris Al-Ani, on 27 May 1982, I informed him that the School of Para Dental Studies, Gilles Plains Community College (TAFE), conducted the only course in Australia for dental hygienists. I believe that Iraq was engaged upon a programme of community health, and that His Excellency may be interested in having Iraqi students trained in para dental techniques.

2. No action has resulted. I have not received a reply concerning this matter.

3. If the Government of Iraq considered that the matters were worth pursuing, the arrangements for training of Iraqi students would be handled at the Federal level through the appropriate agencies in Canberra. The Iraqi Government would be expected to meet the costs of training its students, and payment would be made to the South Australian Government.

## T. R. T. TIME

149. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. What have been the approximate allocation in days of T.R.T. time in each of the past five financial years?

2. What has been the cost of the allocation in each of those years?

3. How many days per full-time equivalent teacher does that T.R.T. allocation average to in each of those years?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The replies are as follows:

1. 1978-79 55 412 days  
1979-80 56 857 days  
1980-81 56 741 days  
1981-82 55 000 days
2. 1978-79 \$3 122 000  
1979-80 \$3 372 000  
1980-81 \$3 990 000  
1981-82 \$3 902 000
3. 1978-79 3.7 days/teacher  
1979-80 3.8 days/teacher  
1980-81 3.8 days/teacher  
1981-82 3.7 days/teacher

Information for 1977-78 is not available in this form.

The level of teacher replacement for teacher absences in South Australia stands at 88 per cent for primary schools

and 84 per cent for secondary schools, some 12 per cent above the national replacement average.

### DOVER GARDENS CENTRE

151. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. What is the present status of the speech and hearing centre at Dover Gardens?
2. How many students attend the centre and how many staff are employed there (in total and in full-time equivalents)?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The replies are as follows:

1. The Dover Gardens speech and hearing centre was formally closed in March this year.
2. There have been no pupils or teachers at the centre for all of this year.

### INDUSTRY LEAVE

153. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What provisions are made at present or are proposed to be made concerning the provision of 'industry leave' for lecturers in the colleges of the Department of Technical and Further Education?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The provision of industrial leave is a major strategy for improving and updating the technical competence of lecturing staff in the colleges of the Department of Technical and Further Education. During the teaching year of 1982 the department allocated \$86 000 to be used specifically for vocational and technical update. This allocation was devoted to three strategies for college staff:

1. Industrial leave.
2. Industry based programmes conducted both within colleges and in industry settings.
3. Attendance at seminars/workshops both national and international.

It is estimated that industrial leave activities have been funded to the extent of \$43 000. Approximately 15 staff received the benefits of industrial leave for periods which ranged from one week to one year. All of these lecturers were and are teaching in programmes requiring high technology competence and the engineering trades were predominant. It should also be noted that the above provision for 1982 was allocated exclusively for technical update and additional provisions were made from other funding sources for activities which also fell into this category, e.g. release-time and overseas scholarships.

### RICE PROGRAMME

156. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Regarding the RICE programme, what has been the amount spent on:

- (a) general non-salary expenses; and
- (b) vehicle expenses,

in each financial year since the programme started?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The reply is as follows:

#### RICE PROJECT

Financial Year	General Non-Salary Expenses A \$	Vehicle Expenses B \$	Total A and B \$
1975-76 .....	11 824	—	11 824
1976-77 .....	30 581	—	30 581
1977-78 .....	11 461	—	11 461
1978-79 .....	14 681	—	14 681

Financial Year	General Non-Salary Expenses A \$	Vehicle Expenses B \$	Total A and B \$
1979-80 .....	31 012	5 192	36 204
1980-81 .....	14 650	—	14 650
1981-82 .....	14 175	—	14 175
Total .....	128 384	5 192	133 576

The above figures do not include salary expenditure items. The source of above figures is Childhood Services Council end of financial year ledger reports.

### PHOTO DRIVERS LICENCES

161. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Is it the intention of this Government to introduce photo drivers licences and, if so:

- (a) when;
- (b) what alterations will be required to the licence;
- (c) what are the estimated costs;
- (d) will the licences be printed by the Government Printer;
- (e) how will the system be introduced;
- (f) is the licence period to be extended from three to five years; and
- (g) how will the photographs be included on the licence (e.g. front cover, back cover)?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The inclusion of photographs on drivers licences has been under consideration for several years. In 1978 tenders were called for the supply, delivery and installation of equipment to be used in the implementation of a system of photographic identification of licence holders. Extensive investigations were conducted and assessment of all submissions failed to establish the feasibility of the scheme. It was considered that benefits were not in proportion to the costs involved.

The main disadvantages and problems were as follows: the initial identification of applicants; high cost; the need for each licence holder to personally present themselves for a photograph; endorsement of changed addresses and restrictions; and the need for annual renewal of licences by licence holders with medical problems. It is not the Government's intention to introduce photo licences at this time.

### MAGILL HOME

164. **The Hon. P. DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Why is the Government using private contractors to replace the approach road to the Magill Home, how much is this work costing and why is it being undertaken if the home is to be closed?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Public Buildings Department does not have the facilities to do the work.
2. \$12 500.
3. Magill Home is not closing.

### TOURISM ADVERTISEMENT

165. **The Hon. P. DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism: How much did the Government spend on its tourism insert in the *Home and Business Directory Guide* and why was this insert put into this publication?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** Total cost to the Department of Tourism was \$399 for the provision of photographic prints. The 116 pages were offered and provided free to the Department of Tourism. The inclusion of the holiday guide in the *Home and Business Directory* is another example of growing awareness of the value and importance of tourism and the way in which the private sector is co-operating with the department.

#### COMMUNITY INFORMATION SERVICE

167. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment and Planning:

1. How many people are employed in the Community Information Service of the Department of Environment and Planning?

2. What were the costs of the service in the year 1981-82 for:

(a) salaries;

(b) rent;

(c) travel;

(d) printing; and

(e) miscellaneous items?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The replies are as follows:

1. The Department of Environment and Planning has allocated eight staff ceiling positions to the Community Information Service. At 30 June 1982 seven of those positions were filled on a permanent basis, one on an acting basis, and an additional ninth person was working in the Community Information Service on a short-term contract.

2. The costs of the Community Information Service in the year 1981-82 were as follows:

(a) Salaries—\$184 242 (includes \$15 114 recharge to the Department of Education).

(b) Rent—not itemised as a separate cost since the service is accommodated along with the rest of the department.

(c) Travel—\$5 992.

(d) Printing and publishing—\$58 257.

(e) Other expenditure—\$18 330 (includes \$6 616 for purchase of motor vehicle).