

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 13 September 1983

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

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

Senior Secondary Assessment Board of South Australia Act Amendment,
Supply (No. 2).

PETITION: MARIHUANA

A petition signed by 40 residents of South Australia praying that the House reject any legislation that would legalise or decriminalise the use of marihuana was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: MEAT SALES

Petitions signed by 160 residents of South Australia praying that the House reject any legislation to extend the existing trading hours for the retail sale of meat were presented by Messrs Hamilton and Plunkett.

Petitions received.

PETITION: MADISON PARK KINDERGARTEN

A petition signed by 329 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to provide additional finance to the Kindergarten Union of South Australia for the provision of additional teaching staff to Madison Park Kindergarten in accordance with prescribed teacher/child ratios was presented by the Hon. Michael Wilson.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that answers to questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the following schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 1, 13, 24, 29, 30, 40, 54 to 57, 59, 62, 65, 70, 76, 80 to 82, 90, 98, 102, 107, 110 to 112, 118, 121 to 123, 128, and 136; and I direct that the following answer to a question without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*:

ORANGE JUICE

In reply to Mr MAYES (9 August).

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: At this stage, the Government does not have under consideration specific amendments to the standard for orange juice under the food and drugs regulations. Under the present regulations, packages of orange juice are not to contain any false or misleading statements or devices, the ingredients are to be listed and when the addition of sucrose exceeds 4 per cent the juice is to be described as sweetened orange juice.

At the national level, the Food Standards Committee of the National Health and Medical Research Council is to consider a report of a review of the standard requirements for orange juice, as it is aware of the need for a more stringent standard. Also, it is considering amendments to the general labelling requirements to provide for a declaration of country of origin, and that additives be declared by their specific name or identified by an international code. Recommendations made by the N.H. & M.R.C. are considered by the Food and Drugs Advisory Committee established under this State's Food and Drugs Act to advise on amendments to the regulations.

The declaration of the amount of sugar is one aspect of the wider need for nutritional labelling statements. While the determination of national standards for nutritional labelling is not imminent, it is the State Government's policy to promote the adoption of legislative requirements for the complete listing or coding of the contents of food.

As a step towards implementing Government policy, Cabinet recently approved the drafting of a Bill based on model uniform food legislation endorsed by Commonwealth and State Ministers of Health. The proposed legislation contains more extensive controls over labelling.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

The **SPEAKER** laid on the table the Auditor-General's Report for the financial year ended 30 June 1983.

Ordered that report be printed.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Audit Act, 1921—Regulations—Tender Levels.
- ii. Savings Bank of South Australia—Balance Sheet, 1982-83.

By the Minister of Labour (Hon. J.D. Wright)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Industrial and Commercial Training Act, 1981—Regulations—Automotive Parts Interpreting Specialist.

By the Minister of Public Works (Hon. J.D. Wright)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works—Fifty-sixth General Report.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

Planning Act, 1982—Crown Development Reports by South Australian Planning Commission on—

- i. Proposed Erection of Single Unit Transportable Classroom at Clare by Public Buildings Department.
- ii. Northeast Busway Depot—Minor Public Service Depot.
- iii. Proposed Sundry Buildings within Bashams Beach Regional Park, Port Elliot.
- iv. Proposed Mezzanine Offices and Other Alterations at the Naracoorte College of Technical and Further Education.
- v. Proposed Division of Land in Perpetual Lease 86692.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

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

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

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Chiropractors Act, 1979—Regulations—Prescribed Institution.
- ii. Firearms Act, 1977—Regulations—Fees.

By the Minister of Community Welfare (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act, 1966—Regulations—Fees.
- ii. Builders Licensing Act, 1967—Regulations—Fees.
- iii. Commercial and Private Agents Act, 1972—Regulations—Licence Fees.
- iv. Consumer Credit Act, 1972—Regulations—Fees.
- v. Consumer Transactions Act, 1972—Regulations—Fees.
- vi. Fees Regulation Act, 1927—Regulations—Cremation Permit Fees.
- Land and Business Agents Act, 1973—Regulations—
 - vii. Land Agents Licence Fees.
 - viii. Land Brokers Licence Fees.
- ix. Land Valuers Licensing Act, 1969—Regulations—Licence Fees.
- x. Places of Public Entertainment Act, 1913—Regulations—Fees.
- xi. Real Property Act, 1886—Regulations—Solicitors and Land Brokers Charges.
- xii. Trade Measurements Act, 1971—Regulations—Fees.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Racecourses Development Board—Report, 1982-83.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

Corporation By-laws—

Adelaide—

- i. No. 16—The Central Market.
- ii. No. 31—Cleaning of Footpaths.
- iii. No. 32—Caravans.
- iv. No. 77—Repeal of By-laws.

Tea Tree Gully—

- v. No. 16—Ice Cream and Produce Carts.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: POLICE OFFICER'S PAYMENT

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Chief Secretary): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: As the House should be aware, the Premier earlier today announced that the State Government would be making an *ex gratia* payment of \$30 000 to Senior Constable I. Goldsmith for the discovery and apprehension of Colin James Creed. I think it is necessary for me to explain to this House why payment is to be made in that form. *Ex gratia*, of course, means 'without legal obligation'.

On the recommendation of the Acting Police Commissioner, Senior Constable Goldsmith was not paid the reward that was approved by Cabinet on 9 August 1982. Members will appreciate that in the matter of the payment of rewards, the decision is invariably one that is at the complete discretion of the Police Commissioner. The Commissioner has advised me of his thinking about Senior Constable Goldsmith's position in this matter.

There is considerable case law in the United Kingdom on the possibility of payments of rewards to police officers. The Commissioner believes, if I may condense lengthy argument he has put on paper, that the oath taken by Senior Constable Goldsmith does not in fact limit his duties to within South Australia. Some arguments that have had currency in recent days refer to the constable's lack of jurisdiction in Western Australia. But we should not confuse his powers with his duty. The Commissioner has a general belief that police officers should not be eligible for rewards. I do not think he, or any recent Commissioner, has had to meet such an exceptional case.

After considerable research and thought, he has detailed why he holds his view about police officers receiving rewards. He has itemised his reservations. They include:

(1) Professionalism: That is, it should not be possible to get a reward for simply doing one's job.

(2) Inside knowledge: Police officers will often have greater knowledge than the rest of the community of a criminal's whereabouts. Therefore, the chances of payment are greater.

(3) Police efficiency: A danger exists that individual officers or groups might not share information with colleagues. This could detract from the force's efficiency.

(4) The public interest: There are possible complications in courts if police witnesses could be presented as having vested interests in obtaining convictions and gaining rewards.

(5) Industrial aspects: If there is payment of rewards, the matter could (as it has in this instance) become divisive within the force, with the Police Association feeling obliged to take up the case of individuals. It then becomes an industrial issue.

(6) Public reaction: In the circumstances surrounding the Perth apprehension, opinion is clearly in favour of Senior Constable Goldsmith. However, in other cases, the element of public support might be lacking. People could easily see police as being rewarded for doing just what they were paid to do.

I think it important to have these elements spelt out, without reflecting in the least on the great public service rendered by the policeman involved. Indeed, we have recognised what Senior Constable Goldsmith and his wife have done by making this special payment of \$30 000. The significant involvement of Mrs Goldsmith is yet another exceptional factor that has had to be taken into account.

As there has been some speculation by observers about the dangers of police being accused of 'bounty hunting', the Commissioner has been at some pains to state that there is absolutely no suggestion that this practice applied to Senior Constable Goldsmith. The sighting of Creed was by pure chance. Because this case has been exceptional and because of the problems it poses for future Police Commissioners should such an instance arise again, Acting Commissioner Killmier is preparing for a review of the reward system, to put beyond doubt the position of police officers in relation to rewards. He will develop a clear policy that will clarify the sorts of issues this case has raised. Because this payment is of an *ex gratia* nature, and not a payment of reward, it cannot of course be regarded as a precedent.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: YATALA LABOUR PRISON

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Chief Secretary): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I am pleased to be able to inform the House that further decisions have been taken by the Government on its progressive reform of the State's correctional system. Members will be aware of decisions already made. However, despite these, the central problem of our major institution, Yatala, remained to be tackled. What I am about to announce goes back to the initiative taken last year by the Executive Director of the Department of Correctional Services, Mr M.J. Dawes, in putting in motion detailed planning for the thorough streamlining of Yatala—in so far as it can be brought up to date.

This commendable initiative resulted in the production of the master plan which I announced in this House on 9 August. Subsequently, members were invited to a presentation of the plan, involving an audio-visual explanation plus a sand table model. At that stage, I made it clear to

members, and to the public, that this planning by Mr Malcolm Whyatt and Mr Glen Hughes, of the Department of Correctional Services, and Mr Peter Grivell, of the Public Buildings Department, was a proposal only. The work of those three officers, with the assistance of a number of their colleagues, plus the staff at Yatala Labour Prison, provided a plan of work over nine years costing an estimated \$13.2 million. I am now able to state that the Government has endorsed the proposals contained in the master plan.

We will press ahead with the construction schedule contained in the plan. The speed of our advance will be to the limit dictated by the state of the economy. Even with that limit in mind, we hope to be able to complete the nine-year programme in about four years. We have accepted the supreme urgency of doing something about Yatala. This financial year we will be getting a great deal of work underway there. Our overall aim, as has been said before, is to develop Yatala as the State's high security prison.

Among the first features of the plan we intend to fulfil are the erection of a new security perimeter fence with microwave detection system, and demolition of superfluous or burnt-out buildings. While I readily acknowledge that cordoning the walls with a further barrier will do nothing to improve conditions inside, it is a vital prerequisite for internal improvements. We owe it to the public and to prison staff to ensure the security of the institution.

With this in mind, we will also be undertaking planning this financial year to enable construction at a later date of new staff training and recreation facilities, provision for prisoner recreation, the upgrading of 'B' division and the construction of a proper visitors' centre (to replace the totally inadequate hut that is pressed into service for this purpose). We will be adding extra security and surveillance at the Northfield Security Hospital, providing a headquarters for the Dog Squad and resiting the brickworks.

In the long term, the Government is considering the transfer of the security hospital from the Health Commission to the Department of Correctional Services. The intention there is to convert it into a high security section within Yatala. As with the recent series of statements I have made in this House about our correctional reforms, I call on all members to declare publicly their backing for what is now firmly proposed. These matters are not, nor should they be, matters for Party contention. We believe that unanimous Parliamentary endorsement of the extensive reconstruction of our major prison will help ensure its rapid implementation.

QUESTION TIME

The SPEAKER: In the absence of the honourable Minister for Environment and Planning, questions should be directed to the Premier.

NATURAL GAS

Mr OLSEN: Can the Premier say what action the Government intends to take following a decision yesterday by independent arbitrators which will result in South Australia's paying 60 per cent more than New South Wales in 1985 for South Australian natural gas produced from the Cooper Basin?

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

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Of course, the action which the Government proposes to take is to give proper consideration to the matter which has led to the Leader's raising the question. I indicate to the House that I will be looking at the question of the royalty which is currently payable.

GAS TAX

Mr TRAINER: Has the Premier's attention been drawn to the statements by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that the former Liberal Government's action in refunding to the South Australian Gas Company the licence fee payable under the Gas Act was not a temporary measure and, if so, can he advise the House of what were the exact arrangements that the former Government made?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I was very surprised to read last week a statement printed in the *Advertiser* of 8 September in which the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, referring to me, said:

Mr Bannon was stooping to lies in his attempts to justify tax increases by claiming the former Liberal Government had removed a gas tax last year only as a temporary measure.

We are used to that sort of reckless language from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in this place. I do find it extraordinary that his method of fulmination has found its way into the columns of the press during the week. However, the fact is that (as I will put to the House very clearly), far from stooping to lies, I was expressing the situation (and the Deputy Leader must know that, unless he has had some sudden very profound lapse of memory; after all, these things did not happen so long ago). On 18 October last year (that is, just four days after Parliament was prorogued for the election, just three weeks before the election itself was held), the former Government made the decision to remit the 5 per cent licence fee payable to the Gas Company under the Act. It did not decide to abolish the fee: that was not the decision. It did not decide to draw up legislation to amend the Gas Act to remove the fee (because that is the only way in which it could be removed on a permanent basis).

I would like to read to the House a portion of a minute to the then Minister of Mines and Energy from the Acting Under Treasurer concerning the decision the previous Government took on that occasion after the election had been called. I will not table the whole minute because it contains, in addition to this reference, matters which are still highly confidential. However, the relevant portion states:

I refer to our recent discussion on this matter. You confirmed—this is the Under Treasurer to the then Deputy Premier and Minister of Mines and Energy—

that Cabinet's decision dated 18 October was to be interpreted in terms of a remission or refund rather than a removal of the licence fee payable by Sagasco, such refund or remission to apply over the period 1 January 1982—

that is, retrospectively—

to 30 June 1983 and to then be subject to review. You asked that a letter be prepared for your signature to be sent to Sagasco to formally advise of the decision. A letter for this purpose is attached for your consideration.

The letter referred to was sent to the General Manager of the South Australian Gas Company by the then Minister of Mines and Energy on 28 October 1982, about a week before the election. That letter stated:

The Government will be reviewing the situation to apply after 30 June 1983 and you will, of course, be advised of the outcome of that review as soon as possible and before any firm decision is announced.

There was no mention there of a removal of the fee. There was no mention of an abolition of the licence fee, but a refund for a set period after which the matter would be reviewed. My Government has in fact extended that period of refund by a further six months, that is, beyond June; under a decision made by the Minister of Mines and Energy, and endorsed by Cabinet, that was extended for a further six months. I remind members of the House that the original purpose of my raising the question of this refund in my recent financial statements was to point out that this was

unbudgeted expenditure made in an election contest which added to the recurrent deficit for which my Government had to take responsibility. Indeed, on 29 October (again, a matter of days before the election), the former Treasurer was asked to approve an excess warrant, an unbudgeted amount, to pay the money from the Governor's Appropriation Fund: it was no small amount, as \$4.1 million was involved. I repeat: there is no evidence that the former Government had any intention of permanently removing the licence fee. If the Deputy Leader cannot accept that, I remind him of the submission that he signed in Cabinet, and in particular of his own annotations to that submission which made it absolutely clear that the approval was for a remittance of the fee for a set period, and not for permanent removal.

GAS PRICE

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: My question is directed to the Premier, or to whichever Minister he deposes to answer the question. Will the Government impose an overriding royalty in relation to the price of gas to be charged to New South Wales consumers so that consumers of gas in South Australia do not have to pay more for their gas than do customers in New South Wales in relation to the fuel gate price for Moomba gas. With your concurrence, Sir, and that of the House I will explain the question. I will seek leave to make a personal explanation to deal with other matters canvassed by the Premier a moment ago—

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: You will need to.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:—and any mis-statements that the Premier likes to put before the House.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! This is not a debate. The honourable member will proceed with his explanation.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Yesterday the arbitrators adjudicating on the price of gas to Sydney handed down a price which was 9c less than that applicable in South Australia. I have criticised the A.G.L. contracts previously entered into by the former Labor Government whereby the contracts, compared with those written by A.G.L. negotiators, were severely deficient in a number of respects, one being, of course, that one arbitrator adjudicates and his judgment is retrospective. The arbitrator awarded a price last year which gave an 80 per cent increase in the price of natural gas to apply retrospectively to 1 January last year. As a result of intervention by the former Liberal Government, and by me in particular as Minister, we managed to have that price increase laid aside so that it would apply only from 9 September. All in all, we saved the public of South Australia about \$20 million, although legally, of course, the producers did not have to agree to the proposal.

The A.G.L. arbitration has now been awarded and the price is significantly lower than that which applies in South Australia. The former Government was well aware of this possibility and it was well advanced in negotiations, with the producers particularly, to apply an overriding royalty to gas supplied to New South Wales to ensure that South Australian consumers did not pay more for their gas in this State.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Leader is now clearly debating the matter. He has also introduced a second question into his original question, and that will not be tolerated. The honourable Deputy Leader.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Mr Speaker, the reference to the second question eludes me: I was explaining the question. In fact, I was addressing the question of the

overriding royalty which was under active consideration. I have asked the Government if it intends to impose this overriding royalty, and I am indicating that the former Government was well aware of this possibility occurring, and was well advanced in its negotiations to see that South Australian consumers were not disadvantaged.

The SPEAKER: If the honourable member continues along that factual line he will be within Standing Orders.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: That is precisely what I thought I was doing. The cost disadvantage to South Australia is obvious, in view of the current South Australian and New South Wales arbitration, and I ask the Premier whether he intends to follow the line which was initiated by the Government of which I was a part in relation to the—

The SPEAKER: Order! Order! I withdraw leave. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J. C. BANNON: The substance of that question is almost identical, to, and an extension, if you like, of the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition which was quite capably and adequately answered by my colleague, the Minister of Mines and Energy. In relation to the action which it is proposed to take, I have nothing to add to what he said. I would suggest that the Deputy Leader, as a former Minister, is aware that speculation about the type of action that may or may not be necessary, about the course of negotiations, is not productive of a solution in these matters. I am not quite sure of his motive in raising it. However, it is interesting that he reminds us yet again of the arbitration and the subsequent negotiations (for which he claimed some credit) last year in relation to the South Australian pricing arrangement. Indeed, it is interesting in view of the fact that this arbitrated decision has come out with a lower price than that paid under the negotiated settlement last year of the former Minister. Very interestingly also, the former Minister, and I think his Premier—I will not vouch for that: the records would have to be checked—said when that decision was first in the offing that there would be appeals against it. They took no action to appeal; they chose to negotiate, and that was the result. In fact, the Deputy Leader is very proud of that result, but I would point across the border to what has happened in this case and suggest another analysis might be conducive in that case.

EDUCATION EXPENDITURE

Mr FERGUSON: Will the Minister of Education explain the claims made by the member for Torrens in the *News* on 8 September regarding education recurrent expenditure? The A.L.P. education platform stated that there would be improved educational resources. I understood this to mean that staffing levels would be retained at the same time as enrolment numbers have significantly declined.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Honourable members may have been as amazed as I was to see the press statement in the *News* last week in which the shadow Minister claimed that in fact there had been a cut in real terms of 2 per cent in the education budget. The Budget has been handed down, members have had the chance to look at it, and in due course they will have the chance to look at the programme performance papers. The honourable member is attempting to suggest that a 2 per cent cut in real terms means that there will be 2 per cent less teachers in the education system, 2 per cent less in the maintenance budget, 2 per cent less in real terms in the school grants, 2 per cent less in the T.R.T. budget, 2 per cent less in the advisory teacher allocation, and so on. That is what a real cut means: a cut in what is available at the classroom door level in our schools.

I take this opportunity to disabuse the honourable member and any other members who share his view on the matter. There is no intention to cut by 2 per cent the level of teachers employed in the education system in South Australia. Indeed, the numbers will be maintained as they were when this Budget took effect. That is entirely different from the situation that applied over the past three years where more than 600 teachers were dispensed with by the previous Government. That was a real cut, a reduction in terms of the numbers of teachers employed. That situation has stopped. On election to Government, this Government put back in place 231 teachers, and this year it will maintain 300 teacher numbers that would have been displaced by declining primary enrolments.

The other situation is that the T.R.T. budget is not cut by 2 per cent but has, in fact, gone up by \$709 000. The maintenance budget in the P.B.D. lines is maintained in real terms, and in addition to that there is an allocation under the Minister of Education's line for maintenance. The furniture budget has gone up well in excess of the cost of living increase. School grants have gone up in excess of the c.p.i. and indeed the number of advisory teachers employed in the department in 1983-84 will be greater than the number employed in 1982-83.

I must say that the honourable member did raise an issue in his press release last week: he has taken out his calculator and worked out various permutations and combinations of figures and come up with a 2 per cent cut. I think that the honourable member's figures need some clarification, but I think that the point the member for Torrens has missed is that 85 per cent of the Education Department budget involves salaries. This was a point his colleague the member for Mount Gambier often used to make, somewhat pointlessly I used to think, because he never quite tied it together with any educational point. However, it is true that 85 per cent of the budget is in fact related to salaries.

If one goes back over the last 12-month period and looks at what actually happened to teacher salaries, one will find that they did not increase by the c.p.i.: they increased by only 6.3 per cent. That is an interesting point in itself, because when Opposition members were in Government they used to berate teachers in this State for being extra greedy, for grabbing every bit of money they could, and members opposite used to say that every cent the teachers were going for was money out of the pockets of the rest of us. In fact, over the past 12 months teachers' salary increases were less than the cost of living increase in this State. In fact, 85 per cent of the cost element of the Education Department budget went up by less than the actual cost of living increase. That explains quite clearly how the figures can seem to be less than the growth rate in the cost of living and yet not only maintain effort but, in terms of per capita effort and the number of students in our system which will decline by 3 000 in the year ahead, actually increase the resource commitment per student in education.

The other point which the member for Torrens raised in his press release and which was implicit in the honourable member's questions concerns the capital side, which is a somewhat different picture from the recurrent side. The recurrent side is clearly an increase in the recurrent expenditure per student. We are not following the policies of the previous Government in this regard. On the capital side it is true that in real terms capital expenditure has been reduced. However, the honourable member made one critical mistake, and that is that he took the education capital lines to include only school buildings: he overlooked the fact that we have a large department—the Department of Technical and Further Education—which grew in terms of its capital expenditure. He also overlooked the fact that we have school buses, which for the first time in years have increased in real

terms. The honourable member overlooked the fact that we have furniture and maintenance, and he overlooked the Teacher Housing Authority, both of which items are taken care of under capital lines. If the honourable member had taken these things into account, he would have appreciated that the cut is not the figure that he suggested. However, I do accept the fact that in terms of real expenditure there has been a cut in the capital expenditure in the education lines. What I am arguing against is the magnitude of the figure put on by the shadow Minister.

For a number of years there has been a problem of an increasing backlog in terms of Education Department buildings. I am amazed that there are not some red faces on the other side of the House, because members opposite willingly took part in this exercise every single year they were in Government, adding to the backlog in the building programme in this State. When we go back to the people in 1986, they will be asked to consider the situation in regard to the backlog in school buildings. In this current financial year South Australia is faced with a serious economic situation, with high rates of unemployment and with growing lists of people needing Government supported housing. I believe that any responsible decision of Government would be to have increased the effort in public housing by a massive amount, and that is the very decision that this Government has taken.

That has had to have an effect on other budgets, and I acknowledge its effect on the school-building budget. I think that that is an appropriate decision to make when one is dealing with people in this State who must live in tents or in caravans in backyards. That situation does not seem to concern members opposite: they do not seem to care about people.

Mr Ferguson: They couldn't care less.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: True. Another important point concerns the employment prospects generated by capital works. Capital works are clearly an important employment generator and a part of the instrument of Government policy of trying to generate jobs in the community. Shortly after my election I asked for studies to be done on the job creation multiplier effect of various capital works programmes. In fact, housing construction generates more jobs, not only on the construction side but also in terms of the fittings in these buildings, than do the public works projects. That really means that this year I, as Minister, am presiding over an increase in the backlog of school buildings because I believe in meeting the employment needs of South Australia. In terms of meeting the backlog of housing, the people living in tents, that is a justifiable decision to make. The massive size of the Education Department budget (the recurrent budget) has not declined as the honourable member suggested: it has in fact increased both in capital terms and in real terms. Last year, 30.1 per cent of the State's recurrent budget was spent on education, and this year the figure has increased to 30.3 per cent, and that with 5 000 fewer students in primary schools this year and another 5 000 fewer next year, and an overall reduction in enrolments of 3 000 students.

NORTH-SOUTH CORRIDOR

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Will the Minister of Transport immediately release publicly the Southern Area Road Network Strategy Report, which was prepared by the Highways Department? If not, why will he not release it? The Highways Department has completed a report entitled 'The Southern Area Road Network Strategy Report', since the decision to scrap the north-south transport corridor was announced. The Minister received the report at the beginning of August,

so he has been sitting on it for six weeks. The report examines the traffic problems existing in the southern metropolitan area as a result of the scrapping of the corridor. As many as 12 local councils have criticised the Government for that decision. Further, the Royal Automobile Association, the executive of the Local Government Association, and the Chamber of Commerce and Industry have criticised it and urged the Government not to sell the land held for that transport corridor. I therefore urge the Minister to release that report.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The report referred to was promised to the councils within the southern region of the metropolitan area and to individual members, both Government and Opposition, five or six weeks ago. That report is being compiled, and I should be surprised if it were not to be posted out today or tomorrow.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: Has it come out yet?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: Can the honourable member wait until tomorrow? It will be in the honourable member's letter-box tomorrow.

SPORTS ADMINISTRATION CENTRE

Mr KLUNDER: Can the Minister of Recreation and Sport say what stage has been reached in the Government's proposal to establish a new recreation and sport administration centre?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The honourable member and other members will appreciate that the current sports administration centre was established by the previous Labor Administration in 1978. It has proved to be a success, but over recent times problems have arisen because of lack of space, parking difficulties, and so on.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: It's expensive, too.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: It is an expensive project but a worthy one in relation to recreation and sport in South Australia. This Government is going one step further. I am pleased to announce that the proposal is to establish a recreation and sports administration centre on the corner of King William and Sturt Streets, Adelaide. The premises, which are being renovated and upgraded, were formerly occupied by Chapman's Smallgoods (I hope that that is no relation to the member for Alexandra), and I believe that this will be the first recreation and sports administration centre in Australia.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Does the Government own it?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: We will not be owning it: we will be leasing the property, and commission costs will be involved.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Is the money coming out of soccer pools?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The money will be coming out of Department of Recreation and Sport funds.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I know that members opposite do not relish this announcement very much, because during their three years in office they did absolutely nothing for recreation and sport, and their record in that regard was atrocious. They are not receiving the announcement with any great enthusiasm, and I do not blame them for that.

The information for which the member for Newland has asked is no doubt of interest to some members. The floor space in the new premises will be 980 square metres, accommodating additional sporting and recreation groups, and it is certainly a step in the right direction for recreation and sport in South Australia. Last week, or the week before, in answer to a question from the member for Price about a sports museum—

Mr Becker interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The honourable member can continue reading the paper and he will see all the advantages we are giving to recreation and sport.

Mr Becker: I want to know where the money is coming from.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: If the honourable member asks me that question at the appropriate time, I will tell him. If members are patient, I will give them the information. As I have said, the new recreation and sports centre will provide additional accommodation for a number of sporting and recreation groups. A couple of those groups have been housed at departmental premises at 67 South Terrace, Adelaide, which is an old house that has been condemned by the Adelaide City Council. We will be inviting one of those groups (the South Australian Women's Keep Fit organisation) and another (the Royal Lifesaving Association) to become tenants of the new centre. We will be providing additional accommodation for some 16 or so groups—possibly more. The premises are currently being renovated and we expect to occupy the building early in December.

POLICE IDENTIFICATION

Mr ASHENDEN: Will the Chief Secretary investigate methods that will allow for better and easier identification by the public of plainclothes police officers in unmarked vehicles when such officers are taking action to have a motorist pull over to the side of the road? I stress from the outset that no criticism is intended of the police officers involved in the incident which I am about to outline. A constituent of mine, her daughter and a friend were recently travelling late in the evening along Lady Ruthven Drive (I have raised this matter with the local member, and he is aware of my question), a road that is evidently poorly lit. As they were driving away from the terminal at Outer Harbor, a vehicle pulled alongside and men inside that vehicle indicated by pointing their fingers that they wished my constituent to pull over to the side of the road. A small card was held to the window (that was all that my constituent could see), and these people had no idea what that card represented.

The daughter (who was only 18 years of age) was driving. The point is that these three women were extremely concerned because they thought, 'If we go on and it is the police, will we get into trouble? If we stop and they are not police, will we be attacked?'

Another point which my constituent raised was, 'What if my daughter had been alone in the car and two men pulled alongside and indicated that they wished her to pull over to the side of the road? What would she do in such a poorly lit area?' No charges were laid, and my constituent acknowledged that the police had good reason to ask them to pull over to the side of the road, so they were not in any way critical of the police. However, my constituent is extremely concerned that it could have been bogus, that they had no way of identifying that the police concerned were in fact detectives and that what the police were holding up was purely and simply an identification card which indicated that they were detectives within the Police Force. I am sure the Minister would agree that it would be impossible to see such a card late in the evening. Therefore, I ask the Chief Secretary would he investigate ways in which a system could be devised in relation to detectives (as they were in this case: they were not ordinary police) who wish to exercise their right to have a vehicle pull to the side of the road to ensure that there can be no doubt whatsoever in a motorist's mind that the persons concerned are genuine?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: This is a very serious question indeed and I appreciate that, in asking the question,

neither the honourable member nor his constituents are in any way reflecting upon the police or criticising the police in taking the particular action they did. The point at issue is how effectively police can identify themselves when they need to pull over a car, particularly if they are in an unmarked car and wearing plain clothes (which, in itself, makes it somewhat difficult because in a sense they are anonymous).

I understand that this problem does not occur in some of the Eastern States because there is a clear way of indicating that they are police officers. They light up a police sign electrically within the vehicle (not on the outside but on the inside of the vehicle), or they have a rather large board that says 'Police' so that they can be readily identified. I will take up the matter with the department. I do not know whether or not the honourable member wants to advise me of the particular instance (which would be of some help) so that I can speak to the police, and I can speak to the honourable member afterwards about that. However, I will take up the general problem with the police so that the instance which the honourable member has described does not occur in future.

POST-BUDGET FORUM

Mr MAYES: Can the Premier advise the House whether or not the post-Budget forum held last Friday was a success?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I think that it is fair to say that it was indeed a success. It was a success both in terms of the range of people who attended it, and their reaction and participation in it. I think that everyone appreciated the opportunity to hear directly from representatives of the Federal Government and the State Government on the economic and financial background to the Budget strategies which we are respectively pursuing. I was particularly pleased to provide the opportunity to the member for Flinders and the Hon. Lance Milne to address the forum on behalf of their respective political viewpoints. It is a pity that the Leader of the Opposition is not here during Question Time, because I would like to make some reference to him. However, perhaps his colleagues could take note of what I am about to say and report it to him.

I was very disappointed that he chose to reject the Government's invitation for him to attend and address the forum. It was not a case of simply asking him to sit in the audience and participate in that way. It was for him to be (as the Leaders of the other Parties were) on the platform and make his statement. I was very disappointed indeed in his attempts to make political capital out of an attempt to provide both information to the community and the opportunity for community representatives to question the Government directly and, indeed, make their views known to all of the political representatives who were there. I must say that I received quite an extraordinary letter from the Leader of the Opposition in response to my invitation. He set out his reasons for rejecting it by saying:

Before inviting the Opposition's representation you would have been aware that the Opposition has been critical of your Budget strategy.

Indeed, I was, but unlike his predecessor (and perhaps that is what he was thinking of) I am not frightened of such criticism, or of allowing the opportunity for such criticism to be voiced, as I did on this occasion at that forum. Because the Leader knew that I was aware that he was critical of the Government's Budget strategy, he further stated:

I believe, therefore, that it would be inappropriate for the Opposition to speak at this meeting called and hosted by you when the view we put is already well known and contrary to your own.

For a start, that seemed to conflict with newspaper statements made by the Leader of the Opposition, such as:

People will have to wait until Tuesday when Parliament resumes to hear my views. I am not going to let them know beforehand.

Here the Leader of the Opposition is writing to me saying that the view that has been put is already well known. I am not sure which way he wants it, but either way he decided that he could not attend the gathering, and I think that that was a pity. The Leader's letter also raised the extraordinary allegation that the Government was in some way withholding the programme performance papers and that for that reason he was unable to give a proper response to the Budget. Again, let us look at the facts. In 1981, the first year in which programme performance papers were tabled in their full form, the Budget was introduced on 15 September, the programme performance papers were made available on 2 October, and the Estimate Committees were commenced four days later on 6 October. Last year, in 1982, the Budget was introduced on 25 August, the programme performance papers were made available on 15 September, and the Estimates Committees commenced six days later on 21 September. This year the papers will be made available next Thursday, 15 September, which will be the fastest they have ever been produced and it will mean that it will be the longest time ever given to the Opposition for studying those papers before the commencement of the Estimates Committees.

The *Advertiser* reported the economic forum in its Saturday edition, although, unfortunately, most people were unable to obtain a copy. However, the headline was interesting, and perhaps the House and members of the Leader's Party might be interested in noting the reaction of not only the general public but that as reflected in the newspaper report. The headline stated:

Everyone was there except Olsen.

The article further stated:

John Olsen should have been there. Lance Milne was there, Peter Blacker was there, even Steele Hall was there.

That is interesting, because the Hon. Lance Milne and Mr Peter Blacker (although I am not sure about the member for Flinders), and, certainly, Mr Steele Hall, were all at the luncheon given by the Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society of South Australia immediately preceding the forum. All of us left, in company with a number of others who were there, including the General Manager of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry and a number of other industry representatives, to go to the forum, leaving the Leader of the Opposition sitting there to finish his luncheon on that occasion. So, even a Federal colleague of the Leader decided that it was worth attending the forum. Mr Hall had not been invited to speak, although if I had known that he was coming perhaps he could have been invited to take the platform as well in place of the Leader who chose not to put his case to the forum. The newspaper article further stated:

Several people said afterwards they felt that just the process of gathering together a wide range of groups on an issue like economic strategy was worth while. For that alone it would have been worth John Olsen's while to attend and push his Party's point of view.

They are not my words, but the words of a reporter reflecting the comment that was made by a number of people at that gathering. Why did the Leader not attend? One can only speculate: perhaps he felt unable to face questions from some 200 people, community representatives, who attended. Perhaps his Party has not sorted out its response to the Government's economic strategy and his colleagues told him he should not attend. Perhaps the Leader has no genuine interest in treating seriously the recovery of this State's economy. Certainly, many of the disruptive statements and

tactics indicate that that motivation may well have been in his mind.

Perhaps the Leader prefers to expose his views through the media and in this place rather than face directly members of the community in expressing that kind of disruptive tactic. I might add that there was no embargo whatsoever in regard to what the Leader chose to say. If he had wanted to indulge in the sort of up-beat attacks on the Government's strategy as he does in this place, he would have been quite free to do so, although I suggest that he would have been judged fairly harshly by those at the forum. Perhaps there is no alternative Budget or, if the Leader is not game to present it in a public forum to responsible and concerned business, union, community and church representatives, one wonders whether that strategy exists at all. Later this afternoon we will see why the Leader was not prepared to front up last Friday.

WALLABIES AND OPOSSUMS

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: Can the Premier, in the absence for the Minister for Environment and Planning, state whether the Minister has powers to authorise the harvesting of dama wallabies and opossums in South Australia and, if so, will he consider exercising those powers in the areas where the legal slaughtering of those species is being carried out? If the Minister does not currently have the powers, will he seek to amend the legislation and/or regulations enabling the flexibility outlined? In the Kangaroo Island community, particularly in the western half of that part of the State, there are and have been indeed for many years large numbers of wallabies and opossums. In relation to dama wallabies, the species that prevail there, it has been and still is a part of property and pasture management to control the numbers, and in more latter years that control has been exercised via a permit system through the Department of Wildlife and Parks. As a result of the destruction each year of many thousands of these animals, there has been brought to my attention the matter of wastage, not only in what might reasonably be available for pet food through the meat source, but more particularly the wastage of the furs involved. There is a current market for those furs, and a very lucrative market for both dama wallabies and opossum furs but so far the officers of the department, as I understand it, have been reluctant to allow the commercial and controlled harvesting of the species that I have mentioned. I ask the Premier in his capacity as Leader of the Government to seek the support of his Minister and have the Government direct its attention to this matter which would not only continue with the control of these animals in plague numbers in that region in particular, but allow appropriate additional employment to occur and save the wastage of the furs, if not the meat, as well.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will refer that question to my colleague for a detailed reply.

FEDERAL STEEL PLAN

Mr MAX BROWN: Can the Premier provide details to the House of what steps the State Government is taking to ensure that the funds which have been earmarked in the Federal Budget for the three steel regions will benefit Whyalla? I am somewhat disappointed at the amount of money that has been allocated to Whyalla. However, I will also explain to the Premier that I would be pleased if it was at all possible to have the money allocated used in some way to attract to Whyalla industry that would give job

opportunities of some substance to the unemployed in that area.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: As honourable members would know, in particular the member for Whyalla, the Federal Government announced in its Budget that \$100 million was being made available for five years for infrastructure and capital works to assist industry development in the steel regions of Wollongong, Newcastle and Whyalla. This was part of the overall steel plan announced by Senator Button. An amount of \$20 million will be spent this financial year on assistance to viable, on-going, productive, employment-generating projects. The State Government has established an inter-departmental committee which is working on a set of proposals which will receive funding consideration and, in addition, we are seeking proposals from members of the local community and industry in Whyalla. These proposals from the community will be co-ordinated through the member for Whyalla's office. The Minister for Secondary Industry, Senator Button, in fact visited Whyalla and had discussions on the spot with both the honourable member and, of course, others in the community.

Certainly, attention is being directed to try to ensure that programmes and projects in Whyalla get as much assistance as they can. In response to the member's direct question, a departmental officer will be made available to go to Whyalla and assist with the development and co-ordination of this local input. As projects are worked up and approved, obviously details will be made available. Whyalla is heavily dependent on its steel industry. The Federal Government's package of aid should assist Whyalla considerably over the years in shoring up its long-term future and viability. Obviously we must also be exploring alternative and new industries for this very important region of the State. I know that that is the concern the honourable member has in asking this question.

NON-GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS REGISTRATION BOARD

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I was going to address my question to the Premier, to ask whether he was as pleased as I was with the result of the elimination final on Saturday and with Tony Antrobus's winning the Magarey Medal, but my question is really addressed to the Minister of Education; it is a very serious question. Does the Minister intend to introduce legislation concerning the Non-government Schools Registration Board to require the following or similar:

- (a) The appointment of four Ministerial nominees to the board instead of the present two;
- (b) an alteration to the complement of visiting panels so that they will in future consist solely of Education Department officers;
- (c) the imposition of fees for registration; and
- (d) that the time of registration for schools be limited to five years for all schools and provisionally for one year in the case of new schools.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: This is an important topic, and I can say that the Government is looking again at the legislation covering the Non-government Schools Registration Board with a view to a number of aspects related to the operations of that board. The actual purpose of opening up the issue at all came to me on the initiative of the board itself. Soon after my appointment to the Ministry I was approached by the board which indicated to me that there were faults in the present legislation that limited its capacity to act in certain regards to fulfil what I think all Parties in this House believe was the intent of the legislation. At that time I indicated that the Government would look again at

the amendments which it moved when in Opposition, when the member for Mount Gambier was the Minister of Education. He originally accepted our amendments but did a *volte face* and later rejected them. We believe that those amendments do need considerable re-examination.

I have written to the board about this issue and I have written also to the Independent Schools Board and to the Catholic Education Office asking for their views on these amendments. It would be my intention that, if we extend the amendments proposed to us by the board, they would not be identical to the amendments moved when we were in Opposition, because a number of elements have changed in any event and circumstances have changed. In other regards the amendments that have been proposed by the board canvass some of the very issues that we in Opposition were putting at that time. They have recognised now that some of the elements we were putting in our amendments would be appropriate now. I will not canvass each one of the issues until I have had feed-back from the Independent Schools Board and the Catholic Education Office and time to consider the Non-government Schools Registration Board's own recommendations in this matter, and until the Government has had time to examine the issue.

One of the problems that existed when the legislation was first introduced was that there was no consultation by the then Government with the non-government school sector about the amendments we moved in Opposition. I have indicated to the non-government schools that they are entitled to be consulted and they will be consulted, and we will listen to their viewpoints and appropriately take into account what they say so that the amendments we make to the legislation will give us the best deal with regard to what I think the whole community expects us to do, that is, to ensure that all our schools, Government or non-government, are providing as good a quality education as possible to students in this State.

SHOP STEALING

Mrs APPLEBY: Will the Chief Secretary say whether he has received recent figures relating to shop stealing and, if so, whether those figures indicate the number of convictions, age breakdowns and cost to the community? Concern about shop stealing has been raised yet again by the business people and parents in my electorate. The small business people operating in shopping centres and smaller strip shops feel the problem is ever increasing, regardless of what deterrent system they put into effect. The parents have expressed helplessness in dealing with their own children, who seem to treat shop stealing as the norm rather than an offence. Both groups have suggested that they believe the community does not place enough importance on the fact that shop stealing is stealing goods which are the property of other persons and that in stealing from any person they are adding to the crime rate and the cost to the community.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I do not have the figures on hand, but I understand that they could be available soon through the Office of Crime Statistics. I will certainly ask the Police Department to make those figures available to me and to the honourable member. I am sure that they will show the number of convictions and the age breakdown of offenders who have been caught shop stealing, but I cannot say whether they will show the cost to the community. I would say that there are two types of cost: first, the economic cost to the community; secondly, the social cost. The economic cost is well understood, but the social cost is much more profound. Much shop stealing takes place because of the poor economic times we are facing and the unemployment within the community. There is a whole range of

reasons why people steal from shops, right through to impulse stealing.

The honourable member has raised an important matter. I suggest that it is a worry that business houses in the community all over Australia, not only in the District of Brighton, are facing. The Police Department is well aware of the increase in this type of offence and marshals its resources as best it can to cope with this crime and all others it is faced with. I will get a report from the department for the honourable member and hopefully as soon as I can, because this issue is one of significant importance.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Will the Premier say what positive action he has taken to ensure that adequate controls in the management of computer-based systems within the public sector have been or are being effected? It is recorded on page 14 of the Auditor-General's Report that has been tabled this afternoon that audit reviews have confirmed the need, particularly in the following seven areas of responsibility:

- Management controls and standards over computer system development and maintenance necessary for the development of effective and well controlled systems;
- Clerical procedures to ensure employees have a clear understanding of their responsibilities and to define accountability;
- Processing and clerical controls designed to provide reasonable assurance that information is not lost, suppressed, duplicated or improperly changed and is completely and accurately processed;
- Division of duties to detect errors, prevent fraud and restrict access to assets to authorised personnel;
- Management review of system operation and system results to ensure efficient and correct system performance;
- System integrity and access controls designed to ensure protection of software and information from accidental or deliberate interference and protect computer assets; and
- System documentation and procedures designed to ensure continuity of system operation is provided for.

It is the aspect of loss, fraud or interference which is so important in my question.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Government has only just received the Auditor-General's Report highlighting this matter and, as with other matters raised by the Auditor-General, action will be taken to ensure that the comments and points raised by him are considered. For some years now there has been concern about Government computers, the systems involved, their efficient use, and so on, and much money is involved in this area. We have a Data Processing Board and there has been much more strict implementation of central control of computer systems, their introduction, and better testing of them. In terms of the specific aspect of fraud and so on, there is no evidence of any widespread abuses of that kind but, naturally, vigilance is necessary and the sort of audit review undertaken by the Auditor-General is an important part of pinpointing the needs to address the problem. The Government is taking action to do so.

RUSTPROOFING

Ms LENEHAN: Will the Minister of Community Welfare ask his colleague the Minister of Consumer Affairs in another place to urgently investigate recent claims made by *Choice* magazine in respect of the rustproofing of motor vehicles? In particular, will the Minister investigate the standard of rustproofing, the application, and the guarantees given to the consumer? A recent article in the *Advertiser* quoted a survey that had been conducted by *Choice* magazine in respect of 2 426 cars in which it was found that rust had occurred in a higher proportion of rust-treated cars than in

unproofed cars and that those most likely to develop rust problems were those which were kept in the open and which had been rustproofed. The *Choice* magazine goes on to say that in fact the astonishing findings of the survey indicate that rustproofing is a waste of time and money. I ask my question in the interest of South Australian consumers.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for her question and her interest in this matter. I shall refer the question to my colleague and ask him to attend to the honourable member's request as a matter of urgency.

GUARD DOGS

Mr BAKER: Will the Minister of Community Welfare ask his colleague the Attorney-General in another place to launch an urgent investigation into the activities of a South Australian security firm that is training guard dogs to kill? I have been informed by a constituent that a person licensed as a security agent is training dogs to attack the throats of trespassers on premises, whereas I understand that it is normal to train such dogs to retard by using the limbs as focal points. I also understand that the agent referred to has been visited by representatives of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals in respect of cruelty to guard dogs and that there was a case before the court some time ago in an attempt to deregister the person concerned. I believe that serious questions have been raised as to the background and training qualifications of personnel employed by this person.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I am not sure who is the responsible authority for matters such as this. However, I shall have the matter investigated and, if the Attorney-General or another Minister is involved, I shall have the matter referred to that authority. Obviously, it is a matter of considerable importance and concern. The honourable member could also help by giving me the specific information so that I may refer it to my colleague.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: GAS PRICES

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.
Leave granted.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I have been misrepresented by the Premier on two counts today in relation to gas price arrangements in the Cooper Basin. The Premier has quoted selectively from documents, and the Government is doing this more and more frequently. It is an improper use of confidential documents. The Premier earlier leaked confidential minutes of the Premiers' Conference to support a false point of view. That is the first time that that has been done. Now he has selectively leaked documents without having been privy to conversations and negotiations that led to the documents. As the Premier rightly stated, these negotiations were conducted after 9 September when the arbitrator's decision was handed down in the light of an impending election. That is a statement of fact. Nonetheless, the arbitrator's decision had the force of law: the decision was made by the arbitrator, not by me. The arbitrator handed down a decision awarding an 80 per cent increase in the price of gas in South Australia, and his decision had the force of law. The Premier has suggested that the Government should appeal.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Leave has been granted.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: If the Premier knew the facts, he would know that the Pipelines Authority of South Australia is the body legally required to conduct these negotiations, but I prevailed on the Authority to appeal to the Supreme Court against the arbitrator's decision. That appeal could be proceeded with only on the grounds that the arbitrator had erred in law, and we were advised that the chance of success was not high. Nevertheless, that was the only weapon the Government had, so it lodged the appeal. The Premier obviously is not aware of that fact. We then negotiated with the producers about the legally binding 80 per cent increase. We managed to negotiate that price downwards, and it was to apply from 1 January, not from 9 September. Moreover, we got the producers to agree that there would be no further increase for 1983. That was the price for 1982. So, instead of going to arbitration, as they were entitled to do to seek a further increase in 1983, the producers agreed that the price be held at \$1.10. Those negotiations in respect of the legally arbitrated gas price saved the public last year \$20 million and the difference between \$1.10 and the arbitrated price for this year.

In respect of the second misrepresentation by the Premier in the selective quoting of documents, I made clear to the Gas Company that the Government wanted to remove the gas tax imposed by the Labor Government in the 1970s, but discussions, to which the Premier is not privy, were held with the Under Treasurer and his officers and I was advised—

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I said—

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Now the Premier seeks to trundle out confidential minutes in this House to support his dishonest view. I am filling the Premier in, because he was not privy to those discussions. He trundles out these confidential documents to support a point of view without knowing their background. The Treasury put to me that the Government would be unwise to close off its options.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! This is a personal explanation, not a debate.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I concurred in the view and agreed that the Under Treasurer send me a minute stating that the Government would in due course conduct a review. I stress that the Government did not intend to reimpose that levy, but it did not close off its options. Now we come to the context in which this was occurring. The Premier now suggests that, during an election campaign, I should have trundled to Cabinet draft legislation to amend the Act, but that would have been improper. That is not a proper course of action for a Government to take—to be making decisions during an election campaign in relation to a change in oil prices.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader will need to seek an extension of time.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I seek leave for an extension of time to conclude my explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Premier also mentions \$4 million, but he conveniently neglects the increase in royalties which flowed to the Government coffers as a result of the increase in gas prices. The net effect was not \$4 million, as he well knows. The Government of the day was prepared to relieve the taxpayers of this State of the burden of the Labor Party's gas tax. At that time we had no intention of reimposing it but we did agree with Treasury to review it in due course.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has strayed far beyond a personal explanation. It has now become a debate.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The last option I wish to exercise is to disagree with your ruling, Mr Speaker. The

Premier suggested publicly and again in this House that the Government—

The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Deputy Premier to resume his seat, and I ask that all interjections cease. The problem is that, as political Parties change sides in the House, their views of Standing Orders change.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: There is not much cause for laughter because I might say that, as Speaker, I have become embarrassed, as I find myself harassed by previous rulings. I have always thought that the strict level of the law was that a Minister had complete freedom in his reply to give an answer such as that given, for instance, by the Premier or the Minister of Education this afternoon. There have been many rulings by my predecessors which say that such is the case. In other words, a person asking a question and giving an explanation can be restricted by the rules of relevance and all sorts of other rules, but a Minister answering the question is restricted not at all except, I assume, by the rules relating to decency. That strictly may not be the case if one looks at Erskine May, and the current review of Standing Orders may well have to take that into account.

I apologise for the long lead-up but make the point that, from any Opposition viewpoint, it always appears that the Chair is giving an undue advantage to Ministers, particularly in their answers to questions, whereas quite clearly on occasions, under both this and the previous Government, there has been blatant debating answers to blatant Dorothy Dix questions. As to this situation, Standing Orders are quite clear, as are the rulings of my predecessors, and I must rule that, as it now stands and until the review has been completed and the Standing Orders Committee has brought down a report to this House, the situation is that, in an explanation to a question or in a personal explanation, the honourable member must not debate the matter. I have ruled that the honourable member was debating the matter. If he pursues that line, I shall rule him out of order and withdraw leave. If he wishes to disagree with my ruling, so be it.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Mr Speaker, I am recounting to the House my recollection of conversations with advisers to the Government and of my conversations with the Gas Company in relation to the gas levy about which the Premier has drawn some incorrect conclusions as a result of selective quoting from some documents. I made perfectly clear in my conversations with the Gas Company that the Government wanted to get rid of the gas levy and to leave it off. For the Premier's information, I also had preliminary discussions with the Electricity Trust in relation to the tax which the Labor Party put on that organisation. I concurred with Treasury advice that we should not close our options, but I repeat that the former Government had no intention of reintroducing that tax.

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 1 September. Page 728.)

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): In presenting his first Budget, the Premier asks this House and the people of South Australia to accept that the Government's economic strategy is an essential ingredient for recovery, for a significant reduction in unemployment. I welcome the fact that the Treasury paper, the *South Australian Economy*, presented

with this Budget, refers to some positive long-term economic developments for South Australia. But I reject the basis of this Government's strategy, inherent in this Budget, that a larger, more active public sector is a prerequisite to economic recovery. In fact, some of the present Government's policies will deny South Australia the opportunity to participate to any significant extent in the longer-term benefits of national and international economic recovery.

This Budget raises three key issues, which I will address in the following order this afternoon. They are, first, the Premier's personal credibility. The Premier has spent his first 10 months in office trying to blame the former Government for financial mismanagement. But, as I will show this afternoon, the Premier has had to break his most important election promise not to increase taxes, because his Government failed to control over-spending last year, and because his Government plans a significant increase in Government spending this year. This Budget exposes the Premier as a man prepared to mislead and deceive in an attempt to hide his Government's failure to competently manage the finances of the State. Secondly, had a Liberal Government remained in office, the tax increases imposed by the Premier this year would have been avoided. Thirdly, unless the Premier changes his economic strategy, South Australia is headed either for a further round of significant increases in taxes and charges next year, or bankruptcy.

This Budget is another demonstration of the clear differences now emerging between the Government and the Opposition in our approaches to economic policy. If economic recovery in South Australia is to be achieved, if it is to be long lasting and if we are to remove the tragedy of double digit unemployment, we must have a more diversified economic base capable of attracting additional investment and supporting more jobs. The policies of the former Government recognised the importance of this objective and set about seeking to achieve it in the most positive and practical manner possible. In its discussion of long-term economic prospects, the Budget paper on the South Australian economy has vindicated the Liberal Party's approach and policies. It refers, for example, to the creation of about 23 000 jobs by the late 1980s in activity related to the development of our mineral and petroleum resources. So much for the mirages in the desert! This will result in large part from the Cooper Basin and Roxby Downs Indentures, which the Liberal Government negotiated, and from the record levels of mineral and petroleum exploration between 1979 and 1982—which the policies of the Liberal Government encouraged.

Some of the activities this Budget will fund continue other initiatives developed since 1979, and I welcome that. I refer especially to activities in tourism and the attraction of high technology industries to South Australia. Resource development, tourism and the attraction of high technology industries were key elements in the economic strategy of the former Government—a strategy with clear long-term benefits for South Australia: benefits brought much closer to realisation during the three years of Liberal Government and benefits involving the creation of more jobs in the private sector, not Government jobs supported by higher taxes. In relentlessly pursuing its strategy, the Liberal Government also believed that it was essential to limit taxes to the maximum extent possible, and, where possible, to reduce them. The Liberal Government did this for two basic and very important reasons.

South Australians had been highly taxed during a decade of Labor Government in the 1970s for no long-term economic benefit. At the time we took office in 1979, unemployment in South Australia had been the highest in the nation for 16 consecutive months, and other indicators pointed to continuing economic decline in comparison with

the other States. A number of significant excesses and inefficiencies in public sector spending had also been demonstrated—for example, Health Commission over-spending and the wasted investment in Monarto, the Frozen Food Factory and the Land Commission. The growth in Government activity during the 1970s had clearly outpaced the community's needs and was being funded through higher taxes and charges. Accordingly, at the 1979 State election, the Liberal Party made specific commitments to cut State taxation and to actively promote more private sector investment and initiatives to diversify the State's economic base. We honoured those promises, despite mounting national and international economic pressures.

But before the last State election the present Premier (as Leader of the Opposition) completely and deliberately ignored those obvious pressures in constantly criticising the former Government's policies and strategies. He claimed that only under a Bannon Labor Government could South Australia insulate itself from sluggish economic activity and high interest rates world wide, the collapse in manufacturing industry Australia-wide, and the worst drought in our history. It would, he said, be a Government which would employ more people and become more interventionist. He promised that this strategy would generate new jobs and significantly reduce unemployment. At the same time, a Labor Government would not increase taxes to pay for its programmes. Put simply, those were the Premier's key promises to the electorate last November.

In his Budget, we now have a confession by the Premier of his deception of the people of South Australia. No Parliament anywhere has ever witnessed a Government repudiate so many promises, and so soon after being elected. It was this Premier who, in May last year, released an economic document which he called *Jobs Now*. It was this Premier who said in his policy speech last year that his Government would get South Australians back to work in a productive way. In Opposition, that was the theory, the promise—the hope held out. In Government, the theory has been rejected, the promise broken, and the hope shattered.

The Premier has suddenly discovered that South Australia is not an island immune from the tides of national and international economic recession. On the first page of his Budget speech he referred to 'circumstances more difficult and more straitened than the State has faced for some decades', as though they had suddenly appeared on the last tide. He admitted on the second page that South Australia's economic position had worsened during the first half of 1983 because of the Australia-wide collapse in manufacturing industry. On page 4, he said:

It will take some years of sustained growth before significant reductions in unemployment can realistically be realised.

The Budget speech and the attachments refer in other places to the decline in Australia-wide car sales being a major cause of weakness in the South Australian economy, to assumptions that employment levels will not increase in South Australia during 1983-84, and to South Australia's rate of population growth being lower than the national average. But where was any recognition of this stark reality or sober assessment before the election? It was shut from view by a Leader and a Party obsessed with seeking power at any price and with no sense of responsibility to acknowledge truth, for that would have been to deny power.

When the Premier said before the election that he wanted South Australia to win, he implied that only a straight kick was needed, that is, kick the Liberals out, elect a Labor Government and the Labor Party will do the rest. He would not get caught in the ruck of economic recession, and his Left wing would not be any bother. Fair play would prevail, according to this Premier, and the goals would soon appear on the scoreboard: more people in work, more investment

in South Australia, an end to our economic problems, and no more tax increases.

But now, in this Budget, the Premier has shown himself and the Labor Party in their true colours. He now wants to call that game off and begin again with some new rules, in particular, with higher taxes and charges, although he has not told the umpires (the people of South Australia) all of his rules. For example, even though Government decisions announced in this Budget to rearrange the borrowing programmes of all Government agencies will mean higher electricity tariffs and water rates, we are not directly told so. We have to go to page 32 of the Budget attachments to find out that the Government has decided to reintroduce the tax on the Gas Company, which will cause gas tariffs to rise from 1 January. The Premier did not announce that in his Budget speech.

The Premier has deliberately disguised the full extent of the Government's excessive increased spending for this financial year. He claims that recurrent spending will increase by 7.4 per cent, but if we eliminate some special one-off commitments which occurred last financial year, the real increase above the level of spending in 1982-83 is about 11 per cent—well above the projected inflation rate on which the Premier has based this Budget. I will return to this point when I discuss recurrent payments in more detail. The Premier has also said that the Budget significantly increases spending on capital works to create jobs, but this is largely illusory, as I will show later.

Another key omission in this Budget is any reference to the much vaunted Enterprise Fund—the fund the Premier promised in his policy speech as the first step that he was taking to assist the expansion of industry. He repeated its importance to his strategy in the *Advertiser* just two days before the election when he said:

I would like to ensure that the State Administration is geared up to implement our programme and that will involve establishing the South Australian Enterprise Fund. I'd like to get that under way pretty quickly.

The Premier further promised in the *News* on 6 December last year that the fund would be established in time for this Budget. We have had a series of announcements over the past month about this Budget, but we have heard nothing about the Enterprise Fund, even though it was central to Labor's whole economic strategy before and during the election campaign. Perhaps it was a myth.

In an attempt to hide the fact that his strategy has disintegrated, the Premier resorted to a series of stage-managed announcements about this Budget. Indeed, this has been the most announced Budget in this State's history. The Premier began talking about what it was likely to contain within a month of taking office, because he wanted to create the climate for tax increases—for broken election promises. Let me trace the development of the Premier's financial policies. As the *Advertiser* commented in its editorial on 3 May this year, it has been a 'tortuous trip'. I would add to that—a dishonourable trip. It had its origins in the former Liberal Government's decision to reduce the size and cost of the public sector for sound and practical reasons which are as valid today as they were four years ago.

The Labor Party opposed these policies but, in doing so, the Premier refused to take the responsibility for saying how increased public sector activity should be funded. At first, he complained that the former Liberal Government's tax cuts had seriously eroded the State's revenue base. But later, in the months leading up to the last State election, he claimed instead that the former Government was a high tax Government. The economic document he released in May 1982 says this of the former Government on page 49:

It is in fact a high tax Government, with a 14.5 per cent rise in State tax collections forecast for 1981-82.

Note that the Premier referred to 1981-82. I ask the House to compare that statement with the following extract from a press release issued by the Premier on 4 August this year to announce some of the tax increases contained in this Budget. The release states:

Mr Bannon also drew attention to the latest available figures from the Australian Bureau of Statistics, comparing the tax burden borne by residents in the various States of Australia. The figures were for the financial year 1981-82. They showed that Victoria had the highest taxes (it should be remembered that a Labor Government had just been elected in Victoria), followed by New South Wales, Western Australia, Queensland, Tasmania and (at the end of the list) South Australia.

In other words, during the very year in which the Premier accused the former Government of being a high-tax Government, official figures showed that South Australia became the lowest taxed State in Australia. In fact, taxes fell by 5.4 per cent. So much for the Premier's credibility! In 1978-79, before the Liberals took office, South Australia was the third highest taxed State. Under the former Government South Australia became the lowest, and the Premier has now recognised that (contained in a press release issued over his name). He has now admitted, but not sought to publicly correct, the dishonesty of his statements of just over a year ago about the former Government being a high-tax Government. For the record, receipts from taxes rose by just over 11 per cent in 1981-82—not 14.5 per cent as suggested in the Premier's economic document. This year, they are estimated to rise by more than 14 per cent—the biggest increase since 1976, almost double the inflation rate projected by the Premier.

The economic document published by the Premier, to which I have just referred, was promoted as stage one of a two-stage plan by the Labor Party for the South Australian Economy. Stage two was promised before the election but it was never published. It still has not been published, because the Premier has no responsible, effective alternative to the policies pursued by the former Liberal Government. To achieve our tax cuts, the former Government, alone of Governments anywhere in Australia during the past three years, was able to reduce the size of the public sector in a manner which did not impair the standards of necessary services. For the period May 1978 to May 1982, public sector employment in South Australia was reduced by about 4.4 per cent while all other States showed increases. Let me stress that the reduction was achieved through labour wastage, without any retrenchments or sackings. It was achieved by careful, responsible management and by continuing scrutiny and review of departmental spending. It was also made possible by ensuring Government charges adequately reflected the cost of providing services. It appears that the Premier may only now be appreciating this principle of responsible financial management.

In Opposition, the present Premier constantly called for more Government services, while at the same time, he questioned and criticised the need for the Government to charge for the services it was providing. In his contribution to the 1980 Budget debate, the Premier made this complaint in this House four days short of three years ago:

Water and sewerage rates are up 6.4 per cent and 6 per cent, respectively; the price of water is up 12.5 per cent; irrigation charges are up 12.5 per cent; public transport fares are up 25 per cent; ETSA tariffs are up 12.5 per cent.

Later in that speech, the then Leader of the Opposition referred to the implications, as he saw them then, of higher charges:

If we raise charges such as electricity, water, and so on, we are putting ourselves at a disadvantage, not only as a community, but in terms of attracting the manufacturing and economic development and investment that the Premier claims he wants to attract. We are destroying any cost advantage that we might have by piling up the charges in the way the Premier is doing.

In 1981, the now Premier called for a 12-month freeze on charges. He mentioned in particular electricity, water and sewerage levies, hospital charges and bus, tram and train fares in a statement on 27 August 1981. In his policy speech last year, the Premier rounded off a three-year tirade of criticism about State charges with a statement clearly intended to give the impression that under the A.L.P. increases in charges would be limited. He said this:

Unlike the Liberals, we will not allow State charges such as transport fares, electricity and hospital charges to be used as a form of backdoor taxation.

Mr Meier: So much for his words!

Mr OLSEN: Indeed, so much for his words.

Mr Meier: Where is he now?

Mr OLSEN: I have no doubt that this little history lesson is of significant embarrassment to him. All South Australians now know just how dishonest that statement was. At the last count, 37 separate State charges have been increased since this Government came to office, and the steepest increases have occurred for those charges about which the Premier complained most often when he was Leader of the Opposition. In just 10 months since the Government was elected water rates have risen by between 16 per cent and 22 per cent (remember the 6.4 per cent and the 6 per cent). Public transport fares have risen by an average of 47.6 per cent (remember the 25 per cent to which I have referred).

The Hon. Michael Wilson: More in one hit than the Tonkin Government did in three years.

Mr OLSEN: Indeed; and to have in 10 months 37 separate charges going up would be just about a record around Australia. Further, electricity tariffs are up 12 per cent, with more to come as a result of this Budget—the Government is going to slice \$14 million out of the Electricity Trust of South Australia. Hospital fees have risen by 20 per cent. The present Premier, while Leader of the Opposition, encouraged South Australians to resent any increases in charges. He said then that they were not necessary, but increases under his Government have been much greater. And the former Leader of the Opposition said nothing about the factor which more than anything else requires charges to rise from time to time, namely, the wages of public sector employees. In summary, the Premier's position on State taxes, charges and services, while he was Opposition Leader, was that taxes and charges should have been kept lower but more services should have been provided.

It was an open invitation to bankruptcy. Not only that, it was extended while the present Premier well knew that the former Government was taking action to reduce some very significant liabilities run up during a decade of Labor Government. Monarto, the Land Commission, the frozen food factory and mismanagement of the Health Commission's huge budget had run up large debts which all taxpayers had to bear—debts which the former Government was able to reduce. For example, our last Budget included a payment of \$25 million to the Commonwealth with respect to the former Land Commission. It also provided \$3.1 million to redeem semi-government borrowings on the Monarto project on top of \$5.1 million already paid to the Commonwealth by the former Government in full settlement of outstanding obligations on the Monarto project.

Commitments such as these, the need to restore efficiency and eliminate waste in the public sector to reduce further burdens on taxpayers, and the impact of a declining economy on receipts required the former Government to exercise very strict control over all State finances. This was a very difficult task—an unpleasant task—but one from which the Government never resiled, and when a Liberal Government is returned after the next election it will not seek to shirk responsibilities in the way that the present Premier and the present Government have.

The Premier and the Government have attempted to convince the public that the former Government did not control its finances properly and responsibly and that the Administration has inherited a significant deficit because of that. The first point that needs to be made in response to the Premier's continuing claims about financial mismanagement is that, had we accepted the advice he gave as Opposition Leader, the State would be bankrupt now and there would be nothing left for him to get his hands on. Instead, he inherited a Budget which, at the time it was presented to this House in August last year, forecast a balance on operations for 1982-83 so that an accumulated deficit of \$6.1 million would be carried forward into this financial year.

The last advice the former Government received before the election on the progress of the Budget was a report from Treasury dated 12 October 1982—the day before the election was called. I made that document available to this House last December following the Premier's first attempts to allege financial mismanagement by the former Government. That document was the basis for a statement I made on 6 December which showed that the former Government's programme and its election commitments would have resulted in a deficit of just over \$13 million on the year's activities based on all the information then available.

The Premier has never disputed that statement because he cannot do so. It was based on the same advice he has drawn on to present this Budget—Treasury advice. Such a deficit for 12 months would have increased the accumulated deficit to just over \$19 million. This would have been a manageable deficit based on prevailing economic and seasonal conditions. The position could have been recovered in subsequent years by continuing tight control over all Government expenditure. Since December, the deficit on the recurrent account has deteriorated for three major reasons: wage and salary increases above Budget estimate, natural disasters, and overspending by Government departments. The recurrent deficit was \$67 million in excess of the forecast when the Budget was introduced. The amount of \$17.5 million, or 26 per cent of the overrun was due to salary and wage increases; \$15.8 million, or 23.6 per cent was to pay for the cost of the drought, bushfires and floods; and \$23.2 million, or 34.6 per cent was because Government departments had overspent their Budget allocations.

I will deal with each of these factors in turn. First, wage and salary increases. The former Government's last Budget provided a round sum allowance of \$80 million for wage and salary increases. That sum needs to be seen in the full perspective of wage and salary movements during the whole of the period the former Government was in office. As the Treasury economic paper tabled by the Premier points out, Australia experienced a wages explosion in 1981 and 1982. This made Budget forecasting for Governments as well as businesses extremely difficult and unpredictable. The pressures it imposed on the State Budget are reflected in the fact that, in the four Budgets the former Government introduced, provisions totalling \$293 million were made for wage and salary increases. That amount was overspent by \$9.4 million in total, or just over 3 per cent. That is the performance of a Liberal Government, just over 3 per cent over those four Budgets: compare that to the 34.6 per cent we have seen in the 10 months of this Administration. While the Premier has criticised the former Government for overruns last financial year, he has done so without acknowledging the extremely accurate budgeting overall for wage and salary increases of the former Administration. The House should also note that the major wage and salary increases which affected the Budget last year were awarded much earlier than anyone anticipated at the time the Budget was introduced.

Secondly, natural disasters: the net impact on the Budget last financial year was \$15.8 million, or a reduction of about 32 per cent on the cost the Premier forecast in May. Nevertheless, because no Government can be expected to budget for drought, bushfires and floods to the extent to which they occurred in 1982-83, and because of the extremely tight Budget situation, I said in May that one option the Government could consider was a one-off revenue-raising measure to recover this cost. The Premier did not take up my proposal. Instead, he attempted to misrepresent it, saying I had advocated a general round of tax increases. The Premier asks for consensus, but when he gets it he abuses it.

Thirdly, overspending by Government departments: on Friday 2 September, on the Jeremy Cordeaux show on 5DN, the Premier said this in relation to the \$23.2 million of overspending by Government departments identified in this Budget:

That overspending was in place and we reined it in for the last six months of the year. If that had been allowed to go unchecked the Budget result would have been infinitely worse. I think we have demonstrated that by some fairly stringent management you can keep departments on line with their budgets.

This is the Premier on the Jeremy Cordeaux show. Tell the public anything: that is the approach of this Premier, to fudge and tell significant untruths. That statement demonstrates the lengths to which the Premier is prepared to go to misrepresent and to mislead the public to seek to justify his tax increases. The clear falseness in this statement is exposed by documents that the Premier has already made available to this Parliament. He suggests that the overspending of \$23.2 million was in place when he came to office, yet the Under Treasurer's minute which the Premier tabled in this House on 14 December, a month after the election, only showed and referred to overspending of a mere \$9 million. What is more, the Premier, in a minute to all Ministers dated 2 February this year—a minute I forced him to release by revealing its existence—gave reasons for overspending by departments—

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Eh!

Mr OLSEN:—and I can understand his embarrassment—which were in no way associated with decisions of the former Government. The minute said in part:

It is disturbing that some agencies appear to have adopted interpretations of the Government's policies and acted on them without specific Cabinet authorisation.

That is Ministers not in control. It continued:

This has already led to unauthorised cost overruns and further difficulties are likely unless a consistent approach is followed.

That minute, signed by the Premier, completely puts the lie to his suggestion that the full extent of these overruns was in place before his Government took office, and certainly puts in proper context his comments on the Jeremy Cordeaux programme.

What now of the Premier's credibility, his honesty, his trustworthiness? What the facts show is that Ministers were not exercising proper control of their departments, not the former Ministers—the present Ministers. These Budget papers do not indicate any conscientious attempt by the Government to arrest these overruns. There has been no attempt to reallocate resources either within a department or from other departments as the former Government did when such circumstances arose. All there has been is abject submission by the Premier, capitulation to free spending, and incompetent Ministers.

The Premier was in charge of the Treasury for two-thirds of last financial year, but did nothing except blame the former Government as one more means of justifying tax increases—his Government's tax increases. Honourable members need to recall that the Premier first made his promise not to increase taxes in May 1982. He did so

without knowing then how South Australia would fare in relation to Commonwealth funds for 1982-83, without knowing the position of the State Treasury, because the promise was made eight months after the 1981-82 Budget was introduced, and without the 1982 Federal and State Budget Estimates. The promise was made in the document published by the Premier entitled 'South Australia's Economic Future—Stage One'. Thank God he has not distributed Stage Two! Importantly, in the introduction to the document, the Premier wrote as follows:

Over the next few months a Premier's conference will be held that will have major implications for the State's share of Commonwealth funds. The Federal Budget will be brought down and our State Budget presented to Parliament. All of these will have a significant impact on the scope of future Government action to develop the economy.

Here, the Premier was admitting that, without the Federal and State Budgets, it was difficult to make final commitments about alternative policies which could be pursued, yet he proceeded to do so, and what is more it was a commitment given not for one year, but for the whole of the period of this Parliament. It was from the beginning a commitment of deception because it was also made with other promises to significantly increase Government spending. The two are demonstrably incompatible. The Premier promised not to increase taxes because he knew this represented the most important difference between Liberal and A.L.P. policies. He wanted to fudge that difference. He well knew the electorate supported the need for restraint in Government spending because of the tough economic climate. When asked, at the time of the last election, how higher spending could be funded without increased taxes, the Premier said this in the *Advertiser* on 4 November last year:

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

By that time, the Premier knew this would be impossible. He had received the State and Federal Budget papers. He knew that depressed economic conditions were continuing to bite hard into Commonwealth and State revenues, that the downturn in industry, Australia-wide, was cutting the revenue sources of the Commonwealth and of the States in their traditional areas such as pay-roll taxes and stamp duties. Given these circumstances, a prudent Leader, not obsessed with power at any cost, would have reassessed his position. But the Premier did not undertake this even though he was in no position to make that forecast two days before the election. His own Budget speech now confirms that. Page two of his printed speech contains the following comment on the impact of a declining economy on his Budget and the Commonwealth's:

Commonwealth taxation receipts are depressed so that the pool on which the States share is lower than it would be otherwise. Our own State revenues are also closely related to the level of economic activity.

This had not occurred overnight. It was a trend of which the Premier was fully aware at the time he made his promise in May last year not to increase taxes. Any objective analysis of the facts will show that when the Premier promised, in his election policy speech, not to introduce new taxes or increase existing levels of taxes during his term of office, he knew it was a commitment he could not keep unless he abandoned his other promises to increase Government spending, to increase the number of employees of the Government and its agencies. Everything the Premier has said since, in his attempts to justify the breaking of that promise, has been as false as the promise itself. It is time the Premier admitted that. He should spend less time trying to blame others and more time seeking solutions to financial difficulties of his own making. It is time he stopped following the typical Labor line of never pulling in the belt, as individuals have to do, to make ends meet. He is grabbing from

the people to recover the cost of overspending he failed to control last year, as I have already shown, and to fund increased spending this year, as I will now demonstrate in turning to the Government's estimates of recurrent spending for this financial year.

A significant increase in Government spending in this Budget is disguised by amounts of recurrent spending last year necessary for one-off items for which little or no allocation has been made this year. The Premier claims at page 27 of the Budget paper that recurrent payments for this financial year are expected to increase by \$149.7 million, or 7.4 per cent over 1982-83. That would be only slightly more than his projection of inflation, but there is, in fact, a large increase in spending in real terms, to fund on-going departmental activities. It has to be recognised that last year's total recurrent spending included the following one-off items:

	\$m
Total State spending on natural disasters	39.1
Remission of the gas tax	4.1
Repayment of semi-government borrowings with respect to Monarto	1.6
Overspending by departments	23.2
Additional transfer of funds to Government Insurance Fund for school fires	4.2
Total	72.2

Without these one-off items, spending in 1982-83 for normal, on-going Government activities amounted to \$1 960.5 million. This year's estimated recurrent payments of \$2 182.5 million include residual allocations of \$7 million for further natural disaster relief and \$1.6 million to remit the gas tax.

If these amounts are discounted from estimated recurrent payments in 1983-84, the real increase between actual spending last year and proposed spending in this Budget for on-going Government activities is identified. That increase is \$213.4 million. It is an increase of 10.9 per cent—an increase of almost 4 per cent in real terms, based on the inflation projection by the Premier in his Budget presentation. The Government is increasing its running expenses to employ more people and to undertake more activities according to its election promises. It therefore needs more revenue to match it and that revenue is being obtained from higher taxes. That is the major reason the Government has increased taxes this year.

The Liberal Party believes that in the present economic circumstances, the Government should have had different priorities. It should have sought to reduce the accumulated deficit—not increase it by a further \$5 million this year and it should have avoided tax increases rather than seeking to increase collections from State taxation by more than 14 per cent. Accordingly, the Liberal Party believes the Government should not have increased spending to the extent it has proposed this year.

After I have referred to capital works and the Government's revenue raising proposals, I will refer to some alternatives the Government should have considered—alternatives a Liberal Government would have followed to avoid the present serious position with our State finances. My colleagues will deal in detail with the lines for various departments but before leaving recurrent spending, I refer to one other matter. The Budget fails to give any clear indication of the amount of extra spending the Government is incurring this year to increase the number of people it will employ in departments and agencies.

Given the fact that this represents a fundamental shift in policy from that of the former Government, I believe the Premier should have attempted, in this Budget, to quantify its impact, because it will be significant. This is one more omission—one more deliberate and serious omission by the

Premier from this Budget presentation. Had the former Government remained in office, the size of the public sector would be about 740 positions less this financial year.

I estimate that the full year saving of this reduction by June 1984 would be more than \$24 million based on projected wage movements during the year and various on-cost additions to average weekly earnings to calculate the full cost of employment. This estimate does not include a continuation of our public sector employment policy in 1983-84, that is, 740 persons would have been in place in the August 1982-83 Budget as at 30 June 1983 and the presentation I am giving today does not include a continuation of that policy during the financial year 1983-84.

I now turn to the aspect of the Budget which the Premier has attempted to highlight the most during the past fortnight—capital works allocations. As with recurrent payments, the figures require careful analysis to establish the true picture. When he claims at page 34 of the Budget papers that payments this financial year, forecast at \$378.6 million, are well above the 1982-83 level, he is ignoring the basic accounting principle of comparing like with like, that is, having a common base from which to make comparisons.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: It makes it easy to fudge the results if you don't compare like with like.

Mr OLSEN: Indeed, right through the Budget papers and the presentation of the Premier he has tried not to compare like with like to present a false impression about this particular Budget. For the first time this year, the Premier has put into the Budget for capital works spending, a large volume of funds invested by statutory authorities.

Previously, as the Budget paper explains, these statutory authority funds were invested directly with the Housing Trust and the State Bank. Had they been included for Budget allocations in the same way they have been this year, capital works spending in 1982-83 would have amounted to \$347.2 million. This year's figure of \$378.6 million, on the adjusted basis, is a 9 per cent increase. That is comparing like with like and it is not the major increase the Premier has claimed and not all of that will be spent on building and construction. For example, allocations for the purchase of motor vehicles by Government departments are now included in the capital account. If we adjust last year's actual spending and this year's estimate for the purchase of motor vehicles, the increase in funds for capital purposes in 1983-84 becomes 8.3 per cent which certainly will not support the jobs bonanza predicted by the Premier.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: It will only just cover inflation.

Mr OLSEN: Indeed; so much for the big boost to the capital works programme. Spending on motor vehicles this year goes up by more than 40 per cent to about \$11 million. It seems that not only are we getting a larger public sector, apparently it is to become more mobile as well. The day before the Budget was presented to this House, the Premier released details of estimates for spending on housing and said the boost of \$35 million would create 1 500 extra building and construction jobs.

I welcome the increased funding for housing. It has been made possible, in the main, by a boost in Commonwealth funds. They have increased by \$23 million while the State's contribution is up \$11.4 million. However, it has only now been possible, with the presentation of all the Budget papers, to assess the extent to which increased spending on housing is being achieved at the expense of other capital and job creating projects. The offsets are, in fact, considerable, and mean that the Premier's suggestion that a boost to housing funding will create an extra 1 500 jobs in the building and construction industry is nonsense.

Spending cuts on some major capital projects were imposed by this Government last financial year and have been continued this year. That means a loss of jobs. They include

the North East Busway. The Budget papers show this Government has reduced the completion cost of O-Bahn from \$95 million to \$77.8 million. This is because the Government has deferred construction of the project beyond Darley Road and has slowed down the total project. Spending on O-Bahn last financial year was \$4.6 million below the original Budget commitment of \$12.5 million by the former Government. I repeat my commitment that a Liberal Government would not have cut spending on this project. The next Liberal Government will complete this project to Tea Tree Plaza with a full guided busway. Regarding the Finger Point sewage treatment plant, the former Government allocated \$500 000 in last year's Budget to begin this project which is vital for the tourist and fishing industries in the South-East. This Budget confirms the present Government's decision to scrap the project. This decision puts jobs at risk because it could jeopardise the lucrative American export market for our lobster industry. This decision shows the extent to which this Government is ignoring country areas of South Australia. The next Liberal Government will proceed with that project as a matter of urgency, not only as an industry in the South-East but to protect a major export market for South Australia and thus jobs in that processing industry.

The Budget papers confirm that the Government will not proceed with the Cobdogla irrigation area headworks. Spending last year was more than \$770 000 down on the original allocation of more than \$1.6 million. The Government's decision will cut \$16 million from proposed spending on vital work to reduce salinity in the Murray River. Highways Department spending on road construction is funded in part by proceeds from the Government's petrol tax. While the tax is being increased, the Budget paper indicates that the transfer of funds to the Highways Department will be held steady this financial year. This means a cut in real terms in road building of at least 7 per cent.

It is clear from an examination of the Budget papers that, while the Government has reordered some priorities in capital works spending, particularly to provide more funds for housing, the overall increase in activity this financial year, taking into account inflation, will be minimal, if any. That is the true picture. In the longer term, the Government's decisions not to proceed with the Finger Point and Cobdogla projects and to defer the final section of the O-Bahn busway have reduced the forward programme by more than \$40 million.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: A lot of jobs.

Mr OLSEN: It is an enormous number of jobs. As well as the reduction in the forward programme, the Premier transferred from the capital to the recurrent account, almost \$10 million more than the former Government had originally allocated for this purpose in 1982-83, and a further \$28 million will be transferred this financial year.

With respect to revenue raising, I have already dealt at some length with the reasons why I believe the Treasurer broke his promise not to increase taxes. They have nothing to do with financial difficulties he claims he inherited. Rather, they result from his failure to control overspending and his policies to increase the size and role of the public sector. On 4 August, the Premier announced five revenue raising measures which he estimates will bring in \$40 million this financial year. Four have already been dealt with by the House. The fifth, a financial institutions duty which the Premier has not introduced, continues to be the subject of indecision by the Government.

When the Premier announced his intention to introduce this new tax, despite his election promise not to introduce any new taxes for three years, he made no reference to any offsets to reduce its impact, such as the abolition of stamp duty on cheques and credit/rental or to any exemptions for liability. It has been only after I called on the Premier to

introduce offsets and exemptions if the Government is determined to proceed with this new tax that the Premier has said he will do so. He must announce the details immediately. The introduction of this tax will be a complex process and financial institutions will have to be able to gear up soon if they are to be in a position to deal with it from 1 December, the day the Government intends it to apply from.

The Opposition will continue to oppose the imposition of this tax. It will be a tax with a major impact on the unemployed, pensioners, and those paying off home mortgages. It is another unseemly example of the manner in which, before the election, the Premier sought to give the impression that he would not do something, and then in Government has done exactly the opposite. In a statement on 30 September last year, less than a year ago, less than five weeks before the last election, the Premier asked the former Government for an assurance that it would not introduce a financial institutions duty. The obvious implication in his request was that a Labor Government would not. The electors got the assurance that the former Liberal Government would not introduce this duty. I will show in a moment how we would have honoured that commitment as, indeed, in our three years of Government we honoured most of our election promises in respect of taxes and charges. A stark comparison is being established. In this respect there is a great difference between the Labor Government and Liberal Government.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: You only broke the State. That's all you did.

Mr OLSEN: Obviously, the Deputy Premier has not been listening. He has been snowed by the Premier. I believe that the Premier will regret his duplicity in this matter. He is well on the way to taxing himself out of office, and so be it. Last financial year, the Victorian Government estimated that it could raise \$96 million in a full year from a financial institutions duty. It has now been forced by reality to introduce a wide range of exemptions with the result that its Revenue Estimate has been reduced by almost half, to \$50 million. For this reason, I believe that the Victorian Government is supporting South Australia in seeking a rate of 0.04 per cent at which to apply the duty. Only New South Wales is holding firm at present at 0.03 per cent, because it would lose considerably more banking business to Queensland if it agreed with South Australia and Victoria to increase the rate. I understand that Western Australian will be the next State to introduce this tax. If businesses colluded in the way in which the Labor State Governments are doing over this tax, they would be before the courts for breaches of the trade practice laws.

I pointed out earlier that we have to go to page 32 of the Budget paper to find out that the Premier has decided to reintroduce the tax on the Gas Company abolished by the former Government. The Premier did not identify it in his Budget speech. He did not do so because he had been saying in the run up to the Budget that there would be no further imposts. He said that immediately after he announced his five tax-raising measures on 4 August, and he said it again on the Jeremy Cordeaux show only a few hours before he introduced his Budget. But the Gas Company has now announced that the reintroduction of the tax, a decision that will increase revenue to the Government this financial year by \$1.6 million, and by about \$3.3 million in a full year, was the major factor in the company's decision to increase tariffs from 1 January 1984.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: That's more than \$1 a head right across the State.

Mr OLSEN: Another impost on the individual, on the families who have been participating in the wages pause in South Australia. The Government wants families and com-

panies to exercise restraint, but it is not willing to do so itself. Typically, in the hope that this additional Budget impost would be overlooked, and in an attempt to get over the fact that he had misled yet again, the Premier tried to place the responsibility on others. Instead of saying specifically in his Budget speech that the tax would be reintroduced, he said only that the decision by the former Government to remit the revenue to the Gas Company had been 'taken very much in an election context'. Of course, the Premier was also among those in the community, at the time the Cooper Basin producers were awarded a significant increase in prices last year, who said something should be done about it. And what did the former Liberal Government do? My colleague the Deputy Leader negotiated with the Cooper Basin producers to reduce the 80 per cent price increase by half for 1982—the increase awarded as a result of supply contracts approved by the Dunstan Labor Government. We are seeing the disadvantages being piled on South Australia *vis-a-vis* New South Wales as a result of the contract signed by the former Labor Government. The former Liberal Government also decided to remit revenue from its gas tax to the Gas Company, backdated to 1 January 1982—the date on which the arbitrator's increase took effect.

These decisions have saved South Australian domestic and industrial consumers of electricity and gas more than \$20 million. That is not a bad incentive for the South Australian business community. So it does the Premier no credit to criticise the former Government when he is the one who has decided to add to the costs of gas consumers this year because he wants more revenue to spend himself. The Premier has attempted to present himself as a man of integrity, but the manner in which he has introduced and tried to justify his first Budget has done a great deal to vindicate the accusations of the member for Elizabeth that the Premier is untrustworthy.

Let us consider another example. Hidden away at page 55 of the Budget papers is an explanation about the impact of the Government's decisions to restructure public sector debt. Again, the Premier was hoping that the impact of this decision would be overlooked. There is no mention of the additional revenue raising of \$14 million in his Budget speech. However, I have already revealed to this House that this decision will mean a rise in electricity tariffs of up to 6 per cent.

The new arrangements will also add to the cost of water, sewerage and irrigation rates. This is confirmed by the Premier's statement in the Budget attachment that the restructuring of borrowing arrangements will have little net effect on the Budget. One has to look at the words carefully: 'net effect on the Budget'. This means that the additional cost to the Engineering and Water Supply Department for debt servicing will be passed on to the public, either through further increases in water, sewerage and irrigation charges later this year, or as an additional component to the increase from next July. This will cost metropolitan consumers up to \$7 million more, and the bill for country consumers will go up by several millions as well.

In total, revenue available to the State Government this financial year through tax increases and other funding measures has increased substantially on last year. The increases include the following:

	\$m
Tobacco tax	13
Petrol tax	11
Liquor licence	2
Stamp duty on general insurance	6
Financial institutions duty	8
Gas tax	1.6
Revenue from restructuring of public debt ...	14

	\$m
Royalties	6
Charges (identified by the Premier)	37
Commonwealth funds—	
(tax sharing—special assistance)	102.6
(job creation)	35.3
Total	236.5

I turn now to a consideration of the alternatives the Government had to increasing the State taxes included in this list—the five State taxes the Premier has increased and the new financial institutions duty. I will deal with this question in two parts. First, I will give an outline of what the Opposition believes the Budget position would have been under a continuation of Liberal Government. Then I will canvass a number of alternatives the Premier should consider to his present strategy if he is to avoid further tax increases next year, or an even more serious decline in the State's finances.

In attempting to justify the increase in State taxes, the Premier has sought constantly to talk up the deficit, in seeking to dupe the public about the fact that this Government is significantly increasing its own spending this year and failed to control overspending last year. Had the Liberal Government remained in office, we would have taken positive action to control last year's deficit. Our record in office showed that when any department exceeded its Budget estimate at any time, immediate action was taken to minimise the impact on the end of year Budget result by reallocating resources within the department or from another department, or taking other remedial action. That is not rhetoric—it is performance in the field over three years. It is a benchmark of credit that this Government has not seen fit to emulate. This was achieved through the Budget Review Committee, which met on a regular basis to monitor Budget performance. The Premier failed to set up a similar mechanism to prevent last year's overspending. Indeed, that committee did a good job which was indicated by the tight control it had, and it did not allow, as this Government has, an overspending of \$23 million by Government departments.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: But then Ministers were Ministers and not puppets.

Mr OLSEN: Indeed, we had a good competent team when in Government. We can compare our record with what we have today. We had an announcement of a capital works project and the Minister of Public Works, the Deputy Premier, did not even know that the Premier had held a press conference several hours earlier to release details of the capital works programme. So much for the co-ordination of this Government!

Families have had to tighten their belts to go on paying their bills during the wage pause. Companies must do so to remain viable. Governments have an even heavier responsibility to do so, because they are spending the money of families, of companies. And when Governments take more of that money in taxes, as this Government is doing, the amount of money available for consumer spending, for companies to employ people, and for economic recovery, is less. Consumer-led recovery is important. It will not be achieved without consumer confidence. This Budget does nothing to engender that confidence. Had a Liberal Government remained in office, last year's recurrent deficit would have been reduced by at least \$24 million. This would have been achieved by more effective control of overspending, and by the lower cost of implementing our election promises, including the employment of more public servants.

A Liberal Government would not have scrapped the Finger Point sewage treatment plant and the Cobdogla salinity control project, as this Government has done. A Liberal Government would not have deferred work on the section of the O-Bahn busway between Darley Road and Tea Tree

Plaza, as this Government has done. Those decisions mean that \$5.9 million more would have been spent on capital works under a Liberal Government in 1982-83. Indeed, school building and redevelopment is yet another aspect of that.

As a result, there would have been a consolidated deficit on the year's activities of about \$38.6 million, largely as a result of the cost of the disasters and increased wage and salary increases—costs unforeseen at the time the Budget was introduced or at the time of the last election. The accumulated deficit carried forward into this year would have been \$44.7 million. A continuation of Liberal Government this financial year would have avoided the following increases in revenue raising:

	\$m
Tobacco tax	13
Petrol tax	11
Liquor licence	2
Stamp duty on general insurance	6
Financial institutions duty	8
Gas tax	1.6
Total	41.6

A Liberal Government would have avoided these six measures—these six broken promises by the Premier—because it would have paid fewer public sector employees this financial year and would have continued to limit increases in departmental spending. Our public sector employment policy would have reduced this year's wages and salaries bill by just over \$24 million had our Budget programme for 1982-83 been implemented.

In addition, we would have kept departmental spending within stricter limits than those proposed by this Government. A real increase in recurrent spending of about 1 per cent, rather than the Government's plan for an increase of almost 4 per cent, would have saved an extra \$36 million this financial year. Our spending policies would have reflected current needs in education, health, community welfare and other priorities in areas of important community services through seeking savings and greater efficiency in other departments. That is, Government responsibility is to establish priorities as the community needs are identified at the time. I am talking in terms of an increase in expenditure limiting that to the total amount—some departments would increase and some departments would in fact reduce.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Where necessary, taking tough options.

Mr OLSEN: Indeed. The Liberal Government indicated on performance, and not on rhetoric, that it was not prepared to resile from the responsibilities of Government-responsible administration. These total savings of about \$60 million by a Liberal Government would have resulted in recurrent payments in 1983-84 of about \$2 122 million. With receipts down by the \$41.6 million forgone through avoiding tax increases, the deficit on the recurrent account would have been about \$13.8 million in the 1983-84 year. On the capital account, a Liberal Government would have spent an extra \$11 million to have continued the O-Bahn, Finger Point and Cobdogla projects according to initial plans, and to have avoided cuts in some other building activities, particularly school building and redevelopment. This would have reduced the surplus on the capital account to \$17 million.

The result would have been a surplus for the year's activities on the Consolidated Account of just over \$3 million, reducing the accumulated deficit at 30 June 1984, from the \$44.7 million a Liberal Government would have carried forward into this year, to \$41.5 million. That is \$26.6 million less than the result estimated by this Government—a \$26.6 million reduction in the deficit through prudent, responsible

Liberal Government policies, and without the massive tax hike.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Policies for the people of South Australia.

Mr OLSEN: Yes, policies for the people of South Australia who have been genuinely and effectively participating in a wages pause for us to wind out of this economic recession. We need to have maximum funds left in the consumers' pockets so that we have a consumer-led recovery. We will not have it with this Budget. There would also be the prospect of further reductions in 1984-85 with continuing firm control on Government spending and increasing royalties from the Cooper Basin—royalties beginning to flow now as a result of the former Liberal Government's initiatives to develop the liquids project—Liberal Government initiatives and Liberal Party policies at work.

What is the alternative, the actual position, advanced by this Government? We have had significant increases in State taxes and charges already, but the overall financial position is not expected to improve. In fact, the Premier expects it to worsen, to the tune of \$5 million which he estimates will be added to the accumulated deficit this financial year. That is reckless and irresponsible financial planning. It is a spend now, pay later strategy based on hope rather than responsible management. Instead, I urge the Premier to take positive action to reverse this strategy, to put a much tighter limit on Government spending than he proposes at present.

The Liberal Party's alternative would have avoided tax increases this year, because South Australian families and industry cannot afford them. The Premier admits that payroll tax is a disincentive to industry: so are petrol taxes, the new financial institutions duty, higher water and sewerage rates, and electricity and gas tariffs. The Federal Minister for Industry and Commerce (Senator Button) has said that, in the case of B.H.P., the South Australian and New South Wales Governments should be doing more to limit State imposts on the company so that it can halt retrenchments—a Federal Labor Minister telling them about the tax increases. This Budget does nothing to address the very valid point Senator Button makes, not only as it affects B.H.P. but all industries.

This Budget will also add just under 1 per cent to the consumer price index. A Liberal Government would have avoided that. We need to do everything possible to protect South Australia's competitive position. In Opposition, as I have already reminded the House, the Premier referred to this matter *ad nauseam* when he questioned the need for increased Government charges, but his first Budget completely ignored it. The Minister of Housing might well feel comfortable for the moment, because he will not be sitting there long, once the reality of the tax increases settles into the people of South Australia, and the member for Brighton, sitting on that very narrow margin—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader keeps turning his back to the Chair, and that is a reflection on the Chair.

Mr OLSEN: Indeed, I would not wish to do that. However, I want to point out to the Parliament that some members opposite sit on very fragile margins of only a few votes. I wonder what their constituents think of the great tax hike and the broken promises of this Government?

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: I am sure that the member for Brighton does not have a 72 per cent margin, which really indicates the capacity of the Minister of Housing in relation to mathematics. We all knew that he was incompetent in terms of those things. He is just proving it by his interjections.

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: If the Premier fails to limit spending in the way I have proposed for this year and next, the outcome in 1984-85 will be another round of increases in taxes and charges or another step towards bankruptcy of the State's finances, because the Budget programme the Premier is developing is a very fragile package indeed. It will require an economic recovery next financial year well in excess of any current projections, to allow him to sustain Government activities at their present levels without a significant increase in revenue raising. This will result from a likely fall-off in Commonwealth receipts next financial year. Wage pressures on the Budget will be much greater than this year, and current economic projections indicate that receipts from pay-roll taxes and stamp duties will remain relatively flat. In fact, the economic paper tabled by the Premier is already warning about possible pressures on the Budget developing later in this financial year. It states at page 17:

Although the rapid deceleration of wage increases in the first half of 1983 is expected to dampen c.p.i. rises over the next two quarters, offsetting adverse factors could also be at work later in the year.

This is a further reason why the Premier should have supported the extension of the wage pause to the end of 1983. The Budget papers show that the wage pause has already saved the Government \$25 million in spending on the wages and salaries of public servants.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Yet he did not believe it.

Mr OLSEN: Indeed, he did not believe it. But the Premier was not only reluctant to go along with the implementation of the pause in the first place; has he done all he can to end it as soon as possible? He said in a statement reported in the *Advertiser* on 8 April that the pause would be terminated at the end of the forthcoming national economic summit. They are the Premier's projections.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: He did not have any weight at that summit, and he did not have any weight at the Premiers' Conference.

Mr OLSEN: Indeed. He says in his Budget speech at page 5—says categorically, what is more—that the pause has ended. I am sure that Sir John Moore and his fellow Commonwealth Commissioners would be interested to know that their role is being pre-empted in this way.

The wage pause has been an important circuit breaker, no less for Governments than for business, and it is unfortunate that the Premier has treated it in such a cavalier fashion when the pause has been of significant assistance to his own Budget position—not to mention the savings of \$70 million over the past three years in Public Service wages and salaries as a result of the former Government's policies.

I began my response to the Premier's first Budget by pointing out that the economic paper he has tabled does highlight some encouraging long-term developments for South Australia, largely as a result of actions taken between 1980 and 1982. Pre-eminent among those are the Cooper Basin and Roxby Downs projects. The Cooper Basin liquids project is expected to generate a 60 per cent boost in royalty returns this financial year. Roxby Downs is a project that the Premier now supports, after spending three years trying to wreck it, and talking about mirages in the desert. The responsibilities of Government have forced him to admit to reality on this issue. I urge him to re-think his approach to other fundamental issues before it is too late. I urge him in particular to revise his spend now pay later Budget strategy before it is too late—before it runs up debts for this State which we can pay only by further massive tax hikes which will cut us out of the economic recovery.

The community now has a much better appreciation of how much a Government can achieve in tough economic times. The community does not want its hard pressed finances raided further to fund the public sector. The public

sector is not immune from the recession: it cannot be. The burdens have to be shared. There are more burdens to be faced, but this Government is refusing to participate, to accept its responsibilities. Since taking office, the Premier has made constant calls for consensus to overcome our present economic difficulties. It is time he started seeking that consensus in a meaningful way. Let me give this House one example. On 4 August, the Premier sent a telex to the Chief Minister of the Northern Territory about arrangements for a joint meeting with the Prime Minister to discuss the future of the Alice Springs to Darwin railway—a project I have fully supported with the Premier, particularly as the Chamber of Commerce and Industry has launched it.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: And before the Premier.

Mr OLSEN: And before him—in fact, before we cajoled the Premier into taking some public profile where he had been very silent. The silence has been deafening.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: He is slow out of the blocks in all these things, isn't he?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr OLSEN: He is a Premier who is not very exciting, not prepared to stand up to his counterparts. Let me relate the story of the consensus Premier, once again matching his performance with his rhetoric. The Premier sent that telex to the Opposition Leader in the Northern Territory—his Labor Party colleague—but he did not send it to the Opposition Leader in his own State, despite the fact that I had joined him publicly in supporting a joint approach to the problem. So much for seeking a bipartisan approach. The Premier of this State wants consensus on this Budget. I have no doubt that I can agree with the Premier that whatever we both do should be directed to improving opportunities for the whole community—for our children and their children.

This Budget, however, highlights the fact that there are marked differences between the approach this Government is taking and the approach a Liberal Government will take after the next election. The Premier has never at any time attempted to achieve consensus about his financial policies. He misled the public about them before the election. Subsequently, there has been a series of carefully orchestrated announcements designed to hide the fact that the Premier has embarked on a course of breaking promise after promise. Stripped of its propaganda dressing, this Budget does nothing to address the long-term needs of South Australia. It takes from all South Australians and gives back to very few.

I have put forward alternatives to the Premier's strategy through which a Liberal Government would have:

- avoided significant overspending by departments last year;
- contained Government spending this year to a 2 per cent increase in real terms, rather than the 4 per cent proposed in this Budget;
- this would have allowed a Liberal Government to avoid tax increases at a time when individuals and business in South Australia can least afford it.

Our performance in office, and events since the last election have demonstrated that only a Liberal Government can competently manage the finances of the State.

While the Liberal Party can back its word with proven performance, the Premier has no credibility because this Budget breaks promise after promise. It increases Government spending and employment significantly when further restraint is needed. Two days short of four years ago, South Australians elected a Liberal Government which honoured its promise to cut taxes and to work for developments such as those which have brought on stream the Cooper Basin oil and will give us one of the world's largest mines at Roxby Downs. Within 908 days, South Australia will elect another Liberal Government, because this Government's

strategy, revealed in this Budget, now that the facade has been stripped away and exaggerations and further broken promises are revealed, is one South Australia and South Australians cannot afford.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): The Budget presented to this House by the Premier is nothing short of a disaster for South Australia. It will destroy in one fell swoop the advantages that were built up during three difficult years of hard work by the former Liberal Administration. As a result of careless, slothful administration, the Bannon Labor Government has allowed Government departments to overspend to the tune of not \$1 million or \$2 million but \$23 million. That simply would not have happened under a Liberal Administration. It did not happen during the three years of the previous Government's occupation of the Treasury benches, and it certainly would not have happened had the Liberal Government been re-elected. Our track record is there for all to see.

This is a dishonest Budget following a dishonest policy speech which deliberately deceived the public of South Australia. I made this point earlier when debating some specific tax measures that were before the House. Under your stricture, Mr Speaker, I was precluded from developing some of those matters, and I was invited to raise them in the context of a full Budget debate, which I intend to do this afternoon. I want to recount to the House some of the promises that were made by the present Premier during his election policy speech and to explain the result of the Premier's lack of action in those areas. The view I am putting that the Budget is a return to the bad old days of the late 1970s, with big spending and record high taxing by the Labor Party, is not simply held by the Opposition: it is a view that is shared by many observers in South Australia. I refer to statements made in the most recent publication of *Statescene*, which I think is sent to all members. This is a regular publication 'outlining, analysing and forecasting South Australian developments' put out by G.W. Holden and Associates of Adelaide. Under the headline 'The Bannon Budget: Record \$68.2 million deficit!' it is stated:

Hidden under claims of 'a small deficit of \$5 million' is a spending spree which will put South Australia in the red to the tune of a record \$68.2 million. The Bannon plan for 1983-84 is a total capital expenditure budget of \$860 million, an increase of 10 per cent on the previous Tonkin Administration's.

That figure is expressed in round figures. In fact, if as the Leader has pointed out one compares like with like, it would be somewhat more modest than that. The article further states:

In his Budget speech, Bannon stated that 'South Australia's regional economy remains precariously balanced.' This view has not deterred him, however, from imposing a series of severe tax collection gambles over the past month—presumably on the assumption that South Australians can absorb the cost of his political aspirations. It seems we have a return to the high-taxing high-spending Labor style where cultural enlightenment and social reform take precedence over economic reality. For instance the Government intends to spend \$18.6 million this year on grants for artistic and history preservation purposes. A worthwhile cause, but is it worth \$18 million out of the taxpayer's pocket—particularly in these hard-pressed times of high unemployment and economic uncertainty, when most people are literally counting cents left after (hopefully) meeting the essential costs of living?

It further states (and I hope that the Minister on the front bench will note this):

Taxpayers have been forced to trim lifestyles down to essentials; it would be encouraging if the Government did the same. Budget beauty treatment: It seems the A.L.P. Caucus has given instructions to both Federal and State Governments to adopt a budget beautification programme. Both Paul Keating and now John Bannon have carefully removed virtually every taint of unpleasantness from their projected economic programmes. Budget time now seems to have become a cosmetic exercise for handing out money,

and the grim harvest from the taxpayers pocket has either been unceremoniously dumped on us beforehand or is still to come.

Mr Trainer: Signed, R. Goldsworthy!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: That is a really smart comment from the honourable member and the sort of remark one could expect. Obviously, the honourable member did not take note of my point that I was referring to a publication called *Statescene*, outlining, analysing and forecasting South Australian developments, readily available to the business community, and published by G. W. Holden and Associates, of 88 Pirie Street, Adelaide. So, there is absolutely no point to that rather childish interjection from the honourable member. What I am saying is that the view that I hold of the Budget being a return to the bad old days of the 1970s is shared by other commentators in the community, one of whom I have just referred to.

One does not have to go far in the business community at large to understand that this Budget will place South Australia at a significant disadvantage in relation to other States in our attempt to recover from the worst unemployment situation to date that has developed during the life of the Labor Government. The Budget does two things: first, it mitigates against a return to full employment or anything like it. It is a Budget that will create unemployment, as it gives away all the hard-won advantages that the previous Liberal Government managed to gain when South Australia became the lowest taxed State in Australia as a deliberate result of the Liberal Government's policies to improve our competitive position. The Budget places South Australia at a significant disadvantage in relation to recovery in the industrial, commercial and retail sectors. Secondly, it disadvantages enormously the average housewife and the average taxpayer in South Australia.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: By how much?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The honourable member has only to take note of what the Leader has said both in this place and publicly if he wants to know by exactly how much. As I have said, it is quite apparent that the Budget will disadvantage our chances of recovery by disadvantaging the industrial and commercial sector to a great extent. Further, it will disadvantage every household in South Australia to the point where some will become impoverished. That will occur as a result of this Budget, which I would describe as being a disaster.

I want to refer to a matter that I attempted to raise earlier concerning one of the promises of the Labor Party in an area for which I was responsible and for which I am still responsible as shadow spokesman on resources and development. Later I will refer to the matter of the Labor Party's policies on industrial relations, and the like. First, however, I want to quote from the Bannon policy speech which, as every member would know, was replete with promises, most of which have now been broken.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: We won the election.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The election was won by deliberately deceiving the public, and the present Budget is a result of that deception. Among other things, it was stated in the Bannon policy speech:

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

What they did was to criticise the Liberal Government for the rapid development of those Cooper Basin fields. That is a plain untruth in the policy speech. The Liberal Government was intent on developing the liquids scheme as rapidly as possible, which it did: it introduced the Bill in Parliament and was criticised by the Labor Party for going too quickly. The speech continues:

and on our return we would support further development of the Basin and Stony Point projects.

Nothing further has happened there, as we well know. All that has happened is that the Premier has been able to go there and turn on the tap as the first oil flowed, as a result of the negotiations by the Liberal Government. The speech also stated:

We would take all possible steps, including action at the national level, to ensure that oil from the Jackson field is piped through South Australia and not to Brisbane. This makes economic sense. It is more economical and it is vital for our State—

'vital' it says—

but we have got to have a Government that will fight to ensure this happens and not like our present Premier who simply caves in to Mr Bjelke-Petersen.

What has been the result of that particular promise? I put a Question on Notice and, if the Minister cares to listen to what I have to say, he will become cognisant of the fact that this is another promise which the present Premier not only has not fulfilled but had no intention of fulfilling. I put this Question on Notice as a result of that clear election promise that he would make the oil flow to South Australia. The question is as follows:

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

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

That was at the beginning of the year. Only the day before Parliament reassembled in August, I received a letter beginning 'Dear Roger' (as soon as I saw 'Dear Roger' I knew I was in for the soft-sell)—this is from the Premier who would make sure, come hell or high water, that Jackson oil would flow to South Australia:

Dear Roger, In reference to your Question on Notice No. 206, the Government held discussions with the interested parties, whose advice was that the decision which had been made by the Queensland Government could not be changed and that they were proceeding on that basis. In this case there was nothing to be gained by South Australia from further discussions with the Queensland Government.

How does that line up with the Premier's clear promise during the election campaign that, come hell or high water, he would go up and tell Joh where he got off—none of the soft-shoe business of the Tonkin Government or of the former Premier—and that he would get that oil flowing into South Australia? He did not answer the question. The question was in the too-hard basket for over six months. The day before Parliament resumed, so that he would not have to table an answer, I received this soft sell—no point in having discussions because they had already decided to sell the oil to Queensland. This question was followed by another to the Premier—this Premier who was going to tell the Queensland Premier where to get off—as follows:

1. Who were the interested parties with whom the Government had discussions concerning oil from the Jackson field in Queensland flowing to Moomba?

2. When were these discussions held?

3. When was the decision made by the Queensland Government not to allow oil from Jackson to flow to Moomba?

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: If the Minister did not go on with such buffoonery he would pick up an important point in relation to the appalling record of the Government (of which he is a part) and further evidence of his Party's absolute sloth in answering Questions on Notice. The last part of my question was as follows:

4. What were the reasons for the delay in answering question No. 206 of the previous session on this matter?

This is the answer I received to that:

The discussions were held with the producers.

The Premier did not even contact the Queensland Government. As to question No. 2, the decisions, he says, were

made in November 1982. November was when he said, 'I will ensure that that oil comes to South Australia because it is vital to the economy of the State'. As to part 3 of the question, the decision was made in October and formally communicated in November—in November after this Government was elected. The Premier did not even approach the Queensland Government. In reply to the last part of the question as to why it took the Government so long to answer my Question on Notice, the answer was:

No reason.

That is an appalling admission for a Government. It keeps members hanging around in excess of six months for 'no reason' to receive an answer to their questions. Here again is a promise by the Labor Premier that he would ensure that the economy of the State was boosted because he would go to Queensland and negotiate in relation to this oil flow. He did not even go there and did not even approach that Government. So much for that promise!

I want to deal now with the Government's attitude to labour relations and to manufacturing industry in South Australia. I mentioned already that this Budget, on two counts, deals almost a death blow to the hopes of this State to recover, in the industrial scene, and certainly it introduces an enormous amount of hardship into every household budget. The approach of this Government when a problem arises is to do absolutely nothing, and it has not been any more evident than in their behaviour in the industrial scene. This low-key Premier is so low key that he does absolutely nothing.

I instance the case of the wage pause. The wage pause was suggested initially so that the economy of the nation and the State would have a chance of recovery. Every other Premier, including the Labor Premiers, got busy and made clear statements that they would institute wage pauses, with the notable exception of the Premier of South Australia. Do nothing, have a pow-wow! He is absolutely in the thrall of the union movement of this State. He has no real clout himself. The Deputy Premier is a far more powerful figure within the Labor movement in South Australia than is the Premier, who has no room to move whatsoever. He exhibits no leadership whatsoever, and the reason is that he has no power. The first instance was in relation to the wage pause. The Leader of the Opposition initially came out quite firmly, gave a lead, and said 'We favour the wage pause.'

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: Was that on Friday?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister is a buffoon. His interjections bear testimony to that point. He will do himself and the House a service if he listens, and he may learn something. It is not only my view that, again, there was a singular lack of leadership by the Premier in relation to instituting a wage pause which would have benefited his Budget enormously (and in fact has done so) but it was the view of the afternoon daily newspaper, which in an editorial at that time under the heading 'Pay pause but how?' stated under 'Weakness':

Locally Mr Bannon is coy about how he intends to hold pay levels in the public sector. He is relying on the soft speaking of consultation and not the big stick of legislation. It is a weak response from a Government with a fresh mandate.

That is typical of the performance of the Premier of South Australia when he is confronted with any problem. I recall the Moomba dispute, which held up further development resulting from Liberal Government negotiations. That was criticised by the Labor Party. During that dispute the Government did absolutely nothing. The dispute continued for weeks, during which time the Premier was not sighted. In relation to the railway line to Darwin, the Premier was conspicuous by his absence in relation to giving a real lead and taking on the Federal Government and demanding that

it kept its promise in relation to that matter of vital importance to this State.

Mr Trainer: Where was the Leader of the Opposition last Friday? We missed him.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Leader of the Opposition was not prepared to be part of a charade to sell a dishonest Budget which is a disaster for this State.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: The Hon. Lance Milne was there.

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Leader was not prepared to be present at an occasion which was a belated attempt by the Government to sell to the public, after the event, a dishonest and disastrous Budget. I think that, if the member and the Minister, who are both part of the Government team (if it can be called that), had listened to the Leader of the Opposition today, they would have learned quite a bit about the fundamental difference in approach to the finances of this State of the present Labor Administration (which is running true to form) and the approach of the Liberal Government, which advocates responsible financial administration in South Australia. I now turn to the difficulties that the industrial community is facing in South Australia in trying to recover and maintain employment in this State. Members opposite seem intent on interjecting and interrupting my speech. That signifies their lack of fundamental interest in the Budget of this State.

I point out to the Minister of Housing that he would benefit from duplicating some of my visits to industrial concerns, particularly in the metal industry in South Australia, to see the lengths to which people in the private sector have to go to try and stay in business. It would be an eye opener. If the Minister, sitting on his 76 per cent majority of which he is so proud, was prepared to take time off and visit some of these places I am sure that he would have his eyes opened. He would understand the extreme lengths to which these managers have to go and which their staff accept as the alternative to unemployment to try and keep in business. I have made these visits and I have talked to these people. This is the sort of Budget that discourages those people. The Government is not prepared to even take a faltering step along the track that these people have to travel in the business community.

I refer to an article in the Metal Industries Association Review headed 'Costs that threaten economic recovery'. If the Minister does not listen to what I am saying he will never learn and there will be no hope in relation to the costs that the Government is placing on the industries and employers of this State. The review states:

It is extremely doubtful whether the Australian community generally, or for that matter the business community, has even begun to appreciate the potential damage to the economy inherent in ACTU claims—the national wage case and the so-called redundancy case—currently before the Full Benches of the Arbitration Commission.

In the national wage case the A.C.T.U. is seeking wages rises to cover increases in the Consumer Prices Index for the March and June 1983 quarters, which if granted would be of the order of 3 or 4 per cent, or in terms of a fitter's wage up to \$12 per week.

That is the immediate claim, without going into the other parts of it, which include full quarterly c.p.i. adjustment in future and a 9.1 per cent 'catch-up' covering previous quarters. This claim is being strenuously opposed by the Confederation of Australian Industry on behalf of employers.

In its submissions supporting the need for a continuation of the wage freeze, the C.A.I. will be tendering the latest economic analysis of the metal and engineering industry prepared by the Commonwealth Bank and M.T.I.A. following a survey of over 1 000 M.T.I.A. companies. Preliminary information available from the survey indicates that the metal and engineering industry is in no shape to sustain wage increases at this time. Many sectors of the industry have still to hit rock bottom.

Later, the document has this to say about redundancy:

In its other application, the A.C.T.U. is claiming, besides existing award and statutory entitlements such as annual leave and long service leave, substantial payments to be made to employees whose employment is terminated 'for reasons of an economic, technological, structural or similar nature.' In summary the A.C.T.U. is seeking:

- Three months' notice of termination or payment in lieu thereof
- Four weeks' pay, plus four weeks' pay for each year of service, plus
- One week's pay for each completed year of service when the employee is aged 35 years or over, plus
- An additional two weeks' pay for each completed year of service in excess of 10 years if the employee is aged 45 years and over, plus
- The full value of accrued sick leave, long service leave and annual leave with loading, plus
- Maintenance of income payments for a period of twelve months after termination, plus
- Any relocation expenses and the cost of training or retraining.

As our members know, in order to assist the C.A.I. in opposing the claim, M.T.I.A. commissioned Coopers and Lybrand to carry out a survey and analysis on the financial implications for employers should the claim be granted in full or in part.

The Government of South Australia supports that claim. Here is a survey of 1 000 firms in the metal industries pointing out clearly the implications of these claims.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: What would you say—

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: If the Minister had the wit to get off his backside, to go out and visit these industries, and to talk to these employers, he would know that what they are saying is not false. The Government has introduced a Budget that will, as sure as the sun rises tomorrow, increase unemployment in this State. Further, this Government supports claims from the Australian Council of Trade Unions before the Arbitration Commission that will create further unemployment inasmuch as those claims are for increased wages and redundancy payments.

The Minister at last is silent because he knows that his Government supports those claims. The Government is acting in this Budget, in its labour relations, and in its dealings with the unions, with the A.C.T.U. and with the courts, to increase unemployment in South Australia. So much for Labor promises and all the hooha before the last election when the Labor Party said that it was concerned with the unemployed. Let Government members get out and find out for themselves what is happening in the private sector.

The other matter that I wish to canvass relates to on-costs, not only redundancy payments which significantly increase on-costs, but a range of other matters relating to the cost of labour and the perquisites (or perks, as they are known in industry) for which the previous Labor Government legislated in the 1970's and for which this Government is legislating in the 1980's. Earlier this year workers compensation legislation embodying a range of proposals was put before this Parliament. The effect of that legislation must be to increase unemployment, as all employer groups acknowledge. Yet we have a re-run of the handing out of perks in respect of industrial relations at the very time when we are at the bottom of the barrel in this State in terms of our industrial activity and employment. I will deal with that topic in a later speech. This Budget is a disaster and does not deserve the support of this House. The alternative Budget put up by the Leader of the Opposition is the one which the Liberal Party—

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

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): Thank heavens for Treasury officials of integrity—officials who were not even accorded a mention by the Treasurer of this State when

presenting this document. This is the first time in the 13 years that I have sat in this House and listened to Budget speeches that there was no deserved compliment given by the Treasurer of the day to the people who prepared the document. I wonder about the reason for that. The clear inference that one can draw from this document is that the abilities of the Treasury officials shine through all the rhetoric that has been engendered into it by a Government struggling to maintain its position in the country because of lost favour resulting from broken promises, from the constant erosion it has undertaken in respect to the people of this State and the concern that it has caused even to its own members who cannot take part in this responsible debate. I am the third speaker in this debate which has consistently had representations from both sides of the House for the 13 years that I have been in this place. I know that the member for Semaphore, who represents the people of his district very well by his physical presence in this place, is concerned about matters contained in the Budget and at the effect it is having on the people of this State. Obviously, members opposite are so ashamed of the Budget that they have headed off in all directions to escape it.

Mr Trainer: Ha!

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: The honourable member can laugh in that manner.

Mr Trainer: Which manner would you prefer?

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: The honourable member's comments are so inane that they do not warrant consideration. The fourth line of the document contains the incursion of the Premier's fantasy and fixation of mind that the problems of the State rest with the former Liberal Administration. This afternoon the Leader of the Opposition clearly destroyed that fantasy or fixation of mind which appears in the document so frequently. I refer to the words 'unique and difficult situation which now confronts South Australia' and which is expanded by seeking to place the blame. Again on the first page the document states:

The problem of accumulating deficits, largely a legacy of previous policies.

In many of the answers provided during Question Time, in public announcements, on talk-back shows, in other documents and in the paid advertisement the night before the Budget, the Premier fully appreciates—

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: At least we paid for ours.

Mr Trainer: We did not try to drop it on the taxpayer like someone else.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Honourable members opposite are full of comment. They would do well to come up with facts and place them on the record. The fact that there is no record of the events to which they allude suggests to me—

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: Come on!

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Is the honourable member seeking to tell us about the walks up the mall by the Hon. D.A. Dunstan and the Hon. Peter Duncan, and advertisements which were a regular Sunday evening feature paid for by the people of this State for the purpose of selling Labor Party philosophy? Those are the facts which are on the record and which cannot be argued. There is not a suggestion which is accorded reality to give credit to the statements which members opposite have made to this point.

I refer to a statement in a document circulated by the Premier on the day before he brought down the Budget, as follows:

When the Government was sworn in last November, it faced a crisis in State finances. Without decisive action we would have faced a record \$100 million deficit this financial year. A deficit of this size was not sustainable. Householders will appreciate that you cannot live beyond your means and hope problems will go away.

What absolute hypocrisy! In early December 1982 the Leader of the Opposition made available to the House factual information in the form of a Treasury document that was offered to the previous Government in October 1982. That information indicated at that time that there was no way that the Budget would blow out in the manner which the Premier would have us believe.

The Premier indicates in that document and in many others how he is prepared to utter deceitful statements to maintain office—deceitful statements which are not borne out by fact and which are becoming more readily recognised by the people of this State. In winding up a debate earlier this session in relation to the overall Budget, but more specifically in relation to one of the increased funding measures which were then under consideration, members of the Opposition were challenged about being repetitive in their comments and of being constant in their demands for further expenditure without offering any alternative. In fact, the Premier suggested that, by virtue of the pronouncements being made by members of the Opposition, there was a likely collapse of the State's economy. Those positions were never espoused from this side of the House. The views uttered by the Premier were a figment of his own imagination and part of the fantasy to which I referred previously.

The Premier seeks to brush aside the scorn being heaped on his Government by the 'Freds' and 'Fredas' in the streets, and he does so at his and his Government's peril. The people of this State are gravely concerned. They have been prepared to withhold demands for increased wages because they genuinely believe that wage restraint will be to the advantage of the Commonwealth of Australia. They have been placed in an invidious position by a Government which has, behind the hand, introduced additional charges upon them. Those additional charges are causing grave difficulties to their way of life and are at odds with the promises that they were given.

The Premier would have us believe that industry is with him, that the actions that he has taken are acceptable to people in South Australia responsible for generating job opportunities. He would have us believe that only by the generation that he seeks to introduce by way of this devious Budget will South Australians pull out of the present difficult situation that besets them. I refer the Premier and other members to a statement made by the economist of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Mr Rod Nettle, in the Chamber's journal of 22 August this year. In a brief statement, Mr Nettle states:

The South Australian Government has taken the soft option in its time of budgetary difficulty. Instead of tightening its belt and becoming more efficient and productive, it has passed its problems on to all South Australians and ordered them to bail it [the Government] out.

Mr Nettle is only one of many people in the industrial world, together with many people on the shop floor, who consider that they have been sold a pup by a Government which had itself elected by making promises that it knew it could not fulfil and which sought election by devious means.

This afternoon the Leader of the Opposition was quite able to define a number of areas in the Budget where there is an excess of spending far beyond the public 7.4 per cent increase that the Premier would have us believe is the basis of framing his Budget. In relation to those comments I will not be repetitive, but I refer members opposite to pages 14 to 21 of the Budget document. Without going into too much detail, let me simply relate to the House other areas of once-up spending which have been written into the new Budget and which are beyond the necessities that were the basis for claiming increased taxation. For example, under 'Special Acts' we find that retirements were greater than expected in 1982-83 and that there was an amount of \$1.2 million

above Budget for that area of operation. A percentage of that \$1.2 million is now written, on an escalating basis, into the Budget for 1983-84, and while the present Government with its current philosophy stays in office that will be written into subsequent Budgets. Further, we find that payments by the Government under the Industries Development Act and Rural Advances Guarantee were \$210 000 more than expected. The crunch line is that which states:

The major payment related to an unsuccessful debenture issue by the Ramsay Trust.

The amount of \$100 000-plus is a once-only payment. In fact, we are not really told what the amount is. We are told that that is a major part of the payment of \$210 000. It represents a loss to South Australia, one which was highlighted before it was entered into. It was a programme that could not be fulfilled and yet the Government went ahead with it, against the best advice not only of a political nature but also of a business and economic nature. Further for the line 'Premier—Miscellaneous' we find an amount of \$228 000 for the E.C. Splatt Royal Commission. In certain circumstances no-one would deny the right to create a Royal Commission, a judicial inquiry or a major inquiry of that nature.

However, it is important, if you are to be responsible in management (and this Government is not), to know where you are going before you start. The amount of \$228 000 to which I have just adverted is only a small part of what the total cost will be to the State, a cost the major part of which could have been prevented. Under Treasurer—Miscellaneous there is a payment in connection with the South Australian Gas Company of \$4.1 million. This figure has been picked up previously by the Deputy Leader. I restate it because it is an issue which cannot be lost to the attention of the people of this State and members opposite. Turning to the Public Buildings Department, we see some very large variations. We know what took place in the previous Administration of a Labor Government where over \$24 million worth of expenditure was undertaken without proper Ministerial authority.

There are indications already that, with that lackadaisical haphazard method of approach by a number of Ministers opposite, authority is not being properly exercised in this new Government. It will be interesting to analyse the information contained in the Auditor-General's Report, tabled today, to pick up evidence of those errors. Under the Minister of Lands and Repatriation we see a very large parcel of money which was a result of the Government's decision to relinquish its involvement in Wardang Island. Members who have been here for some time well know the questions that arose some 10 or 12 years ago relative to the expenditure of public funds in respect of Wardang Island for the purpose for which they were being promoted. The question of the development of a tourist nature in an off-shore island without proper harbour facilities was certainly argued in this place over a long period of time and again we are now picking up the expenditure of a pie in the sky approach of a previous Labor Government.

Also written into the document, with no clear indication as to whether it will be a recurrent problem, a large sum of money, a greater than expected refund under the Mobil Lubricating Oil Refinery Indenture Act, 1976, accounted for most of the overrun of \$448 000. We are given no indication of whether this will be a recurrent cost, and no indication of the circumstances relative to that matter. However, there is written into the Budget for 1983-84 an escalated costing of that \$448 000 which the people in this State are being taxed to obtain; that is wasteful spending.

There is another revelation under the Education Department of a slower than expected turnover of cleaning staff resulting in an additional \$1.5 million of expenditure. What

is the position here? Are cleaning staff being held within the system beyond need as were the millions of dollars of funds which were spent at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the Royal Adelaide Hospital in a previous Labor Administration when people were walking around cleaning rooms that were not being occupied? Millions of dollars was lost, in an effective spending sense, because of a philosophy of sustaining unproductive workers, not even seeking to relocate those people into an area where they might benefit the people of this State, be it in health, education or in whatever other direction.

We go further and find under the Minister of Education and Minister for Technology Miscellaneous lines the statement that an interim payment of \$136 000 was made to the South Australian College of Advanced Education for the retention of academic staff. This is not inconsistent with the approach taken by the previous Liberal Government that there would be no sackings and that loss of job opportunity would result from normal attrition. But, what a bland statement, and what is the detail? I am quite sure that, come the Estimates Committees, there will be a great deal of interest in subjects of that nature to determine precisely what bolstering this Government is doing because of the dictate that it takes from South Terrace rather than positive action taken here on North Terrace. So it can go on in a number of other areas.

I want to say very briefly that the pearls of wisdom which are dotted through the document, which can be sourced to

the reality injected into this matter by Treasury officials, show a great reality in a number of quite vital areas. More is the pity that the reality expressed by those officers, whose actions were denied any form of acknowledgment by the Premier in the presentation of this document, has been diluted by the injection of the Government's rhetoric. I welcome some of the announcements. Indeed, the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon clearly indicated that he welcomed a number of the new initiatives and, more particularly, the continuance of initiatives taken by the previous Government because they were projects which had benefited and will continue to benefit the South Australian community.

I welcome the fact that there is an extra funding in respect of the South Australian Housing Trust and in the vital area of housing, but I question whether the benefits which we are looking for will accrue to the people of South Australia because of the rather shoddy start to a 1983-84 building programme forced upon the Housing Trust by the lack of action of the Government that sits opposite. It is interesting, in the table which appears on page 15 of the *South Australian Economy* document, to recognise the number of new dwellings which were approved in South Australia from the period 1975-77 through to 1982-83. The source of this material is the A.B.S. Catalogue No. 8702.0, 8701.4. It is statistical material, and I seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Table 8.3—Number of New Dwelling Approvals—South Australia

Year	Private		Government		Total	
	No.	Per cent change over year	No.	Per cent change over year	No.	Per cent over year
1976-77	12 271		2 121		14 392	
1977-78	7 941	— 35.3	1 592	— 24.9	9 533	— 33.8
1978-79	6 679	— 15.9	1 465	— 8.0	8 144	— 14.6
1979-80	6 781	+ 1.5	1 897	+ 29.5	8 678	+ 6.6
1980-81	6 403	— 5.6	1 418	— 25.3	7 821	— 9.9
1981-82	6 377	— 0.4	1 745	+ 23.1	8 122	+ 3.8
1982-83	6 456	+ 1.2	2 333	+ 33.7	8 789	+ 8.2

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: It is very important to recognise that the Government building programme in 1982-83 of 2 333 homes was a 33.7 per cent increase on the figure for the previous year. It followed a 23.1 per cent increase in 1981-82, and a decrease of 25.3 per cent in 1980-81, which is the follow-on programme of the previous Labor Administration. So, it clearly picks up that the Liberal Party in Government was attuned to the needs of people in respect of housing, and played a significant role in seeking to meet a number of those needs. It is a great pity that the sum of money which was available for expenditure in South Australia earlier this year as a result of the housing funds available from the wage pause was denied to the State Treasury, as were funds for job creation because South Australia, like a number of other States in Australia, had not got its act together and was not expending the funds which were specifically available for housing and job creation.

They were amassing wealth against expenditure at a later stage. This Government stands condemned for having to be called into line by the present Hawke Government and having its funds withheld until such time as it got on with the job. That does not help the needs of the public in South Australia in regard to housing requirements. In the Estimates Committees I will be looking closely at a number of the initiatives taken by this Government and relating and comparing them to the positive initiatives and actions taken by the previous Government. I indicated earlier that the Leader

of the Opposition showed clearly this afternoon an alternative: a positive obtainable alternative.

Briefly, I want to recap one or two of the positive statements associated with that presentation. Had a Liberal Government remained in office, we would have eliminated departmental over-spending and the cost of implementing election promises would have been less. We would have spent slightly more on capital works last financial year and proceeded with O-Bahn, the Finger Point scheme, and the work at Cobdogla. We would have improved job opportunities for South Australians at a time when the present Labor Government allowed those figures to blow out.

As a result, last year's accumulated deficit would have been reduced by almost \$20 million to \$44.7 million. The present Government let the figures blow out to \$63.7 million. This year, rather than increasing spending in real terms by about 4 per cent—although publicly stating that it is only about 2 per cent, the normal on-going departmental activities—we would have held departments largely within the 1982-83 spending limits, with some real increase of about 1 per cent, a saving of about \$36 million.

Our public sector employment policies would have reduced the salary and wages bill by about \$24 million. We would have spent slightly more on capital works to continue the O-Bahn busway to Tea Tree Plaza, and the Finger Point project, again stimulating employment. Our overall savings would have avoided tax increases, and we would have

reduced the accumulated deficit by just over \$3 million. The accumulated results at the end of 1983-84, under a continuation of the Liberal Government, would have been a deficit of \$41.5 million, \$26.5 million less than the expected result under Labor Government policies.

It is clear that members on this side will be pleased to go out into the community and tell people of whatever political persuasion they meet that there is an alternative that is less costly to the people of this State. We are not satisfied that the ego trip and fantasy land, which is the world in which the Premier functions, is good for South Australia. We recognise that it is not. Clearly, the Premier's Budget has increased the departmental spending of \$23 million last year by over 10 per cent. In other words, he has added to that gross over-spending by at least another \$2.3 million. That 10 per cent has been injected into all accounts, against the best interests of South Australians and causing an increase in the expenditure by way of taxation to South Australians.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): It is gratifying to see that this year's Budget allocation includes grants for the introduction of high technology into high schools and an amount for the continuing development of Technology Park. The advantage of a country turning to technological advancement was soundly presented to me in January this year when I had the privilege of making a private visit to Singapore. While there I took the opportunity to inspect sections of manufacturing industry, particularly the printing industry. I was amazed at the progress that Singapore has made with its industrialisation since 1977.

In recent years I have also visited Hong Kong and while there took the opportunity to have a quick look at its manufacturing industry. The manufacturing industry is significant to South Australia because of our pre-eminent position in the manufacturing field. South Australians necessarily rely on the manufacturing industry for wealth generation. The overall impression that I formed from these visits was that it is difficult, and will become more difficult, for South Australian manufacturers to compete against the industrial countries of Asia because of their geographical, wages and conditions and cost advantages.

If one looks into the future one sees that it is most unlikely that Australian living standards will be lowered in an attempt to match the wage rates and conditions in Asian countries. To illustrate my point, I recall visiting a corrugated box manufacturing factory in Singapore. If that factory were located in Australia it would provide hours and hours of work for a union official. The safety conditions in that factory have to be seen to be believed. Corrugated boxes were stacked from floor to ceiling and machinery was situated at the back, a combination of factors making it difficult for employees to escape in the event of a fire. I have seen the floors of factories in these countries covered with offcuts and people working guillotines in extremely dangerous situations. I became aware of a situation where contracted labour rates were determined by the Government for a particular factory and then reduced for guest workers from Indonesia. I also observed people working outside stripping cartons by hand and counting, stacking and bundling by hand in tropical conditions—conditions that most Australian workers would find difficult to put up with.

These are the sorts of conditions in some areas of Asia with which we are competing. It seemed very logical to me, therefore, that South Australia's tertiary and industrial brain power must be turned towards higher technology in order to compete. It was my impression that unless the State was prepared to turn to the production of higher technology and brain-based industries, its chances of survival in a modern industrial sense would be very slim indeed. The Ministry for Technology was created by this Government immediately upon its election. The Minister, together with the new

Department of State Development, has been given special responsibility for encouraging development of brain-based industries in South Australia. Much South Australian industry is unproductive and of low profitability.

We believe that a considerable proportion of industry can be made productive again by the introduction of new technology projects. I have seen the introduction of new technology into the printing industry, and I have seen industrial relations improved and enhanced by the way in which new technology has been introduced into some firms by enlightened management. On the other hand, I have seen some firms in South Australia run into untold troubles and disruption because of a power approach to industrial relations in respect to the introduction of new machinery and technology. Technology to the employee is often frightening and connected with fears of unemployment.

I applaud the State Cabinet's approved guidelines for the introduction of technological change to protect the interests of the public sector, employees and employers. Similar guidelines are operating federally and in New South Wales, Victoria, and Tasmania. The guidelines aim to encourage consultation and negotiation on any proposed changes. Guidelines were developed by the South Australian Council of Technological Change in consultation with the Public Service Board, the Public Service Association, and the United Trades and Labor Council. It is agreed that rapid changes created by new technology have been introduced into sections of the Public Service. The adoption of guidelines is to ensure a smooth transition and protection for everyone involved.

The speed with which technical improvements are occurring is leading to feelings of insecurity by those who may be affected and in some cases widespread misjudgment of technology has occurred. Technology is, among other things, a social process. It affects social values and attitudes to work. It may provide new aspirations and occupations or, conversely (and this has been my experience), diminishing work opportunities. The complexity of the change of employment, skills, and education makes it increasingly difficult to formulate a proposal in regard to new technology, an introduction that will gain the unanimous support of all concerned. I hope that the introduction of new technology in the public sector will utilise the guidelines produced by State Cabinet in every particular. Technological change and the introduction of modern production equipment has affected every section of industry and, in particular, the industry with which I was associated, the printing industry.

Every investment in the printing industry meant rationalisation, both technical and in work organisation. The rationalisation of work process affects work-people. Traditional manual work processes changed into industrial production runs. The principal negative consequences of unrestrained introduction of new techniques are job losses, deskilling and transfer to different jobs at lower pay. As a result, workers find themselves in a wholly insecure employment situation. There is a need to safeguard and improve social and material standards. Provisions governing the staffing of machinery and equipment should be negotiated with due regard to greater physical and psychological stress and they should be strongly observed.

Overtime should be restricted in favour of new engagements. When negotiating duty rosters, allowance should be made for absences from work due to holidays or illness. For overtime, shift work and night work, as well as for Sunday and statutory holiday work, adequate extra rates or additional time off should be negotiated. The prodigious increase in productivity should provide the opportunity to lower the retirement age. Superannuation schemes should be so devised as to allow for early retirement. The Government superannuation schemes have now changed to meet

this requirement but, unfortunately, the private sector generally has not.

Above everything else there is a need to provide for protection against dismissal because of redundancy. Unfortunately, Australia lags behind the rest of the world so far as legislation for job protection is concerned. The ability to move to a new world producing industries utilising technological change is undoubtedly connected to the education system. Dr Peter Ellyard, Director of the Ministry for Technology, South Australia, stated in a recent paper to the Australian National University:

Our biggest single challenge is our education system. The Premier of South Australia, John Bannon, made a deliberate choice when he gave responsibility for technology to the same man who was responsible for education. The Japanese technological miracle really is more a result of the impact of public education, than any other factor. Some of the challenges before us are to develop in our population attitudes, values and skills which result in the development of a critical, but positive, attitude to technology. The two extremes of neo-luddite abhorrence or unbridled adulation to technology are both highly undesirable. People must also reject a philosophy of technological determinism and they must have the confidence and knowledge that they can control and manage technology and not the other way around. A second area for attention at levels of the education system is the development of skills appropriate to future needs. Australia, for example, is producing insufficient computer specialists. For example, Singapore has committed \$80 million in the next three years to achieve an output of 700 trained computing professionals each year.

The current figure in Australia is about 1 200. When one considers that Singapore has one-sixth of Australia's population, one hardly needs to argue the lamentable performance of Australia in this regard. However, the most important skill to be acquired, must be the skill to acquire yet more skills. The world is changing so rapidly that this challenge is the most important of all. The development of skills is not only needed in our professional development education streams but also in general education streams. We must be deeply worried at the inadequate numeracy of a large number of Australians and, particularly, female Australians. This is a deeply worrying facet which must be attacked directly. We must be on our guard to prevent the splitting of the country into two halves: a wealthy, technology literate part and a poor, technology illiterate part—a deepening of the division between two cultures first described by C.P. Snow. Even people not professionally involved in the world of technology must have much higher technological literacy.

The introduction of new technology has placed greater stress on training and retraining. I found that, while people on the shop floor were interested in the benefits of the introduction of new technology (including shorter working hours and increased pay), they were more interested in retaining their place in the work force. The only way they could achieve this was by retraining, operating new techniques, and mastering new technological processes requires that a more comprehensive, theoretical and practical knowledge should be imparted to all workers. Utmost attention should be paid to improved occupational mobility of workers. The right to work is closely linked to the right to industrial training, and further training rests with the Government and the employer organisations.

I would like to say something very briefly about the problem of industrial health with the introduction of new technology. The introduction of new technologies has a crucial impact on the conditions of work and hence also on health and safety requirements. The psychological and physical intensity of work in industry is increasing steadily. Accidents at work and industrial disease are multiplying. Timely investigation of the effect produced by new technology and production processes on the working and living conditions of the work force, safety at work, health supervision and the improvement of the working environment should be ensured by regular medical examination. Physical and psychological stress at the work place is increasing. This requires strict observation of the provisions laid down by agreements and awards. Work and health risks must not be compensated by money. The proper way to deal with this

problem is the removal of their causes. Optimum ergonomic conditions should be created at all work stations. Attention to details in relation to the working environment (including lighting, ventilation and noise) is of absolute paramount importance. I will, when the opportunity presents, explore the question of industrial health at the appropriate time, sufficient to say that there is a need with the introduction of new technology to look closely into these matters.

I have been involved in the industrial field for many years. Many of the things to which I have been alluding are the things with which I have been dealing all of my industrial life. It is true to say that, in many ways, over the years with many of my colleagues, we have attempted to slow down the technological process. However, having seen industry in other countries and the current recession we are in, the only conclusion that one can draw is that we must utilise technology as far and as quickly as we possibly can. I support the gathering of knowledge of what our intellectual assets in Australia are: the capital investment in research and development; the fact that we must come to fundamental grips with the issue of technological change in Australia; the need to stimulate research and development activities by as many means possible; South Australia needs to apply the appropriate technology to its existing industries; and we need to nourish new activity in the so-called 'sun rise' industries.

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

Mr FERGUSON: Before the dinner adjournment I was telling the House of our need to gather knowledge about what are our intellectual assets in Australia, and about the need for greater capital investment in research and development of technology. I also refer to the fact that we have not yet come to fundamental grips with the issue of technological change in Australia, which is something that we must do. I also believe that we need to gather the wealth of talent that is available in the universities, the C.S.I.R.O. and the colleges of advanced education. There is a need to pool our resources to centralise research and development in a common attitude.

However, none of those things will work unless, above all else, we develop in the industrial relations area a closer co-operation between management and unions concerning the introduction of technology. I sincerely hope that many of the things that I have mentioned earlier will be taken into consideration in the industrial relations field for the benefit of South Australia in particular, and for Australia as a whole.

In the time that I have left for my speech, I wish to refer briefly to the tourism line in the Budget. It is extremely pleasing to see that the allocation for tourism this year has been increased to \$5.665 million, an increase over last year of \$1.577 million. This follows an increase in the previous year of almost the same amount. It is very pleasing to note that the increase in the tourism budget will mean a substantial increase in marketing tourism for South Australia. In previous speeches I have mentioned the major initiatives taken by the Department of Tourism in the advertising of South Australian tourism through the Sydney media, principally on television. The increased allocation will assist in increasing that initiative.

It is worth while recording that heavy spending, amounting to \$450 000, will continue in regard to the Victorian media this financial year. The other amount of money included in the increase will be used for grants to the Regional Tourist Association and town tourist offices beyond the amount necessary to keep pace with inflation. Worthwhile increases in tourism will not occur unless people concerned with it seek to provide relatively unique or high quality leisure experiences for the visitor. It is gratifying that the

Department of Tourism has accepted the challenge and that the State Government is providing the finance to allow that challenge to be fully realised.

I was extremely pleased to read a press release of the Premier on 8 July 1983 which indicated that the Government had approved the first stage of a \$27 million marina and tourism resort development for Porter Bay at Port Lincoln. The development will include a marina for the local commercial fishing fleet as well as facilities for recreational boating. The development will also include a sizable residential component. The tourism component of the project introduces a new and exciting concept to tourism in South Australia.

It is envisaged that the project would involve long-term expenditure on a land-locked marina complex involving some 31 hectares of internal waterways and residential blocks. Safe harbour facilities for the entire commercial fishing fleet of Port Lincoln, which is Australia's biggest tonnage fishing fleet, and recreational and pleasure boat facilities will also be provided to answer existing and future needs. A total of 150 berths will be provided.

A major tourist resort complex comprising 130 units from cabin accommodation through to luxury marina frontage apartments, ultra-modern resort facilities and water-front areas with a general fisherman's wharf theme are involved. There will be a major recreational/aquatic community centre to serve the local community, plus visitors. The job creation factor common to all tourism related projects can only be described as introducing a new era to Port Lincoln which in particular suffers from higher than average unemployment. Employment flow-ons to the State could also be significant.

The project includes a 48-unit hotel/motel. The hotel/motel should also include a function room capable of accommodating small conventions, a heated swimming pool to sustain appeal during the winter months, a sauna and gym facilities and tennis courts in true resort style. The introduction of this resort into South Australia will add significantly to the mixture of tours and packaged holidays that are available in South Australia. Some of the suggested combinations of package holidays could be:

1. Flinders Ranges/Port Lincoln.
2. Flinders/Port Lincoln/Barossa.
3. Murray cruise/Flinders/Port Lincoln.
4. Port Lincoln/Coastal islands/yacht cruise.
5. Port Lincoln/various wine areas.

The imminent sealing of the Stuart Highway is expected to initially double the traffic from the centre with a large range of fly/drive (car and camper and coach) options becoming available. Exciting possibilities exist, for example, a tour containing Sydney/Ayers Rock/Ross River/Port Lincoln/wine regions/Adelaide, or possibly Sydney areas/Ayers Rock/Port Lincoln/Adelaide. This particular facility will also include a caravan park component. Low cost holidays would also be available in this area.

Estimates have been made that in 1980-81, 77 000 visitors stayed in Port Lincoln of whom 60 000 stayed in commercial forms of accommodation, 17 000 staying with friends or in their own holiday houses. The results provided an average of 210 visitors per day circulating in the city.

The present Tourism Minister and his whole department must receive congratulations for the way in which tourism has been promoted recently, and in particular the department and Director of Tourism should be congratulated on their involvement in several projects, including the proposed tourist complex at Porter Bay. I am sure that their efforts will be brought to a successful conclusion.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): On 11 August 1982 in the Address in Reply debate I referred (page 388 of *Hansard*) to an article in the *Business Review Weekly* of 24-30 July 1982,

under the heading 'Who runs Wran?', which contained a statement attributed to one of Neville Wran's former staff members, who stated:

... tax increases were due in last September's Budget. We couldn't do it then because there was an election coming on.

I went on in that speech (page 391 of *Hansard*) to refer to the article to say:

The Growth of Government. Demands for inflation protection have led to a steady swelling of Government spending. Since 1960, the portion of gross national product consumed by Government in the major industrial countries has gone from 28 per cent to 38 per cent. Though taxes have risen sharply during that period, they have not kept up with spending. Virtually every country is running a record budget deficit. In Italy the 1982 Government short-fall is expected to be an astonishing 13 per cent of G.N.P.

What this all means is the increase in Government benefit in this magnificent era. New South Wales has faced the problem, and South Australia has had the problem and we have set out to rectify it. All I can say to the Opposition regarding the lead up and recent promises is 'Be warned and be careful.' Rational decisions need to be made now to prepare for our future and future generations. We as a Parliament owe future generations more than we inherited. This Parliament must be mindful of its responsibilities, particularly in handling taxpayers' money.

The speaker who followed me was the then Leader of the Opposition, now the Premier, who had this to say:

Following on from the contribution by the member for Hanson, it is certainly true that, in developing any programme for government in these difficult financial times, one must pay close attention to the financial resources available and to the efficiency with which those resources are spent, and we have been conscious throughout our period in Opposition of just that responsibility. It often seems to me extraordinary that the present Government, with its abysmal record of financial management of this State, is constantly trying to suggest that we in some way are responsible in terms of financial management in what we are proposing, when we are very careful in what we propose and how we propose it. However, no doubt all that will be canvassed and debated in the course of the coming general election campaign, if not sooner.

I repeat that that was on 11 August 1982. The then Leader of the Opposition (now the Premier) was aware that there would be an election within the next six months; as it happened, it was in November 1982, and he and his Party were successful. But, I remember what the then Leader said, and I took him, like a lot of other people did, as sincere: that when he said he would not increase taxes he meant it, but we find that he followed what Neville Wran did. I believe that Wran was the one who started this push throughout the country of empty promises: promise no tax increases; retain or win Government at all costs. So Wran won Government in September 1981 on the policy of no tax increases. Then, there was an election in Victoria. Mr Cain won and said that he would not increase taxes and, certainly, he increased taxes in every way that he could; he revived many areas of Government charges and increased them considerably. Then we had the election in South Australia.

Then we had an election in Western Australia, where Burke, of course, increased taxes as quickly as he could, and even had the audacity to reduce the wages of some public servants in Western Australia—something which the Labor Party cannot do in this State because of the clear policy of the A.L.P. This was contained in the A.L.P. State platform 1981, as amended, and section 4.3 states:

Ensure that no employees under the Public Service Act, staff of statutory authorities or weekly paid employees, or employees under an Act of Parliament are retrenched, suffer a drop in salary, or are forced to transfer to a place of employment which increases their daily travelling time unreasonably.

So, this Government now is locked into a situation where it must uphold the platform policy, of which section 4.2 states:

Where possible, regulate its financial position by raising tax rates rather than cutting public expenditure programmes.

So, when the Budget document was finally presented to the State Parliament that is exactly what the Premier, as Treasurer, did: he increased taxes rather than cut his Party's programmes. I am not advocating cutting the programmes, because the Premier would be as aware as I am that at least 90 per cent to 95 per cent of the cost of operating his Government is a fixed cost. It is there: it was established before he came into office and was established before the previous Liberal Government came into office; so, it is an ongoing cost.

It is somewhere between 90 per cent and 95 per cent, and that leaves little room for any new Government to move in introducing new programmes, unless they are extremely cost effective. That is the situation with which this Government is faced. Indeed, I wish that the Premier and his Treasury advisers would write that into the documents and tell the people of South Australia that there is an established cost of administering this State and, whether we like it or not, that cost is there.

What we have to do is try to be efficient. The challenge in this State, more than in any other Australian State, is to be efficient in handling taxpayers' moneys. If the Government wants to increase taxes, if it is written in its policy, as it is written in the Labor Party policy to increase taxes, it should come out and say so. Certainly, it is no good coming out after elections, as we have heard year after year, and talking about misleading advertising. Indeed, there is no doubt that all political Parties are responsible in that respect. If anyone goes to the polls and says that they will not increase taxes, that is what I would expect.

A tradition has been dishonoured in this Parliament. We had the announcement of various tax increases and Government charges well before the Budget was brought down. We even had legislation passed through this House before the Budget document was debated. So, there was little in the Budget document at all that the people of South Australia felt was new, except for one or two announcements of new programmes or additional funding. Therefore, I regard the Budget document and its presentation to be as boring as did the previous speaker.

The Budget was designed deliberately so that the people of South Australia were totally conditioned to tax increases. The timing was perfect, because the tax increases were well out of way before the Hawke Federal Government introduced its Budget, which was not a pleasant Budget. However, we were led to believe that it was going to be far more severe than it was. Of course, that man in Queensland decided to pull an election and so for the time being the Federal Budget is a tame document—

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: There is a lot of pork barrelling for Queensland.

Mr BECKER: Yes, there is a lot of pork barrelling for Queensland, as the honourable member says. There is no doubt that Mr Hawke has seized the opportunity to assist his colleague to win Government in Queensland. True, I am too far away from the scene to predict what is going to happen: all I hope is that, no matter what the result, Queensland will get a Public Accounts Committee. That is what it has always needed—all States need it. I remember some years ago telling my colleagues in Queensland that I would come up free of cost—unlike Bob Hawke, who charges anything up to \$1 500—and talk on the necessity for a Public Accounts Committee in Queensland. However, I have yet to see—

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Is it a slush fund?

Mr BECKER: No, he claimed that he paid income tax on it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hanson must not be harassed.

Mr BECKER: I have yet to be convinced that the \$109 million overrun of the State Budget has been entirely the responsibility of the previous Government. I have yet to be convinced that even anywhere near that amount is the responsibility of the previous Liberal Government. I have said publicly that I would not be party to a Budget document that was false or misleading. Therefore, I am concerned. I have studied it. Indeed, I am grateful that this afternoon miraculously the Auditor-General's Report appeared on my desk. I was under the impression that it would be three weeks late.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: What nonsense!

Mr BECKER: I have double checked my source of information on that, and I am surprised at the statement made in that regard. I am disappointed that the Government did not stick to the previous tradition when the report was brought down in conjunction with the release of the Budget. Dunstan did that for many years. We had the two-week Royal Show break to study the report—one or two of us would do that; not many people have ever read it—and we were able to ask some very embarrassing questions of the Government of the day. That situation was changed just before the change of Government, and certainly the Liberal Government did not bring down the Auditor-General's Report at the time of the Budget.

I am disappointed about that, because I believe that that report should have been brought forward at that time as well. This report being made available today is sticking to recent tradition, and that is acceptable. I do not mind whether the Auditor-General's Report is brought down on the day on which we start the Budget debate. I am pleased to have it here, and pleasantly surprised at its format and at some of the comments made in it, to which I will refer later. However, I am yet to find in the report the clear proof I want about Budget blow-outs. If one looks at the Treasurer's line, one sees that there has been almost \$13 million in excess expenditure. I realise that when there is a change of Government and a change of portfolios additional expenses can be incurred. This Government has been unfortunate in that during its term of office the bushfire disaster and flooding in the Barossa Valley have occurred.

The allocation in the Treasurer's line will be increased by \$16.8 million to cover interest on bonds, bills and stock pursuant to the Public Finance Act. This means that the State will be paying some \$220 million in interest on borrowings. This expense will have a fair impact on the Government's fund raising and expenditure. Some of the tax increases that have been implemented will immediately be absorbed in this \$16.8 million additional interest. That hurts!

The other area of concern is the considerable increase in pumping costs and the associated cost of electricity due to dry conditions. The previous Liberal Government was not responsible for that happening as it could not predict how the season would come out and how much pumping would cost. Therefore, it was fair and reasonable for it to have allowed the average allocation for pumping costs. I remember that the Minister of Water Resources was under attack about whether or not he was preparing for a long, hot, dry summer. He, quite rightly, did not panic and, as it has turned out, some of our reservoirs are now overflowing. That is tremendous! It is good to see that the Minister was not stampeded by some of the tactics used at that time.

Nobody could have predicted that the Government would have to meet those sorts of costs. Huge deficits have occurred again in the transport area, being some \$10 million over expenditure. We find that the Budget has been over-run by \$50.4 million in the health area. There is good reason to be concerned about what has happened in that area. There was a \$39 million expenditure over Budget in the education

area. We know that additional jobs were created in that area, and I do not object to that if the Government can afford the expense without increasing taxes. However, those extra jobs explain some of the huge cost increase in that area—about \$280 million over-run on the Budget presented to this Parliament. An amount of \$105 million was provided for salary and price increases, reducing the figure to \$108 million. I am not happy at all to see the huge increases that taxpayers will face this year and in the future (more so in the future).

While I am looking at the Government's taxation increases, I must say that there is little we can do as a Parliament except realise that this Government proposes to raise \$627 million in indirect taxes and that of that amount \$235 million will come from pay-roll tax.

I can well remember the Premier saying on many occasions that he would like to see pay-roll tax abolished. I do not know what the Premier will do to replace the \$235 million that pay-roll tax brings in. That tax is costing jobs—there is no doubt about it. I believe that we in this country have been conditioned for some time to accepting a value-added tax. That would be the only form of tax which could be introduced and considered a fair and reasonable tax if one wanted to replace pay-roll tax. In other words, consumers would pay according to their spending level and, if a person bought luxury items, which would be subject to value-added tax, he would pay more. Those who could afford it would pay for it. That could well be an area to which the Government could look to follow its policy of fairer distribution of tax collections. That is the only way in which the current Government could finance some of its programmes or replace pay-roll tax.

The Acting Auditor-General should be complimented. The previous Auditor-General, Gar Tattersall, retired on 24 June after a very long, loyal, and dedicated career in the South Australian Public Service. Gar Tattersall was responsible for bringing about a different approach to auditing in Government agencies. He sought consensus, co-operation and tighter management. The Public Accounts Committee appreciated what he and his staff were trying to do, and after the first year of my chairmanship we found that we worked very well together. I believe that the P.A.C. was better for that association, as was the Auditor-General's Department. The relationship provided an opportunity for the Auditor-General's staff to come to the P.A.C. and to be involved in some of our investigations. In the preface to the Auditor-General's Report (and it is very important that I read some of the comments that were made), it was stated:

Another matter of considerable concern that was referred to the Treasurer was in relation to the operations of the Country Fire Services which had serious liquidity problems as a result of subsidy commitments far exceeding available funds. As a consequence, additional financial assistance was provided. This exercise was carried out prior to the February bushfires.

The P.A.C. has been investigating the Country Fire Services for some time—in fact, before the change of Government. It was most unfortunate that the P.A.C. happened to be in Mount Gambier in the South-East when the disastrous Ash Wednesday bushfire broke out. Needless to say, we left the area as quickly as we could so that we would not be a hindrance. That experience gave us the opportunity to appreciate the valuable service offered by the C.F.S. and the wonderful volunteer spirit and organisation. Like a lot of our statutory authorities, the C.F.S. has lacked working capital since it was restructured. It needs a great deal of support and I believe that that is now coming. The P.A.C. is yet to report on the C.F.S. and I will not pre-empt that report or go into any of the committee's findings. The Auditor-General further stated:

Some significant changes have taken place in public sector financial management through programme performance budgeting,

enhanced accounting systems, improved reporting techniques, and close scrutiny in some areas by the Public Accounts Committee. These factors have the effect of fostering efficiency and effectiveness.

I support that comment. There is, and there has been for some years, a greater awareness of accountability in the Public Service, and the message is now getting through not only from the P.A.C. but also from the Government, which is concerned and which has established a working committee. The report referred to the Government's activities in this respect. In regard to a review of Public Service management, under the heading 'Specific comments', at page 11, it was stated:

The Government has established a committee to 'Review Public Service Management', with terms of reference to examine and identify means of improving the management and operational performance of the South Australian Public Service, giving particular attention to the role of the Public Service Board and its Department in facilitating the cost-effective implementation of Government programmes and policies. Specific terms of reference are to examine and make recommendations on:

- principles for effective, responsive and accountable management in the Public Service;
- the management roles, functions and responsibilities of central agencies and line departments and their responsibility to Ministers;
- the appropriate role, functions and operations of the Public Service Board in the management and control of Government activities;
- demands, pressures and constraints which affect the performance of the Public Service and the roles of departmental management and the Public Service Board in addressing them;
- organisational, staffing, procedural and other management matters requiring attention;
- amendments to the Public Service Act or other legislation which may be necessary to give effect to proposals;
- any other matters to which the Committee of Review is particularly directed by the Premier in the course of the enquiry.

I hope that that inquiry will not drag on and become another long boring effort to justify the means, because I know that the Public Service Board Chairman has been wanting to amend the Act. He is most concerned about some of the problems within the Board. I hope that the Government will accommodate that request. I refer also to comments on page 13 in regard to internal auditing, which is an important facet of departmental operations. I have said that for many years, and I believe it is high time that internal auditing was insisted upon and virtually made compulsory in every Government agency. If that were so, the next matter I have noted in the Auditor-General's Report might not occur to the extent that it has occurred.

Page 499 of the Auditor-General's report deals with theft of Government property and shows that for the year ended 30 June 1982 property stolen or lost amounted to \$259 000. That amount covered a considerable number of Government agencies. It is interesting to note that, to the end of June 1982, theft in the Education Department totalled \$170 000 including some \$90 000 of audio visual and photographic equipment. To the end of June 1983 the Auditor-General informs us that almost \$200 000 worth of equipment was again stolen from the Education Department. In fact, theft of Government property for the year ending 30 June 1983 totalled \$331 662. That is absolutely scandalous, as I have said on many previous occasions. Any Government that tolerates this level of theft, pilfering, incompetence or general laxness in protecting Government property should be severely reprimanded and should be made to account for it.

I cannot let the opportunity to mention this go by when, year after year, the Auditor-General reports to this Parliament on increasing amounts of theft of Government property. It would not be hard at this rate to estimate that, in the last four years, approximately \$1 million worth of equipment has been stolen from various Government agencies. The Department of Agriculture lost a chain saw worth \$300.

The Department for Community Welfare is always having problems. The Berri District Office lost a rubber raft worth \$225. The Central Western Group Home lost a safe worth \$492 and the Woodville District Office lost a computer worth \$3 656. Such prices are less sales tax: the true retail market value would be considerably higher. How can a department lose a small computer?

Fair enough, the Youth Project Centre at Magill lost a safe worth \$492 and a lawn mower worth \$206—they were stolen—and various filing cabinets and sundry items account for another \$780. But how was audio visual and photographic equipment worth \$100 730 stolen from the Education Department? The school council with which I have been involved installed security systems, and the greatest care is taken by the staff to ensure that equipment is protected. So how can \$100 000 worth of audio visual and photographic equipment be stolen? I do not believe it. Within the Education Department, \$32 910 worth of sporting equipment, \$29 159 worth of workshop equipment, \$15 608 worth of musical equipment, \$11 691 worth of office equipment, \$6 951 worth of grounds equipment, \$5 313 worth of science and home economics equipment, and \$16 030 worth of sundry items was stolen.

In relation to the Engineering and Water Supply Department at Bolivar, \$1 593 worth of technical equipment was stolen; at Gawler River, \$3 270 worth of minor plant was stolen; and \$17 583 worth of sundry items was stolen. In relation to the Fisheries Department, \$567 worth of camera equipment was stolen, and from the Highways Department, \$944 worth of pump and \$15 656 worth of roadside materials was stolen. Does not somebody take any care of Government property in this State? Sundry tools and equipment stolen amounted to \$4 599. In relation to the Department of Mines and Energy, another camera and calculator were stolen, and from the Department of Marine and Harbours an outboard motor worth \$700 was stolen. These are not all small items. I refer to a \$432 chain saw. Chain saws seem to disappear. I believe that we lost a lot of them once before. Two bicycles worth \$290 were stolen.

In relation to the Police Department, \$15 575 worth of communications equipment was stolen. What is going on in the Police Department, I ask, if it cannot even look after its own property? A battery charger worth \$1 200 was stolen.

In relation to the Public Buildings Department, a trailer and plumbing equipment worth \$2 768 were stolen from the Nailsworth High School. A motor vehicle worth \$4 000 was stolen (and not recovered) from the salvage depot at Richmond. Chances are that it was dumped along the Torrens River down my way. An air-conditioner worth \$625 was stolen from the museum. In relation to the Department of Technical and Further Education, audio visual equipment worth \$11 386 was stolen; workshop equipment worth \$2 510, and more photographic equipment was stolen. In relation to the Department of Transport at Warradale, rims and tyres worth \$685 and more sundry items were stolen.

I refer to shortages and theft of cash: \$555 of prisoners' cash was taken from Whyalla. The offender was not identified. It must be awful carelessness, laxity or just general incompetence when we read continuously of these amounts of money and property being lost. I am also staggered by some of the costs involved particularly in relation to the Department for Community Welfare. I think that it is a job for the Public Accounts Committee to look at the cost of running some of the Government institutions under the care of that department. It is very easy to criticise the department, but it does not have a very easy job; in fact, it has a tremendous amount of work to do, and it is under a lot of pressure. However, to look after one youth offender in the South Australian Youth and Remand Assessment Centre today, according to page 64 of the Auditor-General's

Report, costs \$73 000 per year. That is almost as much as the Premier—

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

The Hon. D.C. BROWN (Davenport): Of course, the Budget papers are very important documents because they set the course which the Government intends to take not only in terms of its own financing but also in terms of what it sees as its direction for the State and the State's economy. So often when we debate the State Budget we tend to look at it in terms of what is being spent by individual departments. However, it is a very significant financial document in terms of what effect it has on the outside or private sector economy. Therefore, this evening I would like to talk about the State Budget in the broadest possible terms. I think that, if we are to analyse this State Budget, the first thing we should do is look at the State's economy and the conditions under which the Budget is being considered. We must look at the weaknesses and strengths that exist within the State's economy and, therefore, at what the Budget should be attempting to achieve in terms of influencing the development of the economy.

I propose to briefly highlight some of the key features of the State's economy at present. First, unfortunately, South Australia has the highest incidence of unemployment in Australia. The average unemployment figure for the three months ended July this year was 11 per cent in South Australia, whereas it was 10 per cent for the rest of Australia. Unfortunately, South Australia had the highest average unemployment level over that three month period. Secondly, South Australia had the highest inflation rate in Australia during the past year. For the period from June 1982 to June 1983 the inflation rate in South Australia was 12.3 per cent, whereas the inflation rate for the rest of Australia was 11.2 per cent.

Another factor must be taken into account, namely, the very low population growth rate occurring in South Australia. In fact, it is about half the national average in terms of percentage population growth per year. For the period 1982-1983 the growth rate in South Australia was .77 per cent, whereas nationally the average figure was 1.51 per cent. Certainly, South Australia has the lowest population growth rate in mainland Australia: the only State with a lower population growth rate is Tasmania. In fact, it is interesting to see how the growth rate varies between the different States. In New South Wales it is 1.2 per cent; Victoria, 1.12 per cent; Queensland, 2.7 per cent (about four times South Australia's population growth rate of .77 per cent); Western Australia, 2.46 per cent; Tasmania, .56 per cent; the Northern Territory, 3.3 per cent; and the Australian Capital Territory, 1.88 per cent; with Australia's average being 1.51 per cent. Mr Deputy Speaker, I seek leave to incorporate in *Hansard* without my reading it a table on estimated resident population for each of the Australian States as of December 1982.

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

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Yes, Sir.

Leave granted.

Estimated Resident Population, December 1982, Australia, States and Territories (preliminary)

	Number (000)	% growth over 1982	% share of Australia
New South Wales . . .	5 332.2	1.21	34.91
Victoria	4 013.2	1.12	26.27
Queensland	2 449.9	2.71	16.04
South Australia	1 334.1	0.77	8.73
Western Australia . . .	1 351.4	2.46	8.85

Estimated Resident Population, December 1982, Australia, States and Territories (preliminary)

	Number (000)	% growth over 1982	% share of Australia
Tasmania	430.6	0.56	2.82
Northern Territory ..	131.4	3.30	0.86
A.C.T.	233.2	1.88	1.53
Australia	5 276.1	1.51	100.00

Source: ABS Cat. No. 3101.0

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: We have a very low population growth rate. Another disturbing feature is that the non-dwelling building industry, in other words, the building industry excluding the housing sector, faces the lowest level of activity for many years. Again, I will provide some figures to justify that point. I refer to table 8.4 in *The South Australian Economy* tabled by the Premier in his Budget papers. I stress that all the figures that I am referring to tonight are figures that I have collected from Government sources; they are not figures concocted by the Liberal Party in an attempt to provide a distorted picture or anything like that. They are figures that have been produced from Government sources.

TABLE 8.4—Non-Dwelling Building—South Australia

Financial Year	Value of Other Building Approvals ^(a) \$m	% change over year	Indicative Commercial Buildings Costs increases ^(b) —% change compared with year earlier	% change in real value of other building approvals
1976-77	284.8	—	—	—
1977-78	201.3	−29.3	+ 8.4	−34.8
1978-79	230.2	+14.4	+ 7.0	+ 6.9
1979-80	247.9	+ 7.7	+13.1	− 4.8
1980-81	254.3	+ 2.6	+13.5	− 9.6
1981-82	262.0	+ 3.0	+14.8	−10.3
1982-83	295.4	+12.7	+15.7	− 2.6

^(a) non-dwelling approvals at \$10 000 and over^(b) based on cost indices prepared by South Australian Construction Industry Cost Adjustment Committee for Commercial construction projects with labour/material mix of 45.55.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I now turn to how South Australia's industry is heavily based on manufacturing. It is the one industry sector that is undergoing by far the greatest rationalisation at present. That rationalisation is occurring for two reasons: first due to the impact of the world recession that we are still in (which has particularly hit South Australia and Australia in the past year); and secondly, the impact of technological change. I will refer to that in more detail later. I refer to statistics collected by the State Government which show the dramatic effect of rationalisation on employment within the manufacturing industry.

Over a number of years the State Government has carried out a confidential sample of large manufacturing companies in this State. Once a month those companies are telephoned and asked to provide to the State Government their current employment situation. The State Government undertakes not to release any information on an individual company basis, but releases the accumulated figures for all of the companies surveyed. There are 87 companies in the survey and the figures show that the employment level at the end of June 1982 dropped from 62 897 to a level of 54 857 as at the end of March 1983. To the end of June 1983, 12 months after the initial figure, the employment level dropped to 53 208. In other words, it was a drop from about 63 000 to 53 000, a decline in real terms of about 19 per cent in the 12 month period. Therefore, in the past 12 months 87

If one looks at what has occurred with non-dwelling building in South Australia for some years, one finds that a very significant drop off in the level of non-dwelling building activity has occurred. In regard to the percentage change that has occurred (and I am referring to building activity in real terms—in other words, on a constant dollar basis), in 1977-78 there was a 35 per cent reduction in real building activity (non-dwelling) in South Australia. In the following year there was a 7 per cent increase; in the next year a 4.8 per cent decline; in the next year a 9.6 per cent decline; in 1981-82 there was a 10.3 per cent decline; and in 1982-83 a 2.6 per cent decline.

In five out of the last six years there has been a real decline in non-dwelling building activity in South Australia. That is an important factor that needs to be taken into account when framing the State Budget, because it is one sector that needs stimulating very badly. However, I will show later that the Budget, rather than stimulating that sector, has actually withdrawn funds, so that sector can expect a further decline in its activities in the next 12 months. Mr Deputy Speaker, I seek leave to insert in *Hansard* without my reading it a table showing non-dwelling building in South Australia. I assure you, Sir, that it is purely statistical.

Leave granted.

TABLE 8.4—Non-Dwelling Building—South Australia

of the State's biggest manufacturers reduced their employment by about 19 to 20 per cent; that is a fairly dramatic figure and one that the State Government needs to take into account when framing its Budget.

Technological change is occurring rapidly and there can be no doubt that it will definitely have an impact on employment opportunities. Although there was a lot of argument until several years ago that technological change or new technology would create new jobs as well as causing jobs to be lost in certain areas, it is fair to say that that is no longer the case, and people believe that there will be a net loss of jobs through technological change. It is also a change in the nature of the job opportunity that there will be fewer jobs but that those jobs which are available will require greater skills than previously. That is a factor, because of the rapidity with which change is occurring, and because it is so dramatic, that needs to be taken into account when examining where the State Government is spending its money. The vast majority of families in South Australia, either due to the six month wage freeze or because of the high levels of unemployment, have faced a tight financial position within the family during that 12 month period.

I doubt whether any of us here this evening have not, for one reason or another (after all, we are in what could be described as the upper income bracket), had to tighten our belts and go without things that perhaps five to 10 years

ago would have been taken for granted within the family. That is a fair reflection of now a vast majority of the community. Very few families now are better off than they were perhaps 10 years ago in Australia. Some families, of course, particularly those where unemployment affects the family, are now facing downright hardship.

High interest rates and the recession have caused quite a marked slump in private housing construction over the past few years. However, in the past three or four months there have been signs that that slump in housing, particularly in private housing, has lifted. I have not dealt there with public housing because the Government for a number of years—and it certainly occurred during the previous Liberal Government's period—artificially tried to increase the number of houses being built for the public sector. I do not criticise that. I certainly praise the effort in this Budget by the State Government to further lift that number of houses being built for the public sector. It is important and necessary, particularly when such a housing crisis exists within the community.

It is worth looking at the fact that the Budget has been framed on the basis that there has been a very sharp drop in private housing construction and that there has been no sign of that lifting. In fact, by the time the Budget was introduced it had started to lift; there were quite positive growth signs for at least three or four months. A number of companies have reported to me during the past week that private housing and construction approvals have lifted in their companies by between 12 per cent and 20 per cent in that four month period.

Mr Evans: One has to be conscious that one does not get so much public housing that the taxpayer cannot carry it as an incentive to go to public in lieu of private.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: The member for Fisher raises a very valid point: the long-term cost to the State of the public housing. It is one thing to put the money up to pay for the housing, but there is an ongoing subsidy for that housing because the rents do not cover it—and I think that that is the point that the member for Fisher is raising.

As a member of the Budget Review Committee, I remember some very interesting figures which were brought forward by the Treasury and which showed what an enormous burden that public housing would be on the State Government in five or six years. I will give to the House some figures on the change in private and public housing over the past three years. I start with 1980-81. I refer, first, to private housing (and this is the percentage change over the previous year). In 1980-81 there was a drop of 5.6 per cent in private housing; in 1981-82 there was a drop of 0.4 per cent—so it had slowed off. In 1982-83 there was a lift in private housing of 1.2 per cent. As I said, in the past few months it has lifted rather dramatically. In the same time, Government housing in the first year declined by 25 per cent; in the next year it lifted by 23 per cent; in the year after that it lifted by a further 33 per cent. This year, I think that I am quite right in saying that there is approximately a 30 per cent lift again in funds for public housing.

So, the Government has framed its Budget on the basis that a lot more funds need to be put into housing, even though the housing sector by comparison with the non-housing building industry has actually been doing remarkably well for at least the past 12 to 18 months. The signs are that it is likely to lift very dramatically without further stimulation by the State Government. In fact, funds have been allocated in this year's State Budget for up to 3 000 Government houses compared to about 2 300 last year.

The question has been raised as to whether there are vacant allotments already developed within the metropolitan area in South Australia that would allow that rate of construction to take place. The signs are that there are not the

vacant allotments available. As a result of that, the price of land has increased dramatically. For the so-called cheap blocks of land it has lifted this year already from about \$8 000 to \$12 000. Some builders would argue that it has lifted even further. I spoke to one builder last week who said that in the three month period the land that he had purchased previously at \$8 000 was now selling at about \$12 000.

That has occurred and the State Government must take the responsibility for it, because the then Land Commission (now the Urban Lands Trust) controlled most of the vacant allotments throughout the Adelaide metropolitan area at least on a large-scale basis.

The final point that I wish to raise about the economic environment that currently exists is that Commonwealth expenditure in this year's Budget and in last year's Budget has increased significantly in real terms. In fact, Commonwealth Government expenditure increased in 1982-83 by 18.5 per cent. It is estimated that in 1983-84 it will increase by 15.8 per cent. The deficit will increase from \$4 400 million in 1982-83 to \$8 361 million in 1983-84. I make that point because the Federal Government has decided to allow an increase of its expenditure at almost twice the inflation rate for this year. Whilst one does not criticise that necessarily (because in a recession it is one way of getting some areas moving quickly), one needs to look at the potential that it has for, first, forcing the Government to raise extra finance but, secondly, forcing up interest rates because of the money shortage that exists.

There is real evidence that the Federal Government will need to be very careful about creating too much demand on the money market, both local and overseas, thus forcing up interest rates and not allowing interest rates to naturally fall and follow the trend that has already been established overseas. Certainly, interest rates are starting to come down, but the full impact of the Federal Government's borrowing programme has not yet been felt.

I wanted simply to highlight those key features of the State economy, and I intend now to highlight some of the things in the Budget that flow from that. First, the State Government's recurrent expenditure this year, excluding one-off expenditures on individual items such as natural disasters, has increased by more than the anticipated inflation rate. There is an increase of \$213 million to \$2 174 million, an increase for 1983-84 of 10.9 per cent. Secondly, the State Government's taxation has increased substantially in comparison with last year as a result of six major tax increases: fuel tax, tobacco tax, liquor tax, financial institutions duty, increased stamp duty on insurance and the natural gas levy. An extra \$78 million in State taxes will be collected this year, representing an increase of 14.2 per cent. In other words, the Government is collecting extra revenue from South Australians. The real increase in State taxes will be about 7 per cent, if one takes into account inflation.

The third point that I highlight in regard to the Budget is that, despite a 14 per cent increase in State taxation, a record deficit last year and an accumulated deficit at June 1983 of \$63.2 million, this Budget introduced by the Premier will still leave South Australia in a worse financial position at the end of the financial year than at the beginning of it. There will be a further deficit of \$5 million during this year, taking the accumulated deficit to \$68.2 million.

This deficit would have been even greater if the \$28 million was not being transferred from the capital side of the Budget to meet recurrent expenditure. The part that concerns me is that we have had this dramatic jump in State taxation in a hope to correct the financial problems facing the State, yet this action has not corrected or wiped out the State's deficit: it has increased the State's accumulated deficit rather than decrease it through a staggering \$68

million. It still provides for the transfer of funds from the capital side, which would create jobs in the building sector across to meet the recurrent cost of running Government departments.

One can see that at the end of this financial year we are going to be locked into a situation where the Government's income still will not meet its outgoing expenditure and commitments on an ongoing basis. I know, after three years in Government, that it is not easy for a Government to suddenly tighten its belt and cut back on expenditure. Therefore, the position that this State Government will face next year is one of further substantial increases in State taxation, perhaps on a basis similar to the 14 per cent increase this year, or this State will be plunged into an enormous State deficit which will be added to the accumulated deficit so far of \$68 million. I predict that this State faces an almost disastrous financial position for the next few years unless the Government is prepared to contain State Government expenditure and to increase it by a smaller percentage than it is planning to do this year.

The next point I make about the Budget is that, despite the very depressed position of the building industry (excluding the housing sector), the Budget provides a real reduction in capital funds for this industry. I will quote some figures showing the change from 1982-83 to 1983-84 in expenditure in this area: for schools, a reduction from \$26.7 million to \$24 million; for technical and further education, a slight increase from \$16.2 million to \$17.3 million; and, for other Government buildings, a slight increase from \$25.9 million to \$28.3 million. If one adds those figures together the capital expenditure through the Public Buildings Department last year was \$68.9 million and this year it is \$69.65 million, an increase of only \$795 000, in actual terms 1.2 per cent. However, if one takes into account inflation in the building industry, this is really a decrease of 6 per cent to 7 per cent. One must take this into account when thinking of the figures I quoted earlier which show that the building industry has been declining for a number of years and is facing its worst position ever at present, at least since the depression in the 1930s.

I have some figures produced by the Australian Federation of Construction Contractors which appeared in a recently prepared paper in August 1983. It gives national figures, but the situation in South Australia is probably as bad as, if not worse, than that in the other States. The figures indicate that a lot of the anticipated building projects are now not proceeding and that the industry faces its worst situation for many years. It is expected that more than 24 000 construction jobs will be lost in the next 12 months.

Last week I had discussions with the Master Builders Association which indicated that the competitive position among building companies has never been greater simply because work is not available. Up to 29 major building contractors are presently tendering for one Government contract. In addition, a number of interstate companies are attempting to come into this State and take work away from local builders because the work situation interstate is lean. If ever there was a time when more money needed to be put into the building industry as such now is the time. I believe that the State Government has turned its attention to the housing industry and ignored the other building industry to the detriment of the industry because thousands of jobs will be lost here in South Australia.

I turn now to another area of my shadow portfolio, that of the Highways Department. The State roads funds for the construction of national arterial and rural roads in rural and metropolitan areas will be less this year than last year. In actual terms the reduction is likely to be at least 10 per cent when compared to last year. The Highways Fund will be held at the same level as last year, in other words at

\$40.2 million, but the contributions for administration, road safety programmes and the police will be higher than last year, therefore leaving less funds in the Highways Fund for road works.

Fortunately, Federal Government funds under the Australian Bicentennial Road Development Programme, which all motorists pay for with a 2c levy on each litre of fuel sold, will increase dramatically this year, and I can cite figures in regard to Federal Government funding increases. The Federal funds that come to South Australia will increase from \$68.8 million in 1982-83 to \$91.5 million in 1983-84, an increase of 33 per cent. I certainly welcome that, although I, with all other motorists, am actually paying for it through the Federal Government. That is an excellent programme and it will certainly lift the standard of roads in this and other States.

However, I am concerned that, because there will be a real reduction in State effort of about 10 per cent, the funds that we currently receive from the Federal Government for the Australian Bicentennial Road Development Programme are in jeopardy, because one of the severe conditions of that programme that the Federal Government is policing very tightly is that State effort for roads must be maintained. If there is a 10 per cent reduction in State effort (and even the Premier admits that a problem exists), our share of funds under the Australian Bicentennial Road Development Programme could be in jeopardy. I point out that normally South Australia would expect to receive 10 per cent of the funds under that programme, but already we are receiving only 6.7 per cent of all funds on a national basis. Therefore, if the figure was further reduced simply because the State Government had reduced its efforts, it would be most unfortunate for this State, particularly in regard to its roads.

Under the Budget, the funds for maintenance of Government buildings will be significantly reduced in 1983-84 as compared to the previous year, and I can cite figures in that regard. Maintenance for schools will be reduced from \$13.8 million to \$12.4 million, and maintenance for other Government buildings will be reduced from \$6.9 million to \$6.2 million, in other words a total reduction from \$20.7 million in 1982-83 to \$18.6 million this year. That represents an actual reduction of \$2.1 million, but in constant dollar terms it means a reduction of 17 per cent in maintenance. That is a very unwise decision for any Government to make, and I know that, having seen over three years the very poor state of many of the Government's assets.

For many years the Government has been simply cutting back on funds for Government assets. Some Government schools have been provided with new timbers in some buildings, which were coated with pink primer 10 years ago but which have not had a top coat of paint. The pink primer breaks down under the solar rays of the sun, and before long the timbers rot very quickly and have to be replaced. Therefore, when in government we increased substantially funds for school maintenance, and it concerns me greatly that those funds will now be reduced.

The allocation of funds for wages and salaries for employees of the Public Buildings Department has been reduced this year compared to last year, so that the Public Buildings Department will seek more funds for salaries and wages from the Loan works programme. The Government, according to its ideological philosophy, is once again transferring work from the private sector back to the Government sector at the expense of the private sector, and that is most unfortunate. I believe that the Budget fails to grapple with the significant economic problems that this State faces. Therefore, I predict that it will not achieve what the Premier has stated.

THE ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Klunder): Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): What a surprise! I am pleased to see you, Mr Acting Speaker, in the Chair: I look forward to the same kind of treatment that I know that you can provide for members of this place as is provided by other distinguished members who have occupied that Chair from time to time.

Those of us who took the trouble to stay in the Chamber this afternoon heard the Budget speech of the Leader of the Opposition. Regrettably, while a majority of Opposition members had the courtesy to listen to the Premier's explanation of his Budget, a majority of Government members did not have the courtesy or common sense to attempt to understand the views of the Leader of the Opposition about the directions in which the South Australian economy should be guided, to the extent that Governments do guide it, as Leader of the alternative Government in this State.

If they hope to understand the difference between the strategies which their Leader is advocating and those which the alternative Government is advocating, I would have thought that it was essential for them to have taken that trouble. However, they have chosen to be irresponsible in that regard. That is a salutary comment on the amount of interest they have in the proceedings in this Chamber. Most of them have read every speech they have made in this place since this Government came to office. They are therefore unable to join in the debate in the fashion that was intended when Parliamentary democracy in the Westminster style was developed to the point where it had some meaning. No debate really takes place in this Chamber when members simply stand and read speeches. They are unable to respond to the substance of the argument presented by other members in that the ideas they are projecting are in no way related to the ideas and arguments which have been presented by members who have gone before them. That is tragic.

I daresay that the way in which the Government and the Labor Party generally perform for politics and the community in Australia will deteriorate according to the extent (and directly proportionate to the extent) that they continue that practice. They do so at their own peril, not only because they then fail to make this institution a meaningful one to them in any other sense than as a rubber stamp for their policies, but also because the public will perceive them as being in no way interested in this institution for other than that reason. Accordingly, they will be less competent to reflect accurately public feelings about certain issues of policy. They will also have to rely more and more on the indoctrination of their public to ensure that the viewpoints which they are advocating are understood.

It is regrettable that public funds, whilst such a Party is in Government, will be used for that purpose. It means, of course, that we will get less benefit as a community from the taxes collected by Governments (particularly of this kind) if they are used to that extent in the way that will be necessary to ensure that the public understands what this Government is doing and why it is doing it rather than having a Government which understands what the public believes needs to be done and either does it or explains to the public why it cannot be done. It is very much the same in that general context as it is in a particular context in relation to this Budget.

Whilst the Labor Party's credibility at large (in the way it treats this institution with increasing contempt) is called into question, so also is the Premier's credibility called into question for the same reason as it relates to this Budget document. The Budget demonstrates that the Premier has put up taxes with the concurrence of his Ministers and Party supporters simply because he has failed to control departmental over-spending of more than \$23 million in the last financial year.

He is increasing Government spending this financial year by about 4 per cent in real terms. That is to employ more

people and to implement some election promises. Of course, those election promises are not of the kind which he has already broken. They are election promises which ensure re-endorsement of the Labor Party members at the next State convention (whenever that is held) after the new boundaries are drawn. If any member dares to question, let alone present an argument against the implementation of any such promises (like the one to increase workers compensation premiums) then that member can rest assured that he would fail to get re-endorsement at the next State convention, and we will see the kind of idiotic behaviour when pre-selections are being determined that we have seen in the past from members of the Labor Party just prior to the occasion on which those pre-selections are being determined. It always amazed me to read about it in *Hansard* at the State and Federal levels, and to observe it even more so during the course of the last Parliament. I was really astonished—

The Hon. D.C. Brown: I was also astounded to read how the Prime Minister—

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

Mr LEWIS: Yes, he was quite incredible in that regard. I wonder whether or not he has a hankering to continue that activity.

Mr Trainer: The member for Davenport has to pay people to listen.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEWIS: Whilst the member for Davenport may have to do as he may, I have to suffer the member for Ascot Park when he makes that kind of remark. He knows as well as I do that the public reputation of the member for Davenport is simply that he is an outstanding debater, regardless of his Party-political affiliations. That competence is demonstrated by his participation in those forums in which public speaking ability, quite outside involvement in politics, is assessed by adjudicators who see that—

Mr Trainer: Do you support him for Leader of the Opposition then?

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr LEWIS: Naturally I support the Leader of the Opposition whoever that may be whenever he is Leader of the Opposition. I very much doubt that the current Leader of the Opposition will be Leader of the Opposition for very long because he will be Premier after the next election.

Mr Trainer: Right and wrong.

Mr LEWIS: The honourable member is entitled to his opinions just as I am entitled to mine, and other members are entitled to their opinions as well. Nonetheless, I am disappointed.

I return to the point that I was making, namely, that the Government has found it necessary in the first real legislative initiatives that it has taken, to implement those promises which it made to the trade union movement and forget about all those promises which it made to the rest of the people. Every time I have spoken since the last election I have referred to those promises which have been broken. I refer to promises about the forms of taxation which the Government said it would not increase during its term of office. Actually it has increased many taxes, as I have stated in every other speech, and I will not go through them again as a list, but refer to them as the second broad reason why the Premier's credibility has to be called into account when considering this Budget.

The Budget buries the myth that taxes will go up because of financial mismanagement by the former Liberal Government. It always was a myth, and the very fact that this Budget is written in the terms that it is, clearly illustrates that taxes are not going up because of the former Government's management and aptitude: taxes are going up because

of this Government's mismanagement and ineptitude, and its inability to really bite the bullet when the need to do so has arisen.

For weeks the Premier dithered while the Leader of the Opposition in South Australia, the Prime Minister and the Premiers of all the other States had accepted the necessity for and had given leadership in the direction of the implementation of a wage pause. The Premier dithered, and members of his Party in this Parliament spoke contemptuously and derisively of the need for a wage pause. It was not until the Premier had received final approval from that place on South Terrace, which must give its approval to all things before they can be done in this place by the Labor Party, that he decided he would commit himself to the proposal.

I refer to some other aspects of the Budget. In terms of capital works, the Premier's credibility is in question again, because he has claimed that the Budget will result in a significant boost to jobs through increased capital works spending. However, that is largely illusory. By comparing like with like, as my Leader did earlier this afternoon, we can see that the increase this year is about 8.3 per cent. Possibly that is only a small increase in real terms, because whereas the Federal Treasurer has acknowledged that the Budget papers in the first instance were framed around an anticipated increase in the c.p.i. of about 7.5 per cent, or an increase in inflation of about that much, he has nonetheless conceded that the figure will probably be higher—not only higher than 7.5 per cent, but he is on public record as saying that it could be higher than 8.3 per cent. So, in fact, comparing like with like, there has been no increase whatever in capital spending, contrary to what the Premier has claimed.

While there is an increase in housing construction (and we, as members of the Opposition, applaud that) that is offset by the fact that cuts have occurred in the provision of the O-Bahn transport facility from the north-eastern suburbs to Adelaide involving rapid transit buses. Further, there have been cuts in expenditure for the provision of facilities for the absolutely vital Finger Point sewage works and the Cobdogla salt mitigation drainage and irrigation scheme, which desperately needs to be overhauled in the way that was originally proposed to be undertaken this year. Also, there have been cuts in school-building and school redevelopment programmes.

I want to pay particular attention to a couple of those matters. I refer to the stupidity of cutting expenditure for the provision of an appropriate sewage treatment works for the Finger Point effluent outfall from Mount Gambier. The Minister of Fisheries claims that he will make it illegal for people to take fish from within the immediate vicinity of that place, including crustaceans such as southern rock lobster and abalone, as well as other fish. I have seen abalone taken from an area 16 kilometres from the Finger Point effluent outfall discharge which have rapidly softened and deteriorated and been quite unfit for processing only a few hours after coming out of the water. They looked like a soggy cake of soap and quite unlike healthy abalone, and, therefore, they were quite unsuitable.

If that is the effluent's effect upon those crustaceae, it is high time that we re-examined our priorities. If those fish contain other contaminants apart from whatever bacteria, fungi, other pathogen, dissolved salt or poison there is, it only needs one of those fish to get into a pack of frozen fish for us to lose our entire abalone market. Perhaps it is arsenic, copper or chromium from the pine treatment works that is getting into the water and causing the problem; I do not know. However, it only needs some pathogen of human beings from that outfall to be discovered in those fish and we will lose the entire market. That market is worth several

millions of dollars to South Australia, and it will cost jobs not only of the fishermen collecting abalone but also in the processing works, where it is frozen and packed for market, in the South-East.

The second point I make involves school buildings. The Minister of Education, when spokesman for the Labor Party in Opposition, made a public statement and gave an undertaking to the people at Pinnaroo, the Labor Party sub-branch at Pinnaroo, and to this Parliament that he would not cut the Pinnaroo school-building programme, yet quite clearly that is exactly what he has done. That programme has been cut and interfered with. The work had originally been planned to continue immediately the gymnasium complex at that school was completed by the subcontractors as a team to the local contractor, Mr Bill Black. This Government has not only cut that project but has decided that, if and when it restores it to the capital works programme, it will be with day labour from Adelaide. It will impose a heavy burden on the South Australian taxpayer, involving a 20 to 30 per cent country loading, as the Public Buildings Department day-labour force from Adelaide will have to be accommodated at Pinnaroo, fares to and from having to be paid, and in consequence the facility costing a great deal more than it would have otherwise.

It will deny local people in that community the opportunity to obtain jobs during the period of construction, and it will also mean that those tax dollars, spent at Pinnaroo in a costlier fashion for the same facility, cannot be spent elsewhere.

Had we remained in office, there is no doubt that we would have eliminated departmental over-spending right away, and this project would have got under way.

Mr Groom: Which departments?

Mr LEWIS: It cannot get under way because of the slack and sloppy manner in which the member for Hartley's colleagues allowed their departments' expenditure to run away.

Mr Groom: I only want to know which departments—

Mr LEWIS: You name it, that's the department; just put your finger on it.

Mr Trainer: You'd cut the lot?

Mr LEWIS: I would not have allowed the sloppy administration that Ministers in the Party of the member for Ascot Park allowed immediately they came to office. They were clearly not in control of the responsibilities of their portfolios.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member for Ascot Park is out of order in interjecting.

Mr LEWIS: Yes, he even looks odd when he smiles. We would have eliminated that departmental over-spending, and the cost of implementing the election promises we made would have been less. The Liberal Party in Government would have spent slightly more on capital works last year, and this year it would have proceeded with O-Bahn, Finger Point and Cobdogla. As a result, in our scenario last year's accumulated deficit would have been reduced by almost \$20 million to about \$44.7 million, as was pointed out by our Leader. This year, rather than increase spending in real terms by about 4 per cent for normal ongoing departmental activities, the Liberal Party in Government would have held departments largely within their 1982-83 spending, with a small real increase of about 1 per cent—saving, therefore, about \$36 million.

I believe that the alternative strategy explained in detail by my Leader is a much simpler, more comprehensive and logical proposal. I am sure that members opposite will find that that is the case when they attempt to explain their Government's Budget strategy to the community. The Liberal Party's public sector employment policies, such as they were during our term of office between 1979 and 1982, would

have continued and would have reduced the salary and wages bill by about \$24 million in a full year—below what the present Government has decided to accept. We would have spent slightly more on capital works to continue the O-Bahn to Tea Tree Plaza and to undertake work at Finger Point, as I have pointed out. Our overall savings would have avoided tax increases, and we could have reduced the accumulated deficit by just over \$3 million; therefore, the accumulated result at the end of 1983-84 under a continuation of the previous Liberal Government would have been a deficit of about \$41.5 million, which is \$26.5 million less than the expected result under the Labour Party's policies—and nobody would have been hurt. We would have maintained those people in the Public Service who wished to remain employed there, but, where it was management-wise prudent to do so, we would have allowed the Public Service to responsibly reduce in number by attrition, as it did during the three-year term of the previous Liberal Government.

I turn briefly to what I regard as a rather abusive and unnecessary statement by the Premier in relation to the responsibilities of members of this Parliament and particularly backbenchers. The Premier said that backbenchers, particularly Opposition backbenchers, should not present to Parliament and to the Government any suggestion whatever as to the need for the provision of services from Government within their districts. The Premier said that members of the Opposition were arguing that the Government should not be increasing taxes. If it does not increase taxes it cannot possibly afford to finance expenditure requests made by members of the Opposition. That is nonsense! The fact that competing priorities have to be determined in some list order bears witness to that point.

All members wishing to properly fulfil their function in this place must first represent the interests of his or her constituents. Honourable members must properly and responsibly place in perspective what they regard as the most pressing needs that should be given some priority in the immediate future. Local members do not have to accept the responsibility for determining the priority in which requests for facilities and services are placed across the State, because they cannot do that. They are not aware of what is needed in the other 46 districts. Members are elected to represent one district. Accordingly, it was quite improper for the Premier to suggest that back-bench members of the Liberal Party ought not to represent to this place those needs requiring Government attention identified within the communities which they represent. That would be a dereliction of duty on our part, and it was irresponsible of the Premier to suggest that we should be derelict in our duty in that way.

Accordingly, I refer to several important projects that are being overlooked in my district. A project that relates to the Premier's personal Ministerial responsibility is the provision of an adequate and appropriate facility for the performing arts at Lameroo and Pinnaroo. Those communities sought and were refused assistance to improve facilities in their community institutes so that the performing arts could be more effectively and professionally staged in their community facilities. They sought a mere \$200 000.

However, in the name of cultural development, more than \$4 million is to be spent on a regional theatre complex in the Riverland, which is as remote from the people of Lameroo and Pinnaroo and their established patterns of travel, for any reason whatever, as is Adelaide. In fact, it is more remote. It is unjust and unreasonable to lump the people of Lameroo and Pinnaroo into the same basket as people in the Riverland community and claiming that the provision of a regional cultural centre in the Riverland will service their needs. It is as stupid as saying that, if we want

to see good opera, we should travel with Qantas to Britain and buy a ticket for Covent Garden.

We have clearly decided that we should have adequate facilities in this State, not just somewhere else overseas (or elsewhere in Australia) and, accordingly, we chose to build the Festival Centre complex. I add that the people in my district have been particularly hit and harder hit by the taxation measures announced by the Government since it came to office than most people. Therefore, in relation to this matter, the people in my district should be given more reasonable consideration than they received from this Government and previous Labor Governments over the past 10 years.

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

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Coles): A Government's Budget is the chief instrument by which it implements its philosophical goals and its election commitments; inevitably, they are the promises which ensure that it is elected to office. On both of those grounds, this Budget stands to be condemned.

On the latter ground, this Budget betrays the undertaking given by the Premier, when Leader of the Opposition, to the electors of South Australia prior to November 1982. On the former ground, in terms of a philosophical commitment, it leads South Australia down a path from which it will require a considerable effort for us to retrieve lost ground. In what I have to say about various aspects of the Budget this evening I want to demonstrate these two points. I will, of course, be making reference most specifically to the Budget as it affects the tourism industry and its effect on tourism are by no means confined to the Department of Tourism's budget: in fact, they range across many and varied portfolios and touch at least on the expenditure of almost all Ministers.

This Budget certainly demonstrates that the Premier has raised taxes, because he and his Ministers failed to control departmental spending. The financial statement from pages 14 onwards relates a quite extraordinary tale of over-expenditure by virtually every department. Under 'Payments', which are identified by department, the Financial Statement lists expenditure for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet as exceeding the Budget estimate by \$88 000—not a large sum, but, of course, not a large department. Public Service Board expenditure exceeded budget by \$114 000; and Treasury Department by \$660 000. Expenditure by the new Department of State Development and the Department of Trade and Industry, up to and including 9 March 1982, totalled \$2.03 million, exceeding the Budget estimate by \$405 000. The Department for the Arts expenditure exceeded budget by \$270 000; Department of Labour, \$589 000; Public Buildings Department, \$7.4 million (a massive increase); Attorney-General's Department, \$154 000; Department of the Corporate Affairs Commission, \$305 000; Department of Public and Consumer Affairs, \$1.3 million; and the Department of Environment and Planning, \$1.9 million. However, in that department, although \$1.5 million of the excess was the result of salary and wage award increases, the Ash Wednesday bushfire accounted for most of the remainder of the excess expenditure, and there is, of course, no criticism of that or of the Government meeting that.

Department of Lands, expenditure exceeded its Budget estimate by \$2.4 million; Department of Transport, \$535 000; Highways Department, \$3.5 million; Department of Marine and Harbors, \$3.1 million; and the Education Department, by no less than \$28.3 million. That certainly was in fulfilment of a Government election undertaking, I acknowledge that. The Department of Technical and Further Education exceeded its budget estimate by \$4 million; Police Depart-

ment, \$4.2 million; Department of Correctional Services, \$1.4 million; Mines and Energy Department, \$969 000; Community Welfare Department, \$2.7 million; Water Resources Department, \$14.1 million; Department of Recreation and Sport, \$246 000; Local Government Department, \$624 000; and the Departments of Agriculture and Forests by \$2.7 million.

I have not mentioned the Department of Tourism in that catalogue of over-expenditure, but I will refer to that department shortly. Almost all these excess expenditures relate in the first instance to salary and wage award increases, and it is interesting to contemplate that those increases occurred over a full year, at least six months of which was restrained by a wages pause. One dreads to think what the impact on the State Budget would have been had the wages pause not gone ahead as originally proposed and recommended by the Fraser Government. One is bound to recall the reluctance of the Premier to come to the barrier, we might say, when the Fraser Government in its last days proposed the wages pause.

I suspect that there was a good deal of political hostility in the Labor Party's adopting an idea, however worthy, that was put forward by its opponents, but I believe that the Premier and his Ministers would be in even more difficulty had the wages pause not been adopted. Certainly, if the wages pause had been adopted with the enthusiasm with which the Liberal Party has supported it, it could well have continued until the end of this year, that is, for another six months. Although that will now not happen, it is to be hoped that the restraint that is now recognised nationally as being necessary will be exercised when the new wage decisions are brought down in the near future.

Almost all the expenditures that I have listed are the result of the Government's providing some service or another of an essential or desirable nature to the electorate that it serves. In other words, almost all those departments are providing services which are regarded as being desirable or necessary but which do not, except in a very few instances, bring economic rewards for the State. Of course, exceptions would have to be the Department of State Development (its role is self explanatory from the title), the Department of Agriculture and Forests (which, in fact, involves an economic development portfolio), and sundry other service departments that, by the nature of their services, generate economic activity.

There is one department in which expenditure would be better described as investment in terms of the capacity of that expenditure to develop and to generate economic growth and prosperity for South Australia, and I refer to the Department of Tourism. That department is one where expenditure by the Government from the taxpayers can bring demonstrably excellent economic rewards and in a comparatively short time.

I commend the Minister and the Government for the additional sum that was provided by the Government when it came to office for the department's marketing activities. Expenditure by the Department of Tourism exceeded the Budget estimate by \$468 000, \$155 000 of that excess resulting from salary and wage award increases. The actual marketing budget was topped up from a total of \$1.27 million voted in 1982-83 to \$1.549 million allocated over the full year.

We are already reaping the benefits of that additional expenditure. I have in this House congratulated the Minister and the department on the excellent interstate marketing campaign which was launched in Sydney earlier this year and which is now having quite an impact on Sydney consumers. I was in Sydney last week and was most impressed to have spontaneous remarks from shop assistants and others providing services to me as a visitor. When they knew I

came from South Australia they commented extremely enthusiastically about the current marketing campaign of the South Australian Department of Tourism in Sydney. I am told informally that bookings in the South Australian Government Travel Centre in Sydney have risen dramatically as a result of that marketing campaign. In the next quarter, or possibly in the September quarter, we will see the results in terms of increased profitability to South Australian businesses that provide services to visitors.

Another example of the very short time relationship between expenditure (which I shall describe as investment) in the tourism budget and the resulting returns in benefits to South Australia relates to the line in the tourism budget which might look like a touch of luxury to someone who is not fully aware of the implications of the \$6 000 allocated for a civic reception for the Interdominion Pacing Championships. One might ask what possible reward there might be for South Australia in a civic reception for some visiting harness racers. The reality is that the Interdominion Trotting Championships held in Adelaide in February next year could attract more than \$4 million in tourism revenue.

I am not suggesting that the \$6 000 investment by the State Government will result in \$4 million expenditure by visitors because that clearly is not the case. That civic reception is simply a little bit of icing on a cake which has been carefully prepared by the South Australian Trotting Club as this State takes its turn with all other States and New Zealand in acting as host to the Interdominion Trotting Championships. However, about 3 000 visitors will be attracted to South Australia because of these championships and their average daily expenditure will be in the region of \$85. On top of that they are likely to spend additional sums on miscellaneous items such as local tours, special functions and souvenirs and we will benefit to the tune of \$4 million.

The realisation of the direct relationship between promotion and expenditure that attracts visitors and their expenditure which in turn creates jobs needs to be strongly reinforced, in this Parliament, through the media, in business in South Australia, and amongst the electorate at large. Despite the efforts of the Department and the South Australian Tourism Industry Council, and despite the efforts of successive Ministers, I note that the present Minister of Tourism does not seem to have much greater success in getting large headlines for good announcements than I did as a Minister. However, we will get a greater commitment by the electorate and therefore a greater commitment by the Government to expenditure on tourism in South Australia.

Before referring specifically to the Department of Tourism budget, I refer generally to the Budget and the way in which it affects business, notably tourism business. As the Leader said in his excellent speech outlining the features of the Budget, there is a hidden time bomb located on page 32 and enlarged upon on page 35 of the Financial Statement which referred to the restructuring of public sector debt and interest rate arrangements.

In previous speeches on the specific Bills to do with the taxes to be raised under the Licensing Act, Business Franchise (Petroleum Products) Act and other Acts, I have referred to the impact on the tourism industry of the various tax imposts that the Government has imposed. However, the restructuring of the public sector debt and interest rate arrangements will also have a very adverse effect on the tourism industry. Page 54 of the Financial Statement states:

Present debt and interest rate arrangements within the public sector of South Australia are unsatisfactory in a number of ways. They are unnecessarily complex and varied, they sometimes involve subsidies which may be unwarranted or which should be provided in a more open way and, in a number of cases, the maturity pattern of authorities' debt is inappropriate.

I do not argue with the validity of much of that statement. It then goes on to say that debt arrangements would be considerably simplified in that the different kinds of debt which many authorities now have would be amalgamated into one loan outstanding to the South Australian Government Financing Authority. Again, we have the Labor Government's wish to centralise and control power through financial means. The Financial Statement also states:

Secondly, there would be a uniform interest rate with advantages of simplicity and equity.

I question this allegation of the simplicity and equity contained in a uniform interest rate.

In opening my speech in this debate, I referred to the way in which the Government uses a Budget as a tool to implement both its philosophical and its policy objectives. The policy objectives of previous Governments in this State have been (whether both stated and unstated, but certainly understood) that certain basic and necessary essential services to be provided by the Government must necessarily be subsidised. Whilst the user pay principle is recognised, no-one is suggesting that everyone who travels on a State Transport Authority bus should meet the necessary unit cost to completely maintain the public transport service. Similarly, in the case of power (electricity and gas) there has been a recognition that, by charging a lower interest rate to those power authorities, the consumer is the beneficiary both in the domestic individual sense, in terms of homes and families, and in the business sense, in terms of keeping costs to business at the lowest possible level. The statement further says:

Repayment arrangements would be rationalised and tailored to meet the particular needs of each authority.

However, the real sting is in the fourth point, which states:

Commercial authorities whose present obligations are based on low interest rates would face realistic rates (e.g. ETSA now pays 6.5 per cent per annum on its \$159 million debt to the South Australian Government).

Further down, we find that the common interest rate calculated as at June 1983 on the basis of past policy in this regard would have been about 12 per cent per annum. In other words, under the new regime the Electricity Trust will pay near enough to double the interest that it has formerly been paying. There is no doubt whatsoever that the Trust will have to pass on that increased interest charge to the consumer in the form of increased charges for electricity.

Inevitably, the Gas Company as a user of electricity will have to do the same. In regard to its effect on the ordinary family in South Australia, for many people, especially those on fixed incomes, it will be very significant. But the effect on the tourism industry, notably the hospitality sector of the tourism industry, will be massive, because the raw materials for the hospitality industry are, in fact, food, beverages and service charges, as well as the cost inherent in the kitchen operation, namely, the provision of capital facilities and fuel. The cost of fuel is a very significant factor in any hotel or restaurant operation. Those costs will be increased. We have already seen that the tourism industry, like other industries, will face increased taxes in respect to liquor, tobacco and petrol, an increased stamp duty tax that will have a varying effect on the industry, as it does on all other industries, and there is also the financial institutions duty, about which we know very little at this stage.

In addition, inevitably, charges for power will be increased. One Minister has already denied that charges are likely to rise in the forthcoming year, much to the Premier's embarrassment, and it is clear that there is a failure to communicate within the Cabinet. The Minister of Water Resources, whose portfolio will also be affected by this new policy, was simply not aware of what will be the inevitable outcome of increased borrowing costs for the Engineering and Water Supply

Department, just as there will be significant costs for the Electricity Trust of South Australia. Those imposts have yet to hit the tourism industry, but when they do the industry will realise that it is bearing the full brunt of the Labor Government's policies, that Government having undertaken as a matter of policy to assist, encourage and develop the tourism industry. It seems to me that there needs to be a very careful scrutiny of the impact of State taxation on the tourism industry. It was in recognition of this fact that I asked the Minister early this year whether he would seek the provision of a tourism impact statement regarding State taxation from the Tourism Industry Council. I obtained a recognition of the merits of that and an undertaking to do it, but that undertaking has been breached.

In regard to the budget for the Department of Tourism, on the surface the total amount provided in the Budget does not look bad in the context of difficult financial circumstances for the Government, but on closer analysis it does not look good at all. In fact, I think that the tourism industry has been let down very badly by the Budget, which is at least \$1 million short of what the industry hoped and believed it was entitled to receive. The first point to note is that the total is swollen artificially by the inclusion of \$240 000 to meet accommodation and service costs. I do not quarrel with the Government's decision (which is outlined on page 32 of the Premier's Financial Statement) to charge rental costs in respect to properties leased by the Government and service costs associated with those properties to the particular agency occupying a property and responsible for the costs. In fact, that policy decision is directly consistent with programme performance budgeting, but the fact remains that for all time the tourism Budget for 1983-84 will look a lot better to the casual observer (and many of the people in the industry are casual observers) than it really is.

It will look \$240 000 better than it is. I believe it would, in all honesty, have been better for the Government to draw attention to that in its public release statement about the total of the tourism budget, so that the industry is under no misapprehension whatsoever as to the nature of the total increase in the budget. That is an observation that I make, rather than a criticism.

The next point is indeed a criticism, and that is the allocation of insufficient funds for marketing and promotion. I am very conscious when I refer to the question of insufficient funds that the Government has been criticised and will continue to be criticised by the Opposition for failure to control expenditure and to exercise proper management. Indeed, we believe that we could have kept expenditure down, fulfilled promises and not imposed taxes on the community of South Australia. However, it is all a question of priorities, and the priorities of the Government mean that a sum has been allocated to the State Government employment programme of \$5.7 million, part of which I believe could have been much more responsibly allocated to the Department of Tourism budget. I believe that \$1 million of that \$5.7 million, or at least a portion of \$1 million, should have been allocated directly to the subsidies towards development of tourist resorts which has received a minimal increase barely covering inflation; in fact, it does not cover inflation. It is a minimal increase from \$329 000 to \$342 000. I note with interest that the allocation of \$331 000 has not been spent. I certainly will be intending to ask the Minister about that in the Committee stages of the Budget.

The grants to regional tourist associations is one area where the Government could ensure that its expenditure on tourism would relate to the direct creation of private sector jobs, and yet the increase in grants to regional tourist associations again barely covers inflation. Last year's expenditure

of \$241 000 has been increased to \$290 000. When one takes into account inflation and divides that increase by 11 (for the 11 tourist regions), one realises that each region will receive barely \$2 000 additional. An additional \$2 000 is scarcely enough to pay for a decent brochure for a region to distribute yet, with the sensitive allocation of funds to that area, the regions would have been able to do an enormous amount to raise awareness within their region among businesses of the importance of tourism to the region. That awareness would have resulted in more effective promotion and, therefore, as I have already demonstrated, in job creation. So in all, I can only echo the strength of feeling expressed by my Leader when he said that the accumulated result at the end of 1983-84 under the continuation of a Liberal Government would have been a smaller deficit and no addition to State taxation.

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

Mr GROOM (Hartley): I do not propose to speak very long in this debate, but I do want to congratulate the Government and the Premier in particular on the Budget.

Mr Gunn interjecting:

Mr GROOM: It provides a very sound basis—

The SPEAKER: Order! As I said before, there must be no harassment.

Mr GROOM: For the benefit of the member for Eyre, I point out that the Budget provides a very sound basis for economic recovery in South Australia and I suggest that the honourable member, if he searches his conscience, would acknowledge that fact.

It is well to remember that when we left office in 1979 there was a surplus in the Treasury. After three years of Liberal Party Government the legacy that this Government has had to carry is a deficit of some \$63 million. Plainly, the Liberal Government managed the State's finances quite incompetently. We all know that had the Liberal Party won the 1982 State election it would have massively increased taxation; that has been confirmed by the member for Coles, who said that it would have run a much smaller deficit.

I heard the Leader of the Opposition today saying that under a Liberal Government South Australia would have been the lowest taxed State. That is a very desirable goal, but the Liberal Party just could not have done it, quite simply because we had a legacy of a massive deficit accumulated as a consequence of Liberal Party policies. Knowing that it was coming into an election period, the Liberal Party was prepared to take the risk with South Australia's finances and, knowing that the situation had got out of control, it desisted from raising taxes at that stage simply because it was facing an election. But the plain, ordinary, simple fact of the matter is that, had it won the 1982 State election, the Liberal Party would have had to massively increase State taxation so as to correct the imbalance. So much for its claims that South Australia under a Liberal Government would have been the lowest taxed State: it just could not have done it! A report in the *Advertiser* on 2 September 1983 had the Leader of the Opposition saying:

Treasury documents available to the Liberal Government before the election had indicated the deficit would have been \$13.1 million at 30 June this year.

I heard the member for Coles just say that the deficit under a Liberal Government would have been much lower. Assuming that it would have been \$13.1 million, the Liberal Party would have had to find an extra \$50 million in tax revenue: it would have had to raise that to ensure that the deficit—

The Hon. Michael Wilson: You didn't take anything into account at all.

Mr GROOM: For the benefit of the member for Torrens, if one lowers the deficit one has to get it from somewhere, unless one takes more from capital works, which means that there is less capital works construction and fewer jobs in the construction industry, and we already know that under a Liberal Government there would have been 2 000 fewer jobs in the public sector. That is on record. The fact of the matter is that if one is going to lower the deficit one has to get the money from somewhere. Anyone can guess on which sector of the community this burden would have fallen. Under a Liberal Government we would have had a very disastrous set of circumstances—massive tax increases, far greater than the increases in taxation and charges that have been levied by the current Government — and we would have had, as I said, a significant increase in unemployment levels. That has, as I said, been confirmed on record.

Thankfully, the Premier has set this State on the path to economic recovery, and the Budget provides very significant advances in relation to the housing industry. I note from the Premier's second reading explanation that a total of \$224 million in capital funds will be injected into the housing industry. Back in July of this year Mr Cummings, the Housing Industry Association spokesman, predicted that this would lead to an increase in home funding, involving something like 4 000 jobs in South Australia. I think I am correct in saying that this is the highest increase in housing for many years—at least since 1976. It is a massive injection of funds into the housing industry and it will have a multiplier effect, because not only will there be housing construction jobs but service industry jobs as well. Mr Cummings has predicted that this will lead to an increase of something like 4 000 jobs. In addition, there will be a very significant boost to road construction in South Australia: some \$170 million will be allocated in that way.

There is support for the State education system through an increase in funding. I understand from the documents that the overall funds allocated for primary and secondary education for 1983-84 are \$507 million. \$42 million more than the amount allocated in last year's State Budget. I do not intend to go through all the matters and positive initiatives of the Government's capital works programme, its housing construction programme, its boost for education and the consequent jobs that are going to flow from those schemes. They are on record and are there for all members to see. The fact is that the Premier in very difficult economic circumstances has been able to produce a Budget that sets South Australia on a path of recovery.

I have much difficulty in grappling with some of the utterances of members opposite, because I have heard several Opposition members complain about overspending in Government departments, while at the same time they complain about particular cuts in Government expenditure in certain areas of the State, especially their own districts. Members cannot have it both ways. One cannot claim on the one hand that Government expenditure should be reduced and then on the other hand ask why the Government has not spent more here or there. It is obviously a conflict situation, and Opposition members cannot have it both ways, yet those were the sentiments expressed by members opposite.

My comments on the Premier's Budget are also supported by the Chamber of Commerce. In a report in the *News* on 6 September, headed 'The Chamber supports the Budget objectives', the article leads with this story:

The Bannon Government's attempt to get the South Australian economy moving has the blessing of the State's top industry watchdog. The Chamber of Commerce and Industry says the first Budget by the Premier, Mr Bannon, is financially responsible—

that is a comment from the Chamber of Commerce—

The Chamber's economist, Mr Nettle, said it was a conservative Budget. Mr Bannon has said his Budget has two main aims: to cut the deficit and stimulate job opportunities. Mr Nettle said, 'The objectives were acceptable given present economic circumstances.'

The article continues:

The assessment from the Chamber of Commerce differed markedly from the Opposition Leader. Mr Olsen, who slated the Budget. He said, 'It is a gambler's Budget, I am certain there will be another increase in taxes and charges next year.'

That is the attitude of the Chamber of Commerce to the Premier's Budget. Clearly, those remarks are both positive and supportive of the strategies that have been undertaken by this Government.

I was most disappointed that the Leader of the Opposition did not see fit to turn up at the Budget Review Conference last Friday. I attended and was pleased to see the member for Flinders present. His contribution was impressive. Likewise, the Hon. Mr Milne from another place attended and, although I did not agree with all the things that either of those members said, their contributions were nevertheless impressive and added to the status of the forum. People with varying views about the Budget were able to give input in a critical and constructive way.

Mr Becker: What about my invitation?

Mr GROOM: You just go. With respect to the honourable member, he must have read that it was on. I went along. I was sufficiently interested, but the Leader of the Opposition could not give a damn about it and did not even bother going. I heard his explanation and, with due respect, it was pathetic, because on 30 March in this House the Opposition supported a motion calling for consensus, reconciliation, and economic recovery.

Mr Gunn interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Klunder): Order! The member for Eyre is out of order.

Mr GROOM: With respect to the honourable member opposite, although that motion may have dealt specifically with the Federal Government, the sentiment was nevertheless there, that political considerations be put aside and that an effort be made to work towards economic reconciliation and recovery in this State. However, several months later we have an opportunity for the Leader of the Opposition to put some constructive input into the State's financial position and what does he do? He says, 'I'm not going.' It is to the credit of the member for Flinders that he made a positive contribution.

I heard what the member for Flinders and the Hon. Mr Milne had to say about this matter. Although I do not agree with all of the things that they had to say, they were nevertheless very impressive in their presentations and had some constructive input to make. It is very sad to see the Opposition unprepared to make constructive input into the State's economic position. Yet, on 30 March the Opposition supported a motion in this Chamber which called for a consensus approach and the putting aside of political considerations. I think that it was a black day for the Opposition when the Leader took the stand he did. I do not think that it was a politically wise stand as it won him no public support. Opposition tacticians are in a difficult position. Members of the Opposition are in a 'Catch 22' situation. They stand up in this Chamber and say that we have to cut Government expenditure, they complain about Minister's overrunning expenditure in their departments, and in the same breath ask why there is not more money in other areas. On top of all that, they are saying that there should be a lower deficit. Where does the money for a lower deficit come from? It must come from massive taxation increases.

Statements reported in the *Advertiser* emanated from the Leader of the Opposition and talked of reducing the Budget deficit to \$13 million, but one has to find \$50 million from

somewhere to do that. Where would that money come from? It would come out of the pockets of ordinary South Australians. I challenge honourable members opposite to rise in this debate and say that had the Liberal Party won the last State election they would not have increased taxation this year, because they would have had to do so. Members opposite know darn well that they would have had to increase taxes because they deliberately did not increase taxes and charges during the latter part of 1982 for purely political purposes because they were facing an election period. They were prepared to take South Australia to the brink of economic disaster. Today the legacy of three years of Liberal Government is a deficit of some \$63 million, yet members opposite are trying to use the situation in which they put South Australia in 1982 to suggest that we were the lowest taxed State in Australia. The objective of being the lowest taxed State in Australia is a desirable, but under a Liberal Government, consisting of honourable members opposite, that could not have been achieved. This is a responsible Budget and I am pleased to be part of a Government that is able to set South Australia on the path to economic recovery.

Mr RODDA (Victoria): The honourable member who has just spoken finished full of fire. He should have run out of fire, because the only place money comes from is taxation. However, to get taxation there must be productivity. That is where this Budget falls down—it does not encourage productivity. We have seen one instance of the sale of our resources in the mines and energy field, now presided over by the Minister in charge of the House, the Minister of Mines and Energy. There is now condensate coming from a project which the Deputy Leader and myself negotiated with regard to infrastructure and which is now under the control of the present Minister of Mines and Energy.

The Hon. R.G. Payne: And very well, too.

Mr RODDA: The Minister must be quite proud of the productivity of that project. That is the sort of project that funding comes from to increase the wealth of the State. I am sure that the member for Hartley, when he made his observation, was not unmindful of that. On the other hand, I appreciate the position he finds himself in with his rosy future ahead of him. He is a man of many achievements, and a pleasant fellow, too. I am sure that it will not be long before we see him taking part in the drawing up of Budgets. From past experience I can recommend that to him as an ordeal that I am sure he will enjoy. However, it will not all be the beer and skittles that people stand in this House and say that it is.

However much money is available, there is never enough to go around, and there must be some carving of the lolly. I do not want to get into the meaty parts of my speech tonight, but I was surprised to see an article in yesterday's newspaper that referred to changes in research stations. This matter comes within the ambit of the Minister of Agriculture. However, I will develop comments in that regard later, and I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I draw to the attention of the House one or two matters that affect my district. I have always been of the view that, if one wants to satisfy people in isolated country areas, one has to provide them with good

accommodation at a reasonable rate. The Minister of Education is noted for having a lot to say, but when one analyses what he says, one finds that there is often not a great deal in it. The Minister had a lot to say during the three years in which the Liberal Party was in Government in this State: he had an instant answer to every problem. I can still see the honourable member standing in this place and giving notice of motions that he would move and all sorts of advice, but now he has been put to the test. The people of this State should remember very clearly that the Premier and his colleagues told the people of South Australia that they wanted South Australia to win. They also stated that there would be no increases in charges and no new taxes, but look at what has happened.

Members opposite gave an undertaking to the Institute of Teachers. I understand that the Australian Teachers Federation paid \$750 000 to the Federal Labor Party and about \$40 000 was paid by the Institute of Teachers to the State Labor Party. What has the institute received from Bob Hawke? It has received a superannuation tax, so it is getting a good return on its money in that regard, and in this State the institute has received huge increases in the rents that teachers have to pay to the South Australian Teacher Housing Authority.

I was interested to read some of the correspondence that I have received on this subject. I recall that the member for Goyder asked a quite proper question in this House and I also recall the disgraceful manner in which he was treated by the Minister. On that occasion, the Minister endeavoured to talk down the honourable member and to completely gloss over the situation. I draw to the Minister's attention the comments of his staff. Let the Minister tell those people that they do not know what they are talking about. A letter from the Coober Pedy Area School staff, signed by 18 or 19 teachers, states:

We the undersigned would like to voice our strong objection to the T.H.A. rent increase. On 13 April this year, the Minister, Lynn Arnold, stated that teacher rents would not increase until the wage freeze had ended, and also until 'significant progress is made on the T.H.A. maintenance backlog'.

In discussion, it was found that many T.H.A. residents in Coober Pedy have been waiting for maintenance to be done from between six months and three years. How then can the increase be justified in relation to the Minister's statement and the real situation which exists for our outback teachers? Consultation with SAIT on rental increase was promised in order to clarify any problem areas. This never occurred, yet rent has been increased.

The increase in rent for T.H.A. accommodation has increased 30 per cent for 80 per cent of T.H.A. tenants in Coober Pedy. Surely this is far more than the catch-up for the cost of living expenses since October 1981, for those with a 30 per cent increase. This is unjust and is being brought to your attention to request action on our behalf.

The proper action is for me to bring the matter to the attention of the Parliament and the Minister. I also received a letter from the teachers at Streaky Bay, who made the following points:

... the meeting

- (1) condemned the increases as a breach of promise;
- (2) demanded adequate funding for T.H.A. to enable the full maintenance and upgrading programme to be carried out.

That letter is signed by the teachers' representative at Streaky Bay. I also received a copy of a letter written to the Premier. They have given away the Minister, and are now writing to the Premier. The letter stated:

I wish to express my protest at the recently announced rise in T.H.A. rents. I fail to see how even a small increase is justified but a 23 per cent increase is beyond the bounds of reason. I believe that no increases would occur while the wage freeze existed and so again we see a broken promise. It was also promised that the backlog of maintenance would be caught up and yet there is still a long way to go in this area.

I feel that it is high time that the South Australian Government gave some real thought and showed some real concern for the standard of education in country schools. It is of vital importance

that incentives are given for teachers to come and to remain in country areas, and I would suggest that the biggest difficulty in attracting experienced teachers is the lack of high standard accommodation available at a reasonable rental. Why should country teachers be penalised by not having the security of owning their own homes and have to pay exorbitant rents as well?

That letter was written to the Premier. Let the Minister answer that letter. I have another letter that was written to the Minister. It is unfortunate that he is not in the House tonight, but I am sure that his officers will bring these letters to his attention. The letter states:

We wish to register a strong protest against the increases in rent for teacher housing, which will take effect from 7 October 1983. Our rent will be increased from \$78 to \$97 per fortnight, an increase of 25 per cent.

This increase is a direct breach of promise by the Government, since it was agreed rents were not to be increased during the current wage freeze, and also until significant progress was made on the T.H.A. maintenance backlog. The method of determining any future rent increase would be negotiated with the South Australian Institute of Teachers.

That letter is similar to the other one. I also received a letter from a most irate teacher in Peterborough. It is a lengthy and well put together letter, from which I will quote a few points, as follows:

It seems only to be a method of:

- (1) increasing tax revenue for the Government
- (2) lowering teacher morale
- (3) providing further disincentive for country service by teachers
- (4) forcing teachers to look for cheaper private rental accommodation—a very real possibility in Peterborough.

As the Minister of Transport knows, a lot of homes are available at Peterborough. His officers have unfortunately not yet contacted the council up there about the problem. I discussed the matter with the council today. The letter continues:

- (5) placing further hardships on a minority of teachers and some other Government workers living in more isolated parts of the State, where it is not realistic to purchase a house.

The letter goes on to make a number of other comments. The House and the Minister can see that, from the manner in which he treated the member for Goyder a few weeks ago when he asked his quite proper question, he was not only inaccurate but also did the House a disservice. I want the Minister to come into the House and answer clearly the charges levelled at him. It was interesting that one of the teachers saw fit to address his letter to the Premier. Obviously he approached the Minister and probably got a lengthy spiel from him, but it really would have amounted to absolutely nothing. I said at the beginning of my speech that if the Government wants to keep people happy in the country areas, whether they are employed in private industry or in the Government service, they must be provided with adequate housing.

That is the first thing, otherwise one will have real problems. The housing has to be priced realistically because teachers and other people who spend a long period of their Government service in country areas usually are not able to purchase a home. Therefore, they are disadvantaged, and when they retire they have to come down, purchase a home and pay a large amount of money. However, if a person is fortunate enough to have taught or been employed by the Government and live in the city, he has probably lived in his own home all his life and avoided the added expense of having to rent a home. That ought to be taken into consideration.

In relation to the backlog, I believe that the Government should look at this matter very quickly. From time to time I have had to bring to the attention of the Minister and the department the very serious problems that have existed in relation to my electorate. I recall that 12 months ago the Teacher Housing Authority was to put a caravan in a place

like Cooke and ask a teacher to live in it. In my judgment that was absolutely unacceptable. Cooke is not the most attractive place to live, anyway, and it is difficult enough to get teachers there without having to ask them to live in a small caravan without any proper facilities. I am looking forward to the Minister's reply because I want to be in a position to pass on that reply to my constituents so that they can be fully aware of the reasons which the Minister—

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

Mr PLUNKETT (Peake): I would like to use my time tonight to speak about the International Airport. Most members of the House would probably be aware that I spoke against the International Airport being situated where it is now. I gave evidence at West Torrens when the Federal committee met there under the Chairmanship of Melville Harold Bungey, who I think is no longer a member of Parliament, having been defeated at the last Federal election. Be that as it may, I honestly believe that that committee looked at the situation in Adelaide fairly and squarely. I thought that maybe people who gave evidence to the committee could possibly have brought to its attention that the site of the airport was not the correct place for an international airport. However, I must add that at the next meeting that I attended, which was held at the Thebarton Town Hall, I did not give evidence. I submitted the same evidence that I had previously given.

I do not always agree with my Liberal colleagues: very seldom does that happen. However, I must admit that I agree with what the Member for Hanson (Heini Becker) said at that time in evidence (and he received a lot of criticism). Mr Becker said that he considered that the evidence that we were giving was just a bit of a joke and that, in fact, whatever happened, the International Airport would go ahead. It did happen. Any person here who followed this through would realise the bloody mockery of the Federal committee which came here and held these meetings in South Australia. I say 'bloody mockery', although I do not want to be accused of swearing, because it was just a ridiculous thing that should never have happened. Even the Chairman was ruled out of order. I would have to rely on some of the older members—

Mr Gunn: Get the dictionary out.

Mr PLUNKETT: No. They put a clamp on Bungey so that he could not speak because, as Chairman, he was to recommend that the position of the International terminal be moved slightly so that it could not inconvenience people too much in relation to noise. They put a gag on the Chairman of the Works Committee. That is the way that the Federal Liberal Government worked, which is not unlike the way the State Liberal Government worked, I might add. I wholeheartedly agree with the member for Hanson's comment that it was a joke, because it was a got-up joke. The Liberals had it as a Federal got-up joke. Most certainly the proposal was going to proceed. The committee's report would not matter, because the Chairman himself recommended that the position for the terminal be not in the place where it is at present. He was gagged; and the Liberals themselves gagged him.

Mr Gunn interjecting:

Mr PLUNKETT: I know that a couple of the Liberal members would like to get me off the track, but I now want to refer to the charade that occurred prior to the last State election, in fact, on the day before the election. Mr Tonkin probably did this to gain a little bit of favour in the eyes of those in the electorate (he had not gained much). He was at the airport among a heap of cement and construction workers. In actual fact it was a real joke, because it was not an international airport and still is not an international airport. However in an attempt to gain a little bit of political

mileage, Mr Tonkin opened the international airport and all the members here, other than the member for Hanson, probably celebrated. The unfortunate thing about this is that most of the members here, including some of my own colleagues, do not live near the airport; they do not live beneath the flight paths, so in fact only a certain section of the community is penalised by the loud noise of planes coming in and going out. Unfortunately, those people affected do not have the support of the rest of the residents of Adelaide. Those people not affected say that they want the convenience of having an airport close to the city so that they can travel directly into and out of Adelaide.

Mr Lewis: What came first—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Klunder): Order! The member for Mallee is out of order.

Mr PLUNKETT: A few weeks ago a couple of women complained about this matter, and there is a story headlined in the *West Side* newspaper. They complained about the provision of another airstrip which would affect Lockleys. In regard to the members who have been interjecting, I do not know whether they represent people who have children attending schools, and who are affected by noise from planes. If any honourable members do represent such people, they may agree with me. If they do not, perhaps they will keep on interjecting, like the member for Mallee, who is just a ratbag. Probably the kids in the Mallee would not mind a plane flying overhead every other day. However, this is of concern to those attending Thebarton High School, Salesian College, Kilmara school, Brooklyn Park Primary School (and that is only mentioning a few), and all the others.

The member for Hanson has some concern, because he represents people with children who go to schools in the area, and he has constituents who are concerned about the matter. However, there are some other people who do not think about anything other than driving about in the Mallee or in the bush. I am an old bushman and know more about the bush than most honourable members, but by the same token I think about people, and I care about people from the heart. All that most honourable members opposite are worried about is their seat in this place. I am not worried about the seat that I hold as such, but I do worry about the people I represent. What I say about the airport is that I will be very disappointed if, under a Labor Government, we do not shift that airport, and shift it 20 miles out of town, out to Virginia.

Mr Gunn: It will never be shifted, and you know that.

Mr PLUNKETT: It will be shifted. The honourable member is quiet now, because he understands that I am talking about people, not only children but housewives who put up with the washing being polluted by planes, their nerves being shattered by planes, and husbands coming home at night in the same condition. There is a curfew, but there are no fines on a curfew, and no-one can control a curfew. People say there is a curfew but it is a complete joke. Only people who are under the flight paths can complain about it. I stand here tonight and say that a few more people should go down to the airport, especially some of you politicians who think you are smart when the likes of myself get up and speak, and listen to some of the planes coming in and out. Another strip is proposed on another route.

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

Mr BECKER (Hanson): What the member for Peake has said is perfectly correct. Probably the most incredible situation that has occurred in the western suburbs is the proposal to put a third runway at the Adelaide Airport, at West Beach. The excuse being used for the third runway is that it is needed for light aircraft and, like the member for Peake, I say to hell with the light aircraft, because they have the worst safety record in Australia.

Mr Gunn: That is nonsense.

Mr BECKER: Yes, they have the worst safety record of all aircraft in this country. The member for Eyre cannot inform this House of when the last crash of a commercial aircraft occurred in Australia; I hope that there never will be one. We certainly do not want it at West Beach, because that place could not handle the situation. Light aircraft have a bad habit of taking short cuts. On a couple of occasions light aircraft have stalled on the main runway and commercial aircraft coming in to land have had to touch and take off again. There have been several aborted landings, one only in the past week or so. We do not want light aircraft at Adelaide Airport; they should be using the facilities at Parafield. That is what it is for and for what it was envisaged.

When one considers that it costs between \$7 000 and \$10 000 for a 747 to land at Adelaide Airport, how can anyone justify filling up Adelaide Airport with light aircraft, and justify light aircraft flying over the schools mentioned by the member for Peake? The flight path goes through his electorate and also my electorate. How can anyone justify disturbing the residential environment, the peace of the people at Lockleys, Fulham, Brooklyn Park, Cowandilla, and so forth? The people at West Richmond are suffering tremendously with the aircraft traffic at West Beach airport at the present moment. I happened to be visiting a friend at West Richmond when a jumbo came over, and it is a most frightening thing to stand out in a small enclosed backyard while it flies overhead. A jumbo jet is the most magnificent thing ever invented, and one wonders how it can fly, but to stand underneath as it comes in to land is absolutely frightening. What it is doing to the widows in the electorate of the member for Peake and the member for Adelaide (the Deputy Premier) nobody can measure in terms of distress. I am pleased to hear the member for Peake and I know the Federal member for Hindmarsh doing all they can to convince the new Federal Government that the Adelaide Airport has to be re-established. It will cost \$500 million—

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: Your credibility is not looking too good.

Mr BECKER: The member for Chaffey says that my credibility is not looking too good. I can assure him that if we get rid of the Adelaide Airport it might be safer for him to sail his little yacht down on the gulf near West Beach. However, I am not too sure whether the water is deep enough there, but certainly we would not like him to be blown over by a jet aircraft taking off from Adelaide Airport.

I am also concerned because I picked up in the Federal Budget that during the past few years some \$27.2 million has been spent at the Adelaide Airport. The estimated proposals were: erection of the operations centre, \$3.3 million; erection of electrical and radio maintenance centre, \$858 000; strengthening the domestic aprons and taxiways and extension of domestic terminal building (which is something that I was not aware of), \$10.2 million; erection of international terminal complex, \$12.3 million (so much for the \$11 million building!); construction of airport boundary security fence—that horrible mesh thing that they have around the place at the moment—\$111 000. To add insult to injury, they have now put an asbestos type of fence at the end of the main runway. The provision of a waste-water reticulation system amounts to \$276 000. Up to 30 June 1983, \$25.6 million had been spent, and about \$1.5 million will be spent this financial year.

Additional expenditure at the Adelaide Airport this financial year on new projects will be \$1.7 million. This is for provision of engineering services to new hangar sites, \$500 000; extensions to the fire station, \$92 000; extension to the training school, \$250 000; extension of domestic apron,

\$680 000; erection of an annex to the mechanical workshop, \$200 000.

What this all means is that something like \$29 million has been and will be spent at the Adelaide Airport, and that is making it very difficult now for residents to accept that at some time in the future the airport will be moved. If work commenced yesterday on a new international airport it would take 15 years to complete, and would cost in the vicinity of \$500 million. I know that everyone will say, 'I do not want my taxes to pay for that', but in these hard times there are two trains of thought.

Mr Groom: You can get it back in jobs created.

Mr BECKER: Exactly. That is right. You would create a considerable number of permanent jobs with a full 24-hour international airport—a lot more than currently at the Adelaide Airport—and it would do a tremendous amount of good in generating development and capital in South Australia. Some \$243 million is committed to expenditure on the redevelopment of the Brisbane airport—Brisbane airport does not have a runway as long as our main runway, unless it has now, but it did not—and something like \$14 million had been spent as at 30 June and \$228 million was yet to be spent at Brisbane airport. We do not want that, and there is just no way that that could be spent at Adelaide Airport. So, the time has come when wind tests must now be undertaken north of Adelaide so that the main runway for the international airport can be located. Once the wind velocities and directions are established, the work can get on to planning the new international airport. I hope that we will see that in the not too distant future.

I want to hark back to the Auditor-General's Report, and I am very disappointed to read the comments made in relation to the Correctional Services Department. I would have thought that, following the Public Accounts Committee inquiry into the operations and management of the canteen at the Yatala Prison, the Department of Correctional Services would be acutely aware of the need to watch the accountability of the Department, but the Auditor-General, in my opinion, made some quite scathing comments and quoted from the in-depth audit that had been done. One comment was:

Although there was no evidence of canteen stock shortages, the accounting and financial control procedures were inadequate to provide satisfactory control of stock.

If we are going to have Government departments totally ignoring reports of the Public Accounts Committee, it is time that this Parliament gave those departments a clear instruction. They are accountable to us, as members of Parliament, and the Government of the day is accountable to the people, as are all members of Parliament. There is no excuse for any Government officer, head of a department, let alone a Minister, to be placed in a position where the Auditor-General has to report to Parliament that he is not satisfied with the general accounting systems, procedures and control within that Minister's department.

I have always held the view that the Minister is ultimately the person responsible, and so is the Director-General of the department. I have always believed that middle management must be encouraged to assist the executive officers of Government departments to ensure that we have satisfactory financial control, that we can prevent the wastage of funds in the various departments, so that we can get on and do the job that I would expect correctional services to do; that is, a total rehabilitation programme so that the day can come when we can start closing down prisons instead of having to build them.

Motion carried.

At 10.26 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 14 September at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 13 September 1983

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

RANDOM BREATH TESTS

1. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:
1. How many random breath test units are currently operated by the police throughout the State?
 2. Are more units proposed and, if so, at what cost?
 3. What are the normal hours of operation of each unit and are they operated seven days of week?
 4. What studies have been made to determine whether the random breath testing campaign is successful and, if any, what were the results?
 5. Does the Government propose to reduce the blood alcohol limit to .05 and, if not, why not?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Refer to my letter to the honourable member of 15 August 1983.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN EGG BOARD

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

1. Does the Minister intend to insist on any changes in the South Australian Egg Board's administration of the industry generally and, in particular:
 - (a) the current system of levying producers for administration, marketing and equalisation purposes;
 - (b) the issuing and marketing of hen quotas within the industry; and
 - (c) the hen leasing policy;
 and, if so, what are those changes and when are they are to be introduced?

2. What are the benefits of the South Australian Egg Board's hen leasing policy?

3. Is the retail price of South Australian produced eggs comparable to the prices in all other States and, if not, what are the factors which make South Australian retail prices uncomparable?

4. To what extent does the dumping of shell or pulp eggs on the unprofitable export markets during spring flush periods each year have an effect on the overall retail price of eggs in South Australia and is this effect reflected in the overall prices of eggs to the consumer similar in all States and, if not, what is the variation State by State?

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

1. Following the release of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics' report on egg marketing in Australia, and discussions at Australian Agricultural Council in August, a national review of egg marketing policy has been agreed to by all States. South Australia will not introduce any changes to our egg marketing arrangements during that review.

2. See 1. above.

3. It is argued that, because of lower feed costs in other mainland States, wholesale egg prices are less than those in South Australia. As an example the wholesale prices per dozen for 'Extra Large' (60 gram) eggs are as follows:

S.A.	Vic.	N.S.W.	Qld.	W.A.	Tas.
\$1.72	\$1.69	\$1.65	\$1.67	\$1.64	\$1.85

4. The marketing of surplus South Australian egg production on export markets during spring is a decreasing problem. On information supplied by the South Australian

Egg Board, levels of surplus production have fallen from 38 per cent to only 6½ per cent in 1982-83, and that figure is expected to be further reduced in 1983-84.

MARKET FACILITY

24. **The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Agriculture: Does the Minister intend to establish a new market facility for the marketing of fresh fruit and vegetables in accordance with his Ministerial predecessor's pre-election promise (*The Advertiser* page 9, 25 October 1982) and, if so, where and when; if not, what specifically was meant by his Ministerial predecessor's announcement in view of the East End Market companies' proposal to carry out a feasibility study on the redevelopment and/or relocation of the current East End facilities?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Government's policy was clearly enunciated in a previous reply given on 15 March 1983. The industry commissioned a report which has been considered by Government. A steering committee has been formed to consider proposals for the next stage and will work closely with the industry. These arrangements will bring us to the point of being able to clearly assess the implications of the various options. During discussions with all parties it has been made clear that the Government is concerned to facilitate a practical outcome.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE SERVICES

29. **The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education representing the Minister of Agriculture: Which, if any, Department of Agriculture services, literature, brochures and fact sheet productions does the Minister intend to charge primary producers for during the years 1983-84 to 1985-86?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: While there are no early plans to alter the range of Department of Agriculture services, literature, brochures and fact sheets for which there currently are charges, Government practice determines that such ranges and charges be regularly reviewed.

M.V. TROUBRIDGE

30. **The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education representing the Minister of Agriculture: Does the Minister support the Liberal Party policy of 'not unduly disadvantaging country people because of their geographic location in South Australia' and, if so, will he support maintaining the current schedule of *Troubridge* space rates until they are consistent with mainland rail space rates over comparable distances and index them thereafter in the interest of parity between Kangaroo Island and mainland primary producers?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Departmental officers are continuing an investigation into the operations of the *Troubridge* which includes the question of tariffs. The Government will determine its policy when that report is to hand.

INDOOR PLANTS

40. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Public Works: What will be the requirements of all Government

departments for the supply of plants over the next 12 months?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The Minister of Public Works is no longer responsible for the supply and maintenance of indoor plants to Government departments.

VOLUNTARY PRISON STAFF

54. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: What is the role of voluntary staff and organisations in the South Australian prison system?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: A number of voluntary organisations and staff contribute to programmes within the South Australian prison system. Their roles are varied and include the provision of counselling, visits, chaplaincy and spiritual services, alcohol rehabilitation groups, and literacy tuition.

PRISONS SYSTEM

55. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: What changes need to occur within the South Australian prison system to enable the introduction of programmes for prisoners which are comparable with those introduced in some other States in recent years?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: There is a need to segregate prisoners to enable more appropriate programme development. This need has been recognised and the plans for the Adelaide Remand Centre, a new minimum security prison, and a new medium security prison have been formulated as an appropriate response. Staff training will also be necessary, particularly in the area of developing and implementing prisoner recreation and leisure programmes.

PRISON TELEPHONE CALLS

56. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: Have any nuisance telephone calls been reported to prison officers or any other person in authority since prisoners have been able to make unsupervised telephone calls from prisons in South Australia and, if so, what action has been taken to ensure that such calls do not continue?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: No.

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES STAFF

57. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: What provision is currently available for Correctional Services staff and officers to have on-going, in-service training and, if none, what changes need to occur to ensure that such training is made available?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Currently officers undertake seven weeks inservice training in their first year of service. The first five weeks training are undertaken after they are employed but before they commence duties in a gaol. The remaining two weeks of training are normally undertaken in the latter stage of their first year of service. Subsequently officers may undertake a further five day course of training. Shorter inservice training sessions are also held. From time to time selected officers attend specialised training with outside bodies within South Australia and interstate. For example two places have been reserved for officers on the next S.A. Police Prosecutor's course and two Chief Prison Officers recently attended a N.S.W. Corrective Services Commission Course on Control Force Training Hostage Negotiation and Emergency procedures.

Training opportunities are available from time to time in other branches of the department; for example, seminars are held on a regular basis by the Staff Development Officer, Probation and Parole. Correctional Services staff and officers, as are all public servants, may be released for up to five hours per week for study of approved courses during working hours.

PRISONER ACCOMMODATION

59. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: Is the Government considering the transfer of some prisoners from the Yatala Labour Prison to the Northfield Security Hospital and, if so, under what authority will prisoners who are psychiatrically assessed as being inappropriate persons to be transferred to that hospital be placed in that institution under the control of the South Australian Health Commission?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: No. However some cells were temporarily provided to the Department of Correctional Services to reduce the overcrowding in Yatala Labour Prison caused by the fire. The Government is considering converting the Northfield Security Hospital into a high security prison for Yatala.

YATALA PRISON

62. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: How are prisoners nominated and appointed to the committee representing prisoners' needs at the Yatala Labour Prison?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Prisoners are nominated by themselves or other prisoners and elected by secret ballot to be on the Committee.

TAXI PLATES

65. **The Hon. D.C. BROWN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. When was the inquiry into the conditions placed on taxi plates initiated, who is conducting it, what are the precise terms of reference, and when is it expected to be completed?

2. Has the Minister given an undertaking to any person or group that white plates would lose their city privileges and, if so, what was the precise undertaking given?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The replies are as follows:

1. (a) 4 May 1983.

(b) A committee of inquiry with the following terms of reference:

To investigate and make recommendations on—

- (1) Whether the present licensing system of taxis operating in the metropolitan area is the most suitable system for present day needs.
- (2) Whether improvements can be made to the present system.
- (3) Whether a common licensing system should be introduced for all taxis operating in the metropolitan area and whether such a system should be phased in or not.
- (4) Whether some form of compensation should be devised for existing licencees who could be disadvantaged as a result of any changes to the present licensing system.
- (5) The committee to report to the Minister of Transport by 29 July 1983.

The reporting date was amended on 6 July 1983, to 20 August 1983. The committee was comprised of an independent Chairman and three members—one representing the green plate operators, one the white plate operators and one representing the users of taxis.

2. No.

WATER RATES

70. **The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources: How much in additional water rates will each non-government school be levied in 1983-84, following the Government's decision to end water subsidies?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: It is not possible to provide individual additional water rates details for each non-government school at this stage. The amount of additional water rates charged will naturally depend upon the quantity of water consumed by each school. However, it is estimated that the additional cost to the 160 schools involved resulting from the withdrawal of the Government subsidy may be of the order of \$71 000.

NURSE EDUCATION

76. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary, representing the Minister of Health: What action has been taken to reorientate nurse education along the lines agreed to at the recent A.L.P. convention?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The policy adopted at the convention does not represent a reorientation. It is a policy of peaceful co-existence between nurses who are hospital trained and those who are tertiary trained. The South Australian Health Commission has been advised of the terms of the motion adopted at convention and will act accordingly.

UNIONS

80. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Labour: Has any time been allowed within working hours for union representatives within each department to persuade employees to join relevant unions in response to the Government's directive to provide names of non-contributors to those unions?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: No directive has been issued to departments to allow time within working hours for union representatives within each department to persuade employees to join relevant unions.

FOOD AUTHORITY

81. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare representing the Attorney-General: Are there any initiatives in train to establish a State food authority to oversee the packaging and marketing of food items in South Australia and, if so, how far are they advanced?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: No.

NATIVE VEGETATION

82. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: At 31 July 1983, how many applications had been received by the Department of Environment and Planning for certificates for clearance of scrub, trees, etc., how many had been approved, how many had been refused and how many were awaiting decision?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: As at 31 July 1983, 465 applications had been received, 76 had been approved, none had been refused and 392 were awaiting decision.

SCHOOL YEAR TERMS

90. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: How far advanced is the planning for the introduction of four-term school years in 1984?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: A small working group, with representatives of the Education Department, the South Australian Institute of Teachers and the South Australian Association of State School Organisations, has been established to examine and report on the desirability or otherwise of changing the current school year pattern of terms and dates. In order that this working group is advised by as wide a range of interests as possible, a reference group has been established with representation from a wide range of institutions and agencies likely to be affected by any change in the structure of the school year.

The terms of reference of both groups are: Working Party—To advise the Minister of Education on the desirability or otherwise of changing the current school year pattern of terms and dates thereof. In particular to advise him on: the educational advantages and disadvantages of a change to the four term year (or alternatively a two semester year); optional dates for such proposals; the potential effects outside the direct education field, for example, tourism and the availability of vacation resources in such a move; the effect on personnel matters such as long service leave of teachers and, if possible, on staff/student absenteeism; the likely level of acceptance by all sectors of the education community of such proposals. Reference Group—To provide the working party with comment on any matters considered relevant to the terms of reference of the working party. To provide comment to the working party on any matters or proposals referred to the reference group by the working party.

The membership of both groups is:

Working Party

Chairperson: Mr J.C. Cusack, A/Director of Research and Planning

Nominees of: South Australian Institute of Teachers
South Australian Association of State Schools Organisations Inc.
Director of Personnel

Reference Group

Chairperson: Dr P.I. Tillet, Assistant Director-General of Education (Resources)

Members: Nominees of:
South Australian Institute of Teachers
South Australian Association of State School Organisations
High School Principals Association
Primary School Principals Association
Independent Schools Board
Catholic Schools Commission
Department of Technical and Further Education
Department of Tourism
Kindergarten Union
Federation of Parents and Friends Association (Independent Schools)
Federation of Parents and Friends Association (Catholic Schools)
Tertiary Education Authority of South Australia
Parent Teacher Council
South Australian Jubilee 150 Committee
South Australian Association of School Parents Clubs
Junior Primary Principals Association
Area School Principals Association

Nominations for the working group have now been received and the group met on 25 August 1983. Membership

of the reference group is still being finalised since some agencies have had to await a meeting of their organisation. The public will shortly be invited to make submissions to the working party. The working party is expected to complete its report before the end of this year. Interested groups and the community generally will be further consulted before a decision is made. The timing of school vacations has implications for many groups and individuals, and advance notice of any change is necessary. Thus, there can be no change to school term dates for 1984 from those previously announced.

PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

98. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Labour: How many new employees have been employed by the Public Buildings Department, Engineering and Water Supply Department, and the Highways Department, respectively, as a result of the A.L.P. policy of preference for the public sector in respect of construction contracts?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: No new employees have been employed by the Public Buildings Department, Engineering and Water Supply Department, and the Highways Department as a result of the A.L.P. policy of preference for the public sector in respect of construction contracts.

COMMISSIONER OF AGED CARE AND SERVICES

102. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare: With respect to the Minister's proposal to create a new position in his department with the designation of Commissioner of Aged Care and Services:

- (a) when will appropriate legislation be introduced;
- (b) what is the full job specification;
- (c) what staff will be allocated to assist the Commissioner;
- (d) what criteria will be used to determine aged care;
- (e) what will be the total annual cost of this initiative; and
- (f) what other sections of his department will be sacrificing resources to allow for this new initiative?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:

- (a) Early 1984.
- (b) The job specification will be determined in consultation with Government and non-government agencies and has not yet been completed.
- (c) Not yet determined.
- (d) Aged care will relate to all services, assistance and concessions available to aged people.
- (e) Not yet determined.
- (f) No funding decisions have been made.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN COLLEGE OF ADVANCED EDUCATION

107. **The Hon. M.M. WILSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. What steps has the Minister taken to investigate the misdirection of funds supplied to the South Australian College of Advanced Education by the Malaysian Government?
2. How much money is involved?
3. What steps have been taken to recover the misdirected funds?
4. How will the shortfall in the operating budget of the College be made up?

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

1. The matter is one for the Council of the South Australian College, which has the statutory power to deal with it. The President and Principal informed the Minister of the problem soon after it occurred and explained to the Minister the steps that were being taken to retrieve the misdirected funds.

2. A maximum of \$2 460 for each of the 60 students.

3. The Principal met with the total group of students and explained that the funds had been misdirected. The students were aware that they had been paid the amount in error and accepted that they had to repay the money. Since that meeting each of the 60 students has been interviewed and arrangements are in hand for the repayment of the money from each of the students. The MARA organisation in Malaysia is co-operating fully in this endeavour.

4. The College is as yet unable to estimate what, if any, the shortfall will be.

ADELAIDE ZOOLOGICAL GARDENS

110. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: Have satisfactory arrangements been reached to provide adequate parking for patrons visiting the Adelaide Zoological Gardens and, if so, what are these arrangements and, if not, what steps are being taken to provide adequate facilities?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: A parking study was carried out by a traffic and transportation consultant, which was completed in February 1983, to assess demand for car parking in the vicinity of the Zoological Gardens and the Botanic Gardens, and to propose options for car parking provisions, having regard to the needs of organisations having an interest in the area.

Recommendations made by the Royal Zoological Society and the Botanic Gardens for both short term and long term solutions to the problem based on the recommendations of the study, show that general agreement has been reached on the solutions to be pursued. The long term solution involves use of the existing parking area on the Hackney Road frontage of Botanic Park presently leased to the State Transport Authority by the Highways Department together with areas within both the northern and southern gates to the park.

In the interim, both the Royal Zoological Society and the Board of the Botanic Gardens have agreed that existing parking restrictions be retained within Botanic Park until the implementation of the long term parking scheme. These interim arrangements include provision for increased parking adjacent to the Childrens Zoo entrance during school holidays with access from the northern Hackney Road gate to Botanic Park.

BEACHWOOD GARDENS

111. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: What are the current situation and the future planning programme regarding public access to the Beachwood Gardens which are under the management and control of the Board of the Botanic Gardens?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Given fine weather conditions, restoration work on the conservatory and construction of public toilets are expected to be completed in the near future. Formal opening of the gardens is to follow. It is intended that, commencing in 1984, Beachwood will be opened to the public for the spring and autumn season when the garden is looking its best.

VANDALISM

112. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning:

1. What is the current incidence of vandalism in the Adelaide Botanic Gardens and other gardens under the management and control of the Board of the Botanic Gardens, respectively?

2. Is the Board of the view that further action should be undertaken to assist in overcoming any vandalism and, if so, what action is proposed?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. Vandalism appears to be related to the degree of urbanisation surrounding each of the botanic gardens. The Adelaide Botanic Garden experiences most vandalism, followed by Wittunga Botanic Garden, with Mount Lofty Botanic Garden being least affected. In the Adelaide Botanic Garden the chief forms of vandalism are theft or damage to glasshouse display plants, damage to outdoor plants, destruction of labels or other outdoor fittings, and occasional theft or damage to equipment, including Government vehicles in the nursery adjacent to Botanic Road. Increasing numbers of joggers have taken to running through planted areas with some damage occurring, and if this continues it may be necessary for remedial action to be taken.

2. Yes. In circumstances where the provision of additional staff is not possible because of economic constraints, it will be necessary for the Board to monitor and control vandalism in the most efficient way with existing resources.

YATALA PRISON

118. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: Will the Chief Secretary table in Parliament all reports, both official and unofficial, relating to the fire in 'A' Division at the Yatala Labour Prison in March 1983 and, if not, why not?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: No. Amongst other reasons these matters remain *sub judice*.

DISHERS CREEK PLAN

121. **The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Lands:

1. What is the present status of the Dishers Creek to the Border Management Plan?

2. What are the terms of reference?

3. When is it anticipated that the committee will report to the Minister?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. The committees responsible for preparing the Dishers Creek—Border Management Plan have been formed and have held their first meetings. The co-ordinating committee has met once, the working party twice.

2. The terms of reference of the co-ordinating committee are:

- To produce guidelines for the production of the management plan.
- To establish the Dishers Creek—Border Working Party.
- To review the first draft of the Dishers Creek Border Management Plan.

The terms of reference of the working party are:

- To report to the co-ordinating committee on:
 - The tenure and location of land and water.
 - The physical features of the land and water.
 - The social features of the area.

Perceived conflicts between different users and between different uses of the land and water.

- To produce a draft management plan and, when approved, publicly exhibit it.
- To assess public opinion and revise the plan if considered necessary.

3. It is anticipated that the draft plan will be submitted to the Minister of Lands in May, prior to public display, and that a revised plan will then be submitted in August.

LIGHT SQUARE CAR PARK

122. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Public Works:

1. When did the Public Buildings Department submit plans for the car park being constructed at Light Square to the City of Adelaide Planning Commission?

2. Did such plans include provision for underground car parking at that site and, if not, were further plans submitted in accordance with Premier's Department Circular No. 39 (reissued June 1980)?

3. If changes were made to the original plans submitted to the C.A.P.C. without reference to that body, will the Minister order the reconstruction of the car park so as to prevent loss of an essential traffic lane on the north-east corner of the Square?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The replies are as follows:

1. The Public Buildings Department submitted plans to the City of Adelaide Planning Commission on 2 June 1982 for the proposed Adelaide College of Technical and Further Education. These plans included provision for a basement car park.

2. The schematic plans and model of the proposed Adelaide College of Technical and Further Education submitted to the City of Adelaide Planning Commission included provision for a basement public car park. The plans showed the floor level of the car park approximately two metres below the pavement level of Currie Street to the south, and at the pavement level of the service lane and Rosina Street pedestrian entrances to the north and east. The model clearly shows the ramp down from Morphett Street to the basement car park.

3. The first stage of the car park totalling 150 car spaces was handed over to the Adelaide City Council on 15 July 1982, and the extent and planning of the car park is unchanged from the original submission. It should be noted that as advised in the City of Adelaide Planning Commission approval dated 10 June 1982, proposals for redevelopment within the public area of Light Square were taken up directly with the Adelaide City Council. Following meetings held with the Adelaide City Council it was agreed that the car park access ramp and adjacent roadway layout be designed, documented and constructed by the Adelaide City Council and costs met by project funds.

NOARLUNGA HEALTH VILLAGE

123. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary, representing the Minister of Health and further to Question No. 179 of last Session, at what time is it planned to commence work on the 24-hour-a-day, seven-day-a-week emergency service adjacent to the proposed Noarlunga Polyclinic?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Planning for all services to be available through the Noarlunga Health Village commenced in March 1983, with a detailed report submitted to the Minister of Health in June 1983. Building site work is

expected to commence in March 1984 with completion in mid 1985.

JUSTICE INFORMATION SYSTEM

128. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: what stage has been reached in negotiations to establish the Justice Information System?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: A feasibility study in respect of the Justice Information System has been completed by Touche Ross Services Pty., Management Consultants. The Data Processing Board has requested a greater level of detail and investigation in several areas before the Government considers approval for the development of the system.

AUSTRALIAN TRAINERS ASSOCIATION

136. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Recreation and Sport:

1. What involvement does the Government have in determining whether or not the S.A.J.C. should force trainers and owner trainers to compulsorily become members of the Australian Trainers Association?

2. When is it anticipated that the Government will determine an attitude concerning this matter?

3. Is the Minister aware that, in a recent poll organised officially through the Electoral Office, approximately three quarters of those polled voted against compulsory membership of the A.T.A. and, if so, will the Government take this into consideration when making a final decision on this matter?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The replies are as follows:

1. None.
2. Not relevant, see (1) above.
3. Yes.