

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 20 September 1983

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

PETITION: MEAT SALES

A petition signed by 62 residents of South Australia praying that the House reject any legislation to extend the existing trading hours for the retail sale of meat was presented by Mr Plunkett.

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. 5, 36, 39, 53, 67, 68, 79, 83, 84, 87 to 89, 100, 105, 106, 108, 109, 114, 115, 120, 129, 131, 146, 147, 160, and 161; and I direct that the following answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*:

LICENSING ACT

In reply to Mr **MAX BROWN** (4 August).

The **Hon. G.J. CRAFTER**: I am advised by my colleague the Minister of Consumer Affairs that he understands that the Licensing Act Review has received submissions from over one hundred interested groups and individuals and a few more are expected. It is anticipated that discussions arising from these submissions will be completed during September and the report is likely to be submitted to him by the end of November. He then intends to circulate the report widely and, depending on comment received, will introduce legislation as soon as possible next year.

MORPHETT VALE SHOPS

In reply to Ms **LENEHAN** (17 August).

The **Hon. G.J. CRAFTER**: I am advised by my colleague the Attorney-General that the report of the working party on shopping centre leases is expected to be made to Government within the next two months. In relation to the particular matter to which the member for Mawson referred, I understand that the Small Business Advisory Bureau together with the Building Owners and Managers Association has attempted to assist the parties in discussing means of settling that dispute.

DE FACTO RELATIONSHIPS

In reply to Mr **MAYES** (23 August):

The **Hon. G.J. CRAFTER**: I have been advised by my colleague the Attorney-General that he now has a copy of the New South Wales Law Reform Commission Report on *de facto* relationships. He will be examining that report thoroughly and will discuss with other Attorneys-General

the feasibility of a uniform approach to the legal problems relating to *de facto* relationships. The rights of those persons to sue for property and maintenance would be part of that examination, of course.

YATALA PRISON

In reply to Mr **OSWALD** (7 September).

The **Hon. G.F. KENEALLY**: The former Manager of Yatala Labour Prison allowed the four members of the Prisoners' Needs Committee to see through the bootshop and tailorshop in the new industries complex. This committee stated that the surveillance and security equipment was established for high-security prisoners, and low and medium-security prisoners should not be required to work in those particular workshops.

The level of security surveillance and procedures implemented within the new bootshop and tailorshop was done with the view of being able to employ high-security prisoners. Other security classification prisoners have also been involved in working in that workshop. The Prisoners' Needs Committee was of the view that the different classifications of prisoners should be segregated and low-security prisoners not be required to work in a high-security environment.

The policy of this Government is to provide for such segregation. The building of the proposed new low-security prison at Northfield will enable the Department of Correctional Services to keep low-security prisoners from other classifications. It will only be in exceptional circumstances that low-security prisoners would work in the workshops inside the wall of Yatala Labour Prison, and on the basis of it being in the interests of an individual prisoner to do so.

Although there has been some talk amongst prisoners of refusing to work in the two workshops mentioned, in practice this has not been the case. When the workshops have been opened, prisoners have worked in the two workshops as they have in other industries in Yatala Labour Prison.

VEGETATION CLEARANCE CONTROLS

In reply to Mr **LEWIS** (17 August).

The **Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD**: As at 30 August 1983, 592 applications had been received covering an estimated 350 000 hectares (877 000 acres) or 16.5 per cent of the remaining native vegetation outside the parks and reserves system in the agricultural regions of the State. Approximately 50 applicants have expressed a desire for an urgent decision. In addition, all wood cutting and brush cutting applications are considered to be urgent and are accorded a high priority for early assessment. As at 30 August 1983, 95 applications had been processed, of which 90 were approved by the department—with or without conditions—under delegated authority from the South Australian Planning Commission.

With regard to the number of personnel handling these applications, it is difficult to provide a precise answer as several people in the department are involved to a greater or lesser extent, as are officers of other Government departments and local government. The responsible area for assessing clearance applications in the Department of Environment and Planning, for the South Australian Planning Commission, is the Vegetation Retention Unit of the National Parks and Wildlife Service. That unit currently includes 10 scientific assessment staff and six support and managerial staff whose duties include various aspects of the work involved. The administrative effort involved in deter-

mining the cost of handling each application could not be justified.

CHAFFEY IRRIGATION AREA

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

Chaffey Irrigation Area—Ral Ral Division (Completion of Rehabilitation and Headworks).

Ordered that report be printed.

DEATH OF JUDGE DAUGHERTY

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer)**: With the leave of the House, I wish to make a brief statement concerning the late Judge Daugherty. The late Judge Daugherty was a man with a great zest and enthusiasm for life. Those who did not know it directly could infer it from an account of his early career. Following his formal education at school and the University of Adelaide, a visit in 1948 to what was then the Territory of Papua-New Guinea led him to suspend his articles of clerkship and to launch into a new life. He was for a time a Patrol Officer there. He pursued his legal studies by correspondence through the University of London, taking his degree in 1959 and being admitted to practice in Papua-New Guinea (as it then was) in 1963, when he became Assistant Legislative Draftsman there.

It was in that role that the late Judge Daugherty returned to South Australia in 1967 to serve this Parliament, first, as Assistant Parliamentary Draftsman and then from 1972 until 1980 as Parliamentary Counsel. His 11 years working for this Parliament were certainly years of considerable legislative activity, and fruitful work was done in that respect. The late judge would not, I am sure, wish me to dishonour others in the course of honouring him by suggesting that it was all his own work, but certainly there were many pieces of legislation that had his particular stamp upon them.

One of the first major pieces of his drafting was the new Public Service Act of 1967, which has been in use ever since and has survived great changes in the structure and scope of public administration over the intervening years. Other legislative landmarks with which Judge Daugherty was associated as Parliamentary Counsel were the City of Adelaide Development Control Act of 1976 and some pieces of industrial legislation such as the Workers Compensation Act, Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, and the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act. That was by no means the total of his contribution, and the scope of his work indicates the way in which he served this Parliament enthusiastically and well. His zest for living was undiminished by an illness earlier this year, which was evidenced at the time of his death. I pay a tribute and express my thanks to Judge Daugherty for his work, and I express to his widow the sincere sympathy of members and the hope that in time happy memories of the contribution he made will prevail over the present sadness at his sudden death.

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): I join with the Premier in expressing regret at the sudden death of Judge Daugherty, who was a judge of the Local and District Criminal Courts, a position which he held from 1978 onwards with distinction. Although I did not know Judge Daugherty, those who knew him have told me that he was active in his community. He took a keen interest in the welfare of

those afflicted with arthritis, and in his local church at North Adelaide he served as lay reader and priest's warden. It is always saddening when one of those with whom one has worked dies, as I am sure all members of this House will agree. As Parliamentary Counsel, Judge Daugherty served the Parliament well for six years and no doubt members of this place will be saddened by his untimely death at the age of 56 years, especially those who knew him personally.

The Parliamentary Counsel plays a vital role in the working of the Parliamentary system, and the Acts passed by the South Australian Parliament are directly related to the efforts of those who draft legislation, because it is their skill that must often stand the test of the court system and other challenges. Judge Daugherty participated effectively as part of the Parliamentary system in South Australia. On behalf of Opposition members, I join with the Premier in expressing our regret at Judge Daugherty's sudden passing, and ask that you, Mr Speaker, pass on to his widow that expression of regret.

Mr EVANS (Fisher): I support the remarks of the Premier and of the Leader of the Opposition. I enjoyed the friendship of His Honour Judge Bob Daugherty, as I knew him, and I appreciated his zest for living and his ability to communicate with people of all walks of life and not to disregard anyone. That is a virtue very few people have. To Judge Daugherty's widow, I express condolences and the hope that in her craft and other skills that she enjoys she may find satisfaction and consolation in these days of grief, and happiness in future years. I thank both Bob and his wife for their friendship, and I express special appreciation for the service given to this Parliament and the help often given me by Bob himself as Parliamentary Counsel in this place.

The SPEAKER: I support the remarks of the Premier, of the Leader of the Opposition, and of the honourable member for Fisher. Bob Daugherty was an exceptionally able draftsman, and an extremely affable and pleasant person. He had a unique grasp of reducing complex things to their basic simplicity. Even when burdened to the limit with Government business, he always had time for a cheerful word and was universally liked and respected. I join in the condolences offered to his widow and family, and I shall arrange for a copy of these remarks in *Hansard* to be made available to his widow.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Environmental Protection Council—Report, 1982-83. National Parks and Wildlife Act, 1972-1981—Regulations—
- ii. National parks fees.
- iii. Hunting permit fees.
- iv. Wildlife permit fees.
- Planning Act, 1982—Crown development reports by South Australian Planning Commission on proposed—
- v. Erection of six transportable classrooms—Salisbury North Primary School.
- vi. Division of Lots 50, 51 and 52, Gorge Road, Newton.
- vii. Extensions to the Mount Barker courthouse.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Citrus Organisation Committee of South Australia—Report for period ending 30 April 1983.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. South Australian Psychological Board—Report, 1981-82.

By the Minister of Mines and Energy (Hon. R.G. Payne)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Electricity Trust of South Australia—Report, 1982-83.
- ii. Mining Act, 1971—Regulations—Fees.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Corporation of Whyalla—By-law No. 30—Whyalla Cemetery, Control and Management.
- District Council By-laws—
- ii. Clare—No. 27—Keeping of dogs.
 - iii. Paringa—No. 29—Camping and traffic on reserves.
 - iv. Pinnaroo—No. 25—Keeping of dogs.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: INSTITUTION TELEPHONES

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Last month I received a Question on Notice from the member for Murray about the possibility of nuisance calls from inmates of Yatala Labour Prison by means of the recently installed telephones at that institution. My reply, given on 13 September, advised the member that no prison officers or any other person in authority had reported such calls.

I have now discovered that, about the time that the honourable member's question was being considered by officers of the Department of Correctional Services, the office of the Ombudsman was reporting the experience of its staff there that some 'hostile, rude and abusive' telephone calls had been made by inmates from Yatala Labour Prison or Adelaide Gaol. It is not known whether these nuisance calls were made using the 'red' phones at Yatala, or similar phones installed by the previous Government at Adelaide Gaol in 1980. I have to apologise that this fresh information was not taken into account when the reply to the honourable member's question was being framed. My earlier reply to his question of 'No' must now become 'Yes'.

We have been advised of nuisance calls to the Ombudsman, although no specific complaints have been made to the Department of Correctional Services. It does appear that some prisoners have not accepted that the telephones were placed in our institutions to communicate with their families. The Department of Correctional Services had advised all its institutions that telephones are for communicating with families. The Ombudsman has circulated a notice to all correctional institutions telling them that only when danger to life or property is involved should they telephone his office.

QUESTION TIME

The SPEAKER: Before calling for questions, I indicate that in the absence of the honourable Minister of Community Welfare questions will be taken by the honourable Minister of Mines and Energy.

ROXBY DOWNS

Mr OLSEN: Can the Premier give a clear and unequivocal commitment that the Roxby Downs project will proceed if

the joint venturers, Western Mining Corporation and B.P. seek uranium production and export approvals?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The answer is 'Yes'. That commitment has been given by the Government, was given before the recent election, and has since been sustained. The actions taken by the Government have been completely consistent with the carrying out of the terms of the indenture. The joint venturers are satisfied with the way in which the Government has readily co-operated with the advancement of that project in terms of the indenture that was passed by this Parliament.

SPORTING EVENTS 1986

Mr FERGUSON: Can the Minister of Recreation and Sport say what progress has been made in attracting major sporting events to South Australia in 1986 to mark the State's sesqui-centenary celebrations?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I am pleased to inform the member for Henley Beach and the House (including the member for Glenelg) of sporting events that will be held in South Australia in 1986. Although 1986 is a long way off, already 100 sporting events are registered to take place here during that year. More events are expected to be registered for inclusion as jubilee projects. One of the disappointments is that South Australia will not be the venue for the world youth championships as that has been awarded by the world controlling body to Czechoslovakia.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: That is the rowing?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: Yes, the world youth rowing championships. There is still an opportunity to have the succeeding championships, which will be held in 1988, Australia's centenary year, in Adelaide. Two of the international events confirmed are the world roller skating titles and the world moth class sailing championships, to be held at Largs Bay. In addition, there are quite a number of other national events to be held in Adelaide in 1986, including the Australian surf lifesaving championships (with approximately 5 000 participants), the Australian marathon, the fourteenth national paraplegic and quadraplegic games, South Australian open tennis and golf championships (which I understand will have international competitors), the national archery and volleyball championships, and weightlifting titles. Country centres have not been left out and will play a major part in the sporting events in 1986. One event is the equestrian championships at Gawler, which still needs to be firmed up.

There will be a national polo-crosse championship at Naracoorte, national pony club championships at Clare, and national show jumping at Mount Gambier. The majority of sporting groups in the State are working closely with the Jubilee 150 Board towards assembling probably the greatest concentration of championships in South Australia's history. The State Government has provided \$150 000 towards that project. The sporting executive committee—a subcommittee of the Jubilee 150 Board—is examining funding applications by sporting associations and will make a final recommendation to the Board for approval. The Board expects most events to be self funding, and the \$150 000 would be used as guarantees against loss to the groups conducting registered jubilee events. I believe that 1986 will be the most exciting year of sport in South Australia's 150-year history.

URANIUM

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: How does the Premier reconcile his answer to the Leader of the Opposition today

with the continuing uncertainty about the Federal Government's uranium policy? In answer to the Leader today the Premier gave an unequivocal assurance and commitment that the Roxby Downs project would go ahead. The question of export approvals for uranium is within the province of the Federal Government, which has, as yet, not determined its policy in this matter. For the Roxby Downs venture to proceed the producers need the ability to negotiate export contracts and they need export approvals. At the weekend a group of Federal Labor members of Parliament expressed further uncertainty, calling for a general debate in relation to the uranium question, and seeking a ban on further export approvals. The Federal Government also commissioned a report in relation to uranium, and, as a result, has further delayed a decision in the matter. It is on the basis of this continuing uncertainty about Federal policy that I ask the Premier how he can then give this unequivocal assurance.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I certainly appreciate the Deputy Leader's concern. No doubt he is raising this matter in the Parliament in the public interest, with a view to ensuring that South Australia's interests and the indenture are protected. I certainly hope that that is the case, although some of the statements made by him and the Leader in the course of the demonstrations at Roxby Downs some weeks ago indicated otherwise; indeed, they suggested that the underlying feeling of the Opposition is that it would very much like to see this project interfered with in some way so that it can blame this Government and then take some sort of credit. I hope that that will not be its attitude.

As far as the Federal Government is concerned, it obviously (as the Fraser Federal Government would have to have done) made the decision in relation to export licences. Before the Federal election in March, the present Prime Minister and spokesmen in the various areas made clear that the Roxby Downs project would meet approvals at the Federal level. This is consistent with the policy of the A.L.P. as laid down. It is not caught up, despite the desperate efforts of many people, particularly those opposite, in the current context with a general overview of the uranium situation, as I think should be clear in this State. We, as a Government, acted to put the Honeymoon project in mothballs, and there was much criticism from those on the other side of the House. We did that in conformity with the policy that we have put to the people of South Australia. However, the policy that we put to the people of South Australia also contemplated the continuance of the Roxby Downs project in accordance with our policy. That is the situation both at State and Federal levels, and I suggest that the Opposition would do the project a great favour by becoming a little more supportive in relation to it and not attempting to raise it as a public and political controversy. I would suggest (and I am sure that it would have been suggested to them by the joint venturer) that every time our colleagues opposite seek to raise the issue in the way that they do, it in fact makes it a little harder for people to get on with the job that is being done.

BOLIVAR TREATMENT WORKS

Mrs APPLEBY: What action are the Minister of Water Resources and his Department taking following the report claiming that the Bolivar Sewage Treatment Works is responsible for odours in various parts of metropolitan Adelaide owing to atmospheric conditions?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I noticed a press report this morning claiming that odours over a wide area of Adelaide are emanating from the Bolivar treatment works.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: Well, it may be that the member for Glenelg has not changed his socks. For the information of the member for Brighton and the House, the matter is under investigation to ascertain whether there were any unusual circumstances, because there is a wide range of complaints covering suburbs such as Dulwich, Para Hills and Hallett Cove. Therefore, we are assessing not only the Bolivar treatment works but those at Port Adelaide, Glenelg and Christies Beach, to ascertain whether any unusual circumstances at the works may be responsible for the odours.

I find it fairly difficult to believe that the Bolivar treatment works could be responsible for odours at Hallett Cove, some 34 kilometres away. However, there are times when people living within close proximity to treatment works experience some odour because of atmospheric conditions and certain situations that occur in that regard. I assure all members that the Department takes every care and does everything possible to minimise this problem. I point out that there are many other possible sources of the sulphurous odour, one of which is decomposing sea weed.

Mr Mathwin: What?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: That possibility has been suggested to me. The Air Quality Section of the Department of Environment and Planning is attempting to trace the source of the problem and to determine whether the Bolivar treatment works or some other source is responsible for the odour. If the problem recurs, we ask people living in the area affected to report it, to note the time, the wind direction, and the nature of the odour as much as possible, and to contact the Department of Environment and Planning which will endeavour to ensure that everything is done to minimise or eliminate the odour.

URANIUM

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Has the Premier requested the Federal Government to supply a copy of the inter-departmental report on its uranium policy and, if not, will he do so immediately? I am informed that the inter-departmental report which the Prime Minister commissioned to advise the Federal Government in determining its uranium policy has been completed, and that it deals in part with the future of the Roxby Downs project, which is vital for South Australia. The former Premier, Mr Dunstan, instituted arrangements with the Federal Government whereby there was regular interchange of information on uranium matters. In particular, this included providing Canberra with reports of the South Australian Uranium Enrichment Committee. These arrangements, which were continued by the former Liberal State Government, were of significant benefit to the State in policy formulation.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No, I have not requested a copy of the report. I know a great deal of store is being set on this report by members opposite in their attempt to create public agitation on this matter. I am very pleased to see their interest in these internal reports, but at this stage I do not see the need to request a copy of the report which the member opposite tells me has been completed and deals with certain things. It seems as though he knows more about it than I do, and he is quite welcome to do that. I simply refer the member to the answers I gave to the first two questions and suggest that we should try to get on to topics of more contemporary relevance.

WEST LAKES HIGH SCHOOL

Mr HAMILTON: Is the Minister of Education aware of the disquiet and concern being expressed by parents and teachers at West Lakes High School regarding the decision not to reappoint the present Principal, and is the Minister prepared to provide reasons to support his decision?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I am aware of the disquiet being expressed by some parents within the area of the West Lakes High School, and I understand that there has been a school community very supportive of Dr Peter Jackson, who is the Principal of that school at present. I want to take this opportunity to commend the work that Dr Jackson has done at that school, and look forward to his continuing contribution to the work of the Education Department of South Australia.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: He is very innovative.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: He is indeed a very innovative Principal. The situation is that Mr Brenton Sibley, who is presently Principal at Elizabeth High, has been appointed Principal Class A at West Lakes High School from next year. He is a good Principal and educator. The concern expressed by the local community (quite understandably) has to be considered in the context of the way in which Principal Class A positions are determined. In 1974 Principal Class A positions were introduced into South Australian schools, recognising that at certain points of time certain schools (high, primary and junior primary) had special needs and that for those periods such positions needed to be recognised by a special appointment made by a special procedure.

There has never been an undertaking that Principal Class A positions should remain with a school forever, nor that a person appointed to a Principal Class A position should always occupy a Principal Class A position. When a school is identified for a Principal Class A position, that position is advertised, people are advised to apply for the position, and a selection panel is set up comprising the Director of Personnel, the Superintendent of Personnel, three representatives from the South Australian Institute of Teachers, a representative of the South Australian Association of State School Organisations, and a representative of the High School Councils Association in cases where the appointment is to be made to a high school.

The panel short-lists the applications and then interviews the applicants on the short list. The panel then submits a recommendation, first, to the Director-General and, secondly, to me as Minister of Education. If either the Director-General or the Minister does not accept, or is unhappy with, the recommendation, that recommendation must be referred back to the selection panel which then reconsiders its recommendation. If the panel determines to continue with its original recommendation and the Minister and/or the Director-General cannot accept it, the position must be readvertised. There is no possibility of the Director-General or the Minister (and rightly so) interceding and appointing someone other than the person nominated, unless it is done through readvertisement.

These selection panels have worked well ever since 1974. Indeed, there has not been one case of a formal referral back to the selection panel by a Director-General or by a Minister since the scheme was introduced, although there have been times when either the Director-General or the Minister may have asked questions to clarify an issue. Therefore, these selection panels have served over the years with a great degree of probity, and their recommendations need to be taken seriously.

While the panel acknowledges the creative leadership given by Dr Jackson at West Lakes High School over the past five years, in interviewing the applicants for the position

members of the panel were conscious of the job description which had been spelt out for that school and of the fact that the person concerned was being appointed for the next five years. The job description for the school included information provided by the local school community. There were 16 applicants for the position four of whom made the short list, including Dr Jackson. Those four were interviewed and, as a result of that process, Mr Brenton Sibley was appointed. I understand the high regard in which Dr Jackson is held by the students, staff and the school community of West Lakes High School: he is a good educator and will serve well in the Education Department in whatever position he is appointed to. Mr Sibley is also an excellent educator, and I am confident that he will serve West Lakes High School with distinction.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS DUTY

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Can the Treasurer say what rate will be applied when the financial institutions duty becomes law in this State? The New South Wales Budget will be introduced later today and the Victorian Budget tomorrow. Today's *Australian* reports that the rate of the financial institutions duty in New South Wales will be increased by the Budget from 3c to 4c per \$100. Today's *Advertiser* indicates a similar percentage for Victoria when the Budget is introduced in that State tomorrow. At the weekend the Western Australian press announced that the financial institutions duty in that State would be 4c per \$100. I note that the Treasurer has had discussions with the Treasurers of New South Wales and Victoria about the rate of the financial institutions duty. The latest announcements suggest a large element of collusive uniformity in this matter, notwithstanding that the South Australian business community has been asked for an input to the South Australian package, when it appears that a decision has already been taken on the matter.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The answer to the question is 'No', a decision has not been taken in South Australia. The draft proposed Bill has been circulated to financial institutions. I had a meeting a couple of weeks ago to provide copies and discuss the measure in general terms. Copies have been taken away and the people concerned are responding to the Treasury with comments on such a duty and on administrative and other aspects. Those responses will be collated as we advance with the preparation of the legislation.

As I have already explained a number of times before to the House, the rate is bound up with two other aspects, which relate to the yield from an f.i.d., one being the method of exemption that may apply in this case and the other being the taxes which may be remitted as part of the introduction of an f.i.d. Determinations have not been finalised on either of those two matters. Naturally, we will be influenced by the rate of an f.i.d. in the other States and, as I have already said to this House when the Leader of the Opposition was attempting to beat up some sort of shock horror story around this question, it would not be in South Australia's interest to be too much out of kilter with what other States do. Indeed, in this whole area of transactions duty, I guess that it would be in the general interest of commercial transactions if some form of standard could be established across Australia. That matter is being discussed by a working party which was established following the Premiers' Conference this week.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Light not to continue interjecting.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am still working on the assumption that the honourable member's interest is a genuine one and that he is not simply trying to score points. That is why I am spending a little time giving information, but if the honourable member really is not interested I may as well sit down. However, to finalise on this point, we have also criticised very roundly the intrusion of the Commonwealth Government into this area of taxation through their bank debits tax, the so-called 'bad tax'. I hope that this situation can be rationalised soon because, with the narrow revenue base that the State has and with our monumental financial problems, we are placed in a very difficult position where the Commonwealth is moving into those few areas of revenue which are at present open to us. All those matters are the subject of discussion, and I hope that the honourable member now understands the complexity of this issue. It is not a simple matter but one requiring a lot of consultation and consideration. The final decision of the rate will be made only when we have been able to review the overall situation, both in relation to other States and in relation to the responses we get from the financial institutions we have consulted.

INSURANCE COMPANIES

Mr MAYES: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy, representing the Attorney-General in another place, ask his colleague to urgently investigate the need for legislation requiring insurance companies to offer minimum insurance coverage for homes and property, in particular to cover flood and fire damage? Members will recall that after the Ash Wednesday fire I raised this issue in the House following contact from South Australians who had suffered as a consequence of the fire.

That was in relation to the lack of response from a particular insurance company regarding claims made by a person who had lost everything during the Ash Wednesday fire. I again draw this matter to the attention of the House and refer to an article which appeared in the *News* last week relating to the Ombudsman's Report. The article, headed 'Insurance laws need change: Ombudsman', referred to two points, as follows:

In his annual report, tabled in State Parliament yesterday, he says that too often insurance companies regard payment of an insurance claim as a benevolent gesture as the policy is so ambiguously worded the company could refuse to pay practically every claim made.

The article further states:

It is one that should be addressed and reformed so that policy holders are covered, at the very least, for bottom-line insurance and are not told, as it were, after the event that 'flood damage' is not within the ambit of their policy or, alternatively, that they are grossly over-insured and have paid premiums for a number of years based on a misapprehension.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The honourable member has correctly indicated to the House that the matter properly concerns the Attorney-General's portfolio. However, I think all members would be gratified that the member for Unley has raised the question because of its topicality in relation to the recent South Australian flood and fire disasters, and also because it is not an uncommon matter to be raised with all members through their electorate offices. I will undertake for the honourable member to see that his request for an urgent investigation of the matter is forwarded to the Attorney-General, who I am certain will treat the request in a manner satisfactory to the member for Unley and his constituents who have raised the issue with him.

PILOTS' STRIKE

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Will the Minister of Tourism say what alternative travel arrangements are being made during the proposed pilots' strike for interstate people who have booked South Australian holidays through the interstate travel centres of the South Australian Government as a result of the Department of Tourism's current marketing campaign interstate? Today's *Advertiser* carries a report headed 'Pilots plan super war', which states:

A strike expected to ground domestic airlines for several days from Tuesday week will mark the start of a war the pilots plan against the Federal Government's decision to increase lump sum superannuation tax.

It also, unhappily, almost coincides with tourism week. The article continues:

The Executive Director of the AFAP, Mr Len Coysh, said yesterday the federation planned a two-year campaign of action.

It is inevitable that such a campaign would have an adverse effect on the continuing marketing activities of all Australian tourism authorities and would certainly be counter-productive to what the Department of Tourism campaign is trying to achieve.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for raising the matter with me. I, too, share her concern about tourists who have booked for South Australian destinations and who may be affected by the strike. I will have a report brought down for the honourable member on what arrangements can and are being made to satisfy the needs of those people who have booked through South Australian offices in both Victoria and New South Wales and through our agency in Western Australia.

COAST PROTECTION BOARD

Mr PETERSON: Before asking my question, I congratulate the Minister for Environment and Planning on the tenth anniversary of his appointment as a Minister in 1973.

Members interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: Is the Minister aware of the criticism levelled at the Coast Protection Board by Councillor John Denison of the Port Adelaide Council over the allocation of the lease of the Customs Boarding House at Semaphore to the Semaphore Promotions and Tourist Association, and does he intend to reconsider that decision? The *News* last evening, in an article headed 'Coast body must disband' (to which no reporter would put his name), states:

The Coast Protection Board should be disbanded, according to a Port Adelaide City councillor. Cr John Denison said today he was unhappy with the Board's handling of the use of the Old Customs Boarding House at Semaphore. He would put a motion to the Port Adelaide council today that the board be disbanded and a body be set up which was 'more appropriate to community needs'.

I understand that that motion failed last night for want of a seconder. However, the Customs House was purchased by the Government about five years ago and renovated at that time. Since then, it has subsequently been listed with the National Trust. Many suggestions have been put forward during those five years in relation to the use of the building, but the uses are restricted by council zoning, the National Trust listing, and also being within a coastal protection zone.

It has been put to me that, although the dissatisfaction appears to be an individual's comment, it could put at risk an opportunity to use the building within all the restrictions placed upon its use by zoning and the physical layout of the building, because it would require considerable alteration to be used as commercial premises such as a restaurant.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I thank the honourable member for his best wishes and acute sense of history. There is no intention on my part nor that of the Coast Protection Board to review this decision. I think that it is a good decision. It was one that was taken with my full knowledge, and I regard Councillor Denison's call as absolutely ridiculous. I think that it is important to place on record that the whole matter was considered very carefully before this decision was taken. I regard the group to which the honourable member has referred as being a soundly based local organisation and one which has a good deal of local support.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: Who are they?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: It is a tourist promotion group which had been operative locally in the area for quite some time and which sponsored some very worthwhile local activities. I am sure that the local group would be only too happy to approach the honourable member to give him a briefing on its activities if he thought that that would be mutually useful. However, it is a group that intends (and has already with some success) to promote the development of the local area for its tourist potential.

I am happy with the decision that has been made in this case and, in any event, to link up what one councillor perceives as a bad decision in his mind with the concept of disbanding the Coast Protection Board, when all members of this House (particularly those with coastlines in their districts) will be able to testify to the considerable benefits that this State and their districts have had as a result of the activities of the Board, is strange behaviour indeed on the part of that councillor.

Members will also recall that it was the same councillor who caused considerable trouble in the local area in relation to removal of sand from the beaches there. As a result of that agitation, there was considerable discussion with officials of the Corporation of the City of Port Adelaide, and I believe that we have come to some reasonable accommodation as to the way in which things will proceed in future. That is an accommodation which was always possible and, in a sense, was always there and could have happened without the sort of nonsense to which we were subjected by this particular individual. I thank the honourable member for his question.

ROXBY DOWNS

Mr OSWALD: Will the Premier tell the Prime Minister that there is no need for any further wide debate inside or outside the Labor Party about the Roxby Downs project before the Federal Government decides its uranium policy?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr OSWALD: I am informed that, at a meeting of Victorian Federal Labor M.P.s at the weekend, those members demanded, amongst other things, that a wide debate be set in train in and outside the Australian Labor Party on the Roxby Downs project before any decision is taken by Federal Cabinet and Caucus. It has already been put to me that this project has been the subject of continuing public and political debate for more than five years and that, at the recent Federal and State elections, leaders of the major Parties made statements indicating support for the project. As this is a clear attempt by those members to delay the project, I ask the Premier to make urgent representations to the Prime Minister calling on him to reject the call for any further wide debate on this project before the Federal Government finalises its uranium policy.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I would have thought that there was nothing to fear from a wide debate on the project.

We have had such debate over a period in South Australia and we have reached a position that has been confirmed yet again in this place under the constant raising of the issue by members opposite. I repeat that those involved in the project simply want to get on with the job. If there is to be a wide debate, I think it will reinforce my statements in this House on this subject several times since we came to Government.

MUSIC EDUCATION

Mr KLUNDER: Can the Minister of Education say what emphasis is placed on the teaching of music in schools today?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I can advise the honourable member and other members that the Education Department places significant emphasis on the teaching of music in our schools. We have a very active music programme in our primary schools. At the high school level, first, we have music education that takes place in the ordinary high schools, and, secondly, the establishment of special interest music schools, which do an excellent job. It is interesting that the honourable member raises this question today, because this week we are in the midst of the South Australian Public Schools Music Society Festival of Music, and I take this opportunity—

The Hon. Michael Wilson: I am going tonight.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I hear the member for Torrens is going tonight; I wish him well. I think he will thoroughly enjoy himself. I had the opportunity to go on Sunday evening, and I had a superb evening that I thoroughly enjoyed. It paid a tribute—

The Hon. B.C. Eastick interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The member for Light nods his head. He was with us on Sunday night, and I believe he enjoyed it very much, too. It is a tribute to the calibre of the teachers we have in our education system in South Australia that such a festival is produced as well as it is. It is also a tribute to the students who are taking part in the festival. Many schools are involved in this festival and, for those members who have not had a chance yet to go along, it continues until Monday 26 September. Many different schools are performing each night, and I can only commend members to take an opportunity to go if for no other reason than to see schools in their own district performing.

The night I went I was particularly impressed with many things. Again I pay a tribute to the calibre of teachers in our schools and our students and the enthusiasm with which they entered into this festival. One piece which was performed by students of the Port Adelaide Primary School was performed on the Angklung instrument, which is a mediaeval instrument of Indonesia. Those students played an excellent rendition on a mediaeval instrument of Chariots of Fire by Vangelis. It was quite a symbolic piece: the translation of a twentieth century piece of music written for electronics converted to a mediaeval musical instrument. It was a delight to listen to. There were many other special items such as violin concertos, a trumpet solo, and various vocal renditions. The items were excellent, and the school choirs performed superbly.

One item was *Lost in Space*, which was specially commissioned this year for the Music Festival. I first heard it performed at the Elizabeth and Salisbury Music Festival some weeks ago, and it was repeated at this festival on Sunday night. It was written by Martin Wesley-Smith and Ann North, the music by Martin Wesley-Smith. It was a very good production into which the students entered with great gusto, and they performed it exceptionally well.

I think we can take pride in the level of education we have in South Australia. What we saw at this festival was one aspect of that good quality education, namely, music education. However, I think we need to remind ourselves sometimes that we have a superb system in this State. It has teachers who are very good; it has students who are being enlivened with the spirit of education; and they are being supported by parents who are supportive indeed. Music is one of the areas in which we can hold our heads high.

URANIUM

Mr EVANS: Has the Premier asked South Australian Labor members of the Federal Parliament to support the Roxby Downs project during Caucus and Cabinet discussions and, if not, will he do so?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am sure all my Federal Labor colleagues are well aware of our Party policy and the importance of the project.

AID TO DISABLED PERSONS

Mr TRAINER: Will the Chief Secretary ask the Minister of Health to make representations to his Federal colleague to inquire whether the Federal Government's Aid to Disabled Persons Programme can be extended to provide assistance towards covering the cost of battery replacements for certain categories of medical equipment? Last week my office received an inquiry from a Mr and Mrs Galloway, constituents of mine, who are invalid pensioners residing in Morphettville. Mr Galloway has a condition requiring an epidural implant, a device which blocks pain impulses by means of electronic impulses from electrodes implanted in the body, impulses produced by a device powered by a small 9-volt dry cell battery similar to that used in many transistor radios.

Mrs Galloway advises me that her husband needs a fresh battery each day, involving an expenditure of over \$7 a week. This is apparently not covered by medical funds or any Government assistance and is a quite onerous expense for an invalid pensioner. I have made some inquiries on their behalf as to the possibility of using rechargeable batteries. This would have involved an outlay of around \$40 for a charger and two interchangeable 9-volt batteries. That method would have paid for itself within six weeks, but Mrs Galloway advises me that the Flinders Medical Centre has told her that rechargeable batteries are not suitable for powering epidural implants.

It appears that this electronic device is very sensitive to voltage fluctuations, and Mr Galloway must use relatively expensive disposable heavy duty 9-volt transistor batteries and dispose of them when they are only 25 per cent discharged. I further understand that she has been told that rechargeable batteries do not hold a constant 9 volts for long enough to be a feasible alternative. Mr Galloway suffers from a disability which he believes is worthy of consideration for financial assistance similar to that given to other persons, under the Aid to Disabled Persons Programme or any programme that can be arranged by the South Australian Government.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I shall be pleased to take this matter up with my colleague, and I thank the honourable member for bringing it to the attention of Parliament. I am sure that all members would agree with him in the expectation that the Federal Government can show some sympathy to the predicament of his constituent, and can provide the

assistance that I am sure we all believe such people should have.

SOUTHERN DEVELOPMENT

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Can the Minister for Environment and Planning say when it is intended that land will be rezoned to facilitate development south of the Onkaparinga River and whether the development of that land will have higher priority than land at Morphett Vale East?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: This matter has yet to be resolved.

UNMARKED POLICE VEHICLES

Mr FERGUSON: Will the Chief Secretary investigate the possibility of increasing the number of unmarked police vehicles to patrol the metropolitan area in an attempt to police traffic offences? I have received correspondence from a constituent who has suggested that the road toll and the number of accidents in the metropolitan area could be reduced by increased patrolling in unmarked police cars. Inquiries of police officers have revealed that there is a considerable body of opinion within the Police Force that this might be an effective way of reducing the road toll.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I will have the question investigated by the Police Department and bring down a reply. It may be, as the member suggests, that more unmarked police vehicles on the road could have the effect of reducing the road toll and road accidents because drivers would never be certain as to who was in a vehicle alongside or behind them, and they might be persuaded to be more careful.

The contrary argument has been put to me by the Police Department that the more visible police vehicles are on the road, the more visible police are whether they are on motor cycles, in patrol cars, or on foot, the more likely it is that they will be able to reduce the actions of irresponsible drivers that lead to accidents. Whichever one is the more effective, or whether both systems are effective, I share with the honourable member his concern about the extent to which the road accident rate can be reduced, and any suggestion that may help solve the problem should be investigated.

COUNTRY ROADS

Mr BLACKER: Can the Minister of Transport assure the House and the District Council of Elliston that funding for the Lock-Elliston road will continue as previously promised? Further, can the Minister give a similar assurance that funding of the Cleve-Kimba road will continue as in previous years? Some months ago I introduced a deputation from the District Council of Elliston to the Minister to discuss future funding of work on the Lock-Elliston road. On that occasion the Minister and the Commissioner of Highways could not indicate the possibility of increased funding for this rural arterial road, but assurances were given that at least equal funding could be expected in respect of work on it. Similar assurances have been given with respect to work on the Cleve-Kimba road. I have been told that, at even this low level of funding, the completion of the road will take 22 years with no other roadworks being undertaken on Eyre Peninsula. I further understand that the district councils

involved have, in framing their budgets, assumed that similar funding will be received.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: There has been a reduction in some areas of the road programme in line with general economies forced on the Government, and such reduction has some impact on the grants to councils for the extension of the rural arterial network. Efforts are being concentrated on maintenance and essential construction rather than on extensions. The discussions held with the honourable member and local government representatives regarding the Lock-Elliston road showed that the Highways Department was allocating as much money as it could for work on that road. During the 1984-85 financial year, the money available to those local councils under the local government grants legislation will be increased by 6 per cent and, whilst the 1983-84 grants to local government for extension roadworks will be reduced in respect of direct grants, there will be an increase in the rural arterial specific works programme, so that in that regard the councils will not suffer any overall reduction because of the additional money being put into these specific roadworks programmes.

Recently, this Government negotiated with the Commonwealth Government for an additional \$4.5 million for national highways, and most of that additional grant for this financial year will be spent on Dukes Highway and Stuart Highway. The funds now available will represent an almost 100 per cent increase in the money available for contract work compared to last year's total. There is an allocation, together with the A.B.R.D. funding, of \$50 million in the tendering for roadworks this financial year. When the \$4.5 million is added to that, the total of \$54.5 million compares with the \$27 million referred to in the Auditor-General's Report this year. So, although there is some reduction for the rural arterial roadworks, councils will not suffer as a result of additional money being made available for specific roadworks.

CIGARETTE ADVERTISING

Mr BAKER: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy, who today is representing the Attorney-General, say whether, if the Bill to ban tobacco advertising introduced by the Australian Democrats in the Legislative Council became law, there would be legal implications in respect of the Benson and Hedges sponsorship—

The SPEAKER: Order! The question is totally out of order on several grounds. Regarding the first part of the question, as to whether the legislation has been made law, the honourable member answers his own question since one House alone cannot make law. The second part of the question is totally speculative, and I must rule it out of order.

ALICE SPRINGS TO DARWIN RAILWAY

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Can the Premier say why the South Australian Government has endorsed the terms of reference of the economic inquiry into the Alice Springs to Darwin railway line when the terms of reference exclude the consideration of defence matters? Further, why has the South Australian Government endorsed the appointment of Mr David Hill as Chairman of that inquiry? It has been indicated in this morning's newspaper that apparently the terms of reference of this inquiry will exclude consideration of any defence matter, and I understand that it will simply consider the economic aspects of the railway. I refer the

Premier to the debate in this House on 31 May 1983, when the Deputy Premier said, concerning the inquiry to be set up by the Commonwealth Government into the proposed railway line from Alice Springs to Darwin:

We have agreed only if the terms of reference suit us... Let me repeat what I said on radio and on television immediately following that conference—

That is, the conference with the Prime Minister—

I said: the inquiry must cover the short and long-term economic effects of both links; otherwise, we are wasting our time. That was my public statement, which happened to coincide exactly with what I told the Prime Minister: that, unless the terms of reference were extended to cater for such a situation, obviously South Australia would not be interested.

I heard a broadcast on the local radio last Thursday during which Mr David Hill was described as the hatchet man for the New South Wales Premier (Mr Wran). The broadcast went on to question whether such a person was suitable to conduct such an inquiry because of his strong support for New South Wales against the rest of Australia. I ask my question especially as it appears that the terms of reference are limited and, based on what the Deputy Premier said in this House, the South Australian Government under no circumstances should accept the terms of reference laid down by the Prime Minister. Therefore, the South Australian Government should not support the inquiry.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The question is relevant, perhaps a little more on the issues of the day than some of the nonsense we heard earlier today in Question Time. The terms of reference of the inquiry and the person to conduct it have been agreed to by the Government in the sense that we will participate fully in the inquiry and our case make just as it has been made by the Northern Territory.

In fact, I conferred with my colleague from the Northern Territory prior to making any statement about them. At the meeting that Mr Everingham and I had with the Prime Minister in Canberra some weeks ago, it was agreed that our officers would consult in relation to the terms of reference. At that meeting, the Prime Minister also made clear his attitude to the defence aspect of the inquiry and said that this was a matter that properly should be reserved for the Federal Government, that it should not be canvassed in the inquiry. Both Mr Everingham and I said that we believed that it was a relevant factor that should be looked at as part of the general inquiry but that, if that was the policy of the Federal Government, we would hope to have some input into defence ramifications of the railway at the stage at which the Government would be considering them.

In fact, the terms of reference, as agreed, have taken into account most of the points that the Northern Territory and South Australia wish to have included, with that exception of defence, which we were not surprised to see excluded because the Prime Minister made clear that he would not include that as a term of reference for the inquiry. I have, in accepting those terms of reference, restated the opinion that the Northern Territory and South Australia share about the importance of it, expressing the desire to be involved in submissions on defence implications if necessary at the time the Federal Government considers them.

As to the person to conduct the inquiry, both the Northern Territory and South Australia suggested a range of names; there has been considerable consultation over that. It was always accepted that the Commonwealth would make the final decision as to the person who would conduct the inquiry. Certainly, suggestions have been made about Mr Hill's role. I do not believe that it is a reasonable approach to the inquiry to begin by abusing or casting imputations on the inquirer. The onus is on us to make the case and to see that that case is sustained. Mr Hill has, without question, considerable experience in railways, railway administration and general transport. A quotation of an opinion on him

was made by the member, but it is interesting to note that about two weeks ago in the *Sunday Australian* Mr Hill was reported as endorsing and expressing great support for the promotion of passenger services from Sydney to Alice Springs, taking advantage of course of the new rail link there, saying that this is something that ought to be promoted much more vigorously as a tourist route, and that he and the New South Wales railways administration intended to do just that.

The tourist benefits of the Alice Springs to Darwin link are obviously an important part of our case, so, at least in that direction, I think it is fair to say that the person conducting the inquiry is on record as understanding the possible tourist benefits and implications of railways. However, all that having been said, the terms of reference are established, the person has been appointed to conduct the inquiry, the inquiry, I understand, is to report by the end of the year, and it is now up to the Chamber of Commerce and other interested groups in the community and the respective Governments to make their case.

COAST PROTECTION BOARD

Mr BECKER: Will the Minister for Environment and Planning approach the Coast Protection Board to stop the proposed scheme for sand removal from West Beach? I understand that the Coast Protection Board plans to remove about 60 000 tonnes of sand from West Beach. I believe that the area is south of the Henley South outlet. A constituent of mine (a retired engineer) assisted me in trying to ascertain how much 60 000 tonnes of sand would be if taken from the beach. I understand that this would mean the removal of about 5 feet of sand from the Torrens outlet through to the lifesaving club. If this is the case, I wonder why the Coast Protection Board would want to remove such a large volume of sand, as some years ago a similar project was undertaken and it has taken all this time for the sand to build up again on the beach.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I am sure that I can commit myself to discussing the matter with the Coast Protection Board, but I am not prepared to commit myself to giving an instruction to the Board that it should not proceed. The Coast Protection Board, of course, proceeds in relation to sand on the good socialist principle of taking it from those who have too much and giving it to those who have not got enough. The reason for the uneven distribution of sand along the metropolitan beaches is in part the result of groynes, either artificial or natural, which occur along the beach. The natural groyne that occurs in the area to which the honourable member has referred is the River Torrens outlet. At a time of the year such as the present, when there is a good deal of water flowing to the sea, this acts as a barrier to the long-shore drift to the north. The result is that there is a considerable build up.

The SPEAKER: Order! The time for questions has expired, it being 3.15 p.m. Before calling on the business of the day, I understand that the honourable Deputy Leader seeks leave to make a personal explanation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: ROXBY DOWNS

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Premier misrepresented both me and the Leader today in a non-answer to a question I asked when he suggested that public statements made by the Leader and me had sought to impede or in fact stop the Roxby Downs project during the course of the recent blockade, without any skerrick of evidence to support that untruth.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I put it before the House—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The fact is that the Opposition has fought tooth and nail for that project to proceed, and the Premier knows that full well. The difficulty during the blockade was that members of the Young Labor Movement were up there trying to stop it, and significant sections in the Labor Party, including particularly the Victorian branch, wished to stop that project. The Premier should not attempt to alleviate those difficulties by making untrue statements about the behaviour of the Opposition.

JOINT HOUSE COMMITTEE

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Deputy Premier): By leave, I move:

That, pursuant to the Joint House Committee Act, 1941, Mr K.C. Hamilton be appointed to be a representative of the House of Assembly on the Joint House Committee in place of Mr K.H. Plunkett.

Motion carried.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I move:

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution.

Motion carried.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 15 September. Page 886.)

Mr MAYES (Unley): In the time that remains to me I wish to continue the points that I raised last week, particularly in regard to the education line and the position taken by the Labor Government in regard to the allocation of moneys to both recurrent expenditure and the capital budget. As I pointed out to the House last week, the situation regarding wages is quite clear. Over the past 12 months there has not been a wage movement for teachers in this State. One would believe, from comments made from the Opposition benches, that teachers were in fact putting this State under severe pressure financially with their outrageous demands. We know that not to be the case; in fact, there has been a wage freeze since September 1982, and the adjustment then was in the order of 6 per cent.

I want to look at the allocations made by this Government in comparison with the allocations made by the previous Government, particularly in the recurrent expenditure area but also in the capital area, and to make some analysis of what that means to the State of South Australia and particularly to education in the State, which is such a vital area of expenditure. The total allocation for education for recurrent operations in 1983-84 represents 30.31 per cent of the total proposed recurrent outlays from Consolidated Account. That does not include money set aside for the expected increase in wages and salaries over the next year or any price increases as a consequence of price rises that occur in

that period. If one looks at the allocations that have been made for the period 1982-83, making actual adjustments for that period, the previous Liberal Government's allocation was 30.1 per cent.

So, we can see that in real terms there has been an increase in the allocation to the education recurrent expenditure budget. If we go back to the comparable period in 1981-82 and look at the figure again, allowing for adjustments to get a comparative figure, we find that it was 30 per cent for the same period. Again, this Government has maintained its commitment to education as the best possible investment for the future of this State. As the Minister indicated earlier in answer to a question about the quality of education, it is an emphasis which this Government sees as being relevant and important for the future development of South Australia. This Government has again committed itself to a real increase in expenditure for education in the recurrent line. It is important that that message goes out to the community so that what we have done in this regard is clear.

I refer also to staff numbers (as I did briefly last week in my address on the Budget allocation). It is clear that we have increased the number of staff available for teaching in two areas. The 1983-84 Budget represents an increase of 154 in ancillary staff, namely, school assistants, teacher aides and laboratory assistants. Such areas are vital in order to allow teachers free time and to give specialist teaching to students, whether it be language teaching for migrant children recently arrived in Australia, or as a back-up for other teaching services. In addition, we made a clear commitment to the education community of South Australia (the whole community, as everyone is affected indirectly) that 231 additional staff would be maintained. That provides for an absolute improvement in the student/staff ratio and brings that ratio below 25 to 30, depending on whether the school is primary or junior primary. It is clear that this Government has maintained its commitment to the State and has emphasised the importance of education investment in South Australia.

It is also important that it highlights a comparison between the former Tonkin Liberal Government and what the Bannan Labor Government has done over the past 10 months in the education line. In addition, if we look at declining enrolments over that period (which is the proper way to provide a comparison), we see a net loss in student enrolments of some 4 000. In 1984 we expect a decline in the order of 2 000. Again, this Government will maintain its commitment and improve student/staff ratios so that there are fewer students per class.

I turn now to the Budget allocation for capital expenditure. That issue has been pursued with some vigilance by the shadow Minister and some of his colleagues in regard to the real situation as far as the allocation is concerned. Before doing that, I draw to members' attention the comment made in the *South Australian Teachers Journal*. We have been much criticised by members opposite who state that there has been a drop in real terms in the education allocation. In a recent issue of the journal, copies of which all members of the House receive, it is clear that the President's comments are in praise of this Government's attitude and its commitment to education in this State. It states:

South Australian education has fared better under Labor's first Bannan Budget than it would have under a Liberal Government. Labor's commitment on salaries has been met—300 have been saved.

The '300' refers to teaching and ancillary staff jobs. The article continues:

Other positive initiatives include an injection of \$1.7 million into housing, 8 800 extra days for temporary relieving teachers, the Government's commitment to fund two full-time positions for the South Australian Aboriginal Education Consultative Com-

mittee and allocation of \$250 000 for leasing equipment for high technology centres within the State school system.

Overall funds for primary and secondary education for 1983-84 are \$507 million, roughly \$42 million more than for last year's Budget. The Department of Technical and Further Education will receive \$73 million, approximately \$8 million more than last year.

That is well above any inflation factor to be encountered by the Department of Technical and Further Education. So, we find that the comments from the Institute of Teachers, which is concerned about the quality of education and the emphasis that any Government places on education in this State, praise the Labor Government's policies on education. I believe that that praise is appropriate, given the Government's commitment to education.

I refer now to the Budget allocation as the shadow Minister has made great mileage out of it. I will draw to the attention of the House some factors that may have escaped the attention of members opposite and may have escaped the eye of the public. I refer to allocations made up to 1981 in the education area from the time the Liberal Government came into power in 1979. It is clear that there has been a direct percentage drop in expenditure in real terms in the capital Budget line by the Liberal Government. It is ill-placed and poor comment from the shadow Minister, who stands up and accuses our Minister of cutting off allocations to real capital expenditure in the education area when, in fact, there was a rapid decline from the Liberal Government over that period. The Opposition has nothing to stand on and cannot trumpet its praises to the community. It has nothing to herald as expenditure dropped over that period.

In 1981, actual expenditure was \$34.6 million and expenditure in real terms was \$27.54 million, representing in 1977-78 terms 62.9 per cent of the Budget for capital expenditure. That is a drop since the Dunstan Government period of about 40 per cent. In 1981-82, \$27.35 million was actually expended or 19.261 million was the amount in real terms—44 per cent in 1977-78 expenditure in real terms. That Government incurred a further 20 per cent drop in real terms in the capital expenditure area. In 1982-83, \$26.7 million was actually expended, \$17.5 million in real terms—40.1 per cent in percentage terms in 1977-78 figures. Liberal Party members stand on the other side and criticise our position. Given their track record in terms of recurrent expenditure, teacher relations, and education as a whole, and their criticism of us for our position, when we have been diligently looking at recurrent expenditure areas in terms of teacher and education quality, they have nothing to crow about. They ought to look carefully before they make any criticism of our position in regard to capital expenditure.

I do not have much more time to devote to any other part of the Budget today. However, I have referred to an important aspect which was picked up by the Opposition, and regarding which our Minister was criticised. There have been comments in the community, from parents in my electorate, and from the teachers' representative union. It is a matter about which we can be pleased in terms of our continued commitment not only to education as a whole but to Aboriginal education, technical and further education, and to the continuation of teacher numbers and improving the quality of teacher/staff ratios.

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

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I would like to commence by referring to four words: truth, lie, promise and trust, and, of course, their implication to the Budget. It was interesting to look up the definition of these words. For example, the word 'truth' means 'conformity to fact and reality to the utmost extent that these are discoverable by the human

mind'; 'conformity to fact in statement'; or, interestingly enough, 'the reverse of a lie'. The word 'lie' means 'a deliberate untruth'; 'a statement made to hide the truth for sinister reasons'. Interesting is the meaning of 'white lie'—'a statement not in strict accordance with the truth uttered for benevolent motives'. Perhaps that is one of the attributes of a certain person in this place. The word 'promise' means 'an undertaking, engagement, assurance by one person to another or others to do or not to do something'.

Why define these words? It all began last Saturday morning when, strolling through the Burnside Village, I met a young 16-year-old lad, a good friend of my wife, who said to me, 'Mr Ingerson, can I trust you?', which I thought was a rather strange sort of question to come from such a person. He then said, 'Last Wednesday I read an article in the *News* written by Mr Tony Baker.' The article, headed 'M.P.s can't be real', stated:

Humanity can be divided into two categories apart from men and women: real people and politicians. Politicians begin sentences with phrases like 'at this point in time' and their entire language is a unique variant of English in which a word means what you want it to mean. For instance, the word 'promise' has an infinity of meanings.

He goes on in that article to talk about the increasing number of M.P.s in the Federal Parliament, and then says:

There is one other quality which distinguishes politicians and the punters: they are dead crafty.

I would like to bring out those two points again: that the word 'promise' has an infinity of meanings, and that we are crafty people. That sort of comment concerns me, especially when a lot of young people consider that politicians do not understand what the word 'promise' means and believe that we are crafty or devious people. The next question this young man put to me was, 'Do all politicians break their promises when they become elected?', because he said that it seemed that while one does not have a position in Government—

Mr Mayes: You're okay: you make none.

Mr INGERSON: Perhaps when we get to that side of the fence, at least we will be able to uphold them.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Klunder): Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr INGERSON: I was asked what were we going to do about this problem of truth and broken promises. That brings me to the point of who has caused this problem in recent times and whether the problem is continuing. Who is it that has broken so many promises that it must be difficult for him to tell the difference between truth and lie? Who is it that cannot be trusted any more because he does not know the difference between fudge and apple pie? Who is it that blames the previous Government for mismanagement and then lets his own Ministers overspend \$23 million? Who is it that continues to overspend himself by authorising a further \$5 million deficit? Of course, it is the Premier and Treasurer, the person who obviously believes that credibility, integrity, truth and honesty are traits that are not needed to lead this State.

Referring to the 1982-83 Budget, I point out the document presented by the Leader of the Opposition to this Parliament in December clearly set out the position regarding the re-statement of the \$13 million deficit and the information that was then available in the achievement of that deficit. It is interesting that the present Premier of this State has never disputed this fact, and I suppose that that is purely and simply because the advice in that statement was put forward by Treasury. The same document pointed out clearly that, if the Budget put forward had been managed by the Liberal Government, there would have been a deficit of the order of \$19 million which obviously could have been controllable and could have been funded clearly by good management

in the future. Of course, that does not take into consideration the problem of the terrible natural disasters we had which would obviously have increased that sum of \$19 million.

Since December there has been a marked deterioration, and it is interesting that, going back to the statement of the Leader of the Opposition, the Premier has not refuted that statement, which clearly set out from a minute of the Under-Treasurer that on about 14 December there was in fact an over-run in expenditure by departments of some \$9 million, the balance of \$23 million being attributed to the mismanagement of this Government. Why did the Budget deteriorate in 1982-83? First, it deteriorated because of wage and salary increases to the extent of some \$17.5 million above the Budget. These increases were due to negotiations in 1981-82 and could not possibly have been taken into consideration by the previous Government. I have mentioned the natural disasters, amounting to a figure of the order of \$15.8 million.

Finally, the third and major reason for the problem is the fact that there was an over-spending by departments of \$23.2 million. I am quite sure that any manager in charge of a business for two-thirds of the year who did nothing about such a situation but merely sat down and blamed his predecessors would not be reappointed as a manager of any public company in this State. One of the areas in which I am especially interested is that of health, and on this matter I thought it would be appropriate to quote from the Auditor-General's Report, page 385 of which states:

Internal audit—I am concerned at the inadequate reporting and accountability to Parliament for revenues and expenditures of approximately \$550 million per annum on health services.

In relation to cash management, the report states:

It is evident that greater attention needs to be given by management to efficient cash management practices. The delays in the raising of certain types of charges, tardy follow-up of unpaid accounts and excess stock holdings in relation to usage, showed a lack of appreciation of the cumulative effect on the Commission's cash resources and in turn the Treasury.

Further comment is made on this matter later in the report. The report continues:

Significant features—Total funds applied to health and associated activities increased by \$67 million (14 per cent) to \$546 million. The cost of salaries and wages increased by \$50 million (16 per cent to \$370 million).

The report further states:

Net cost of commission operations—The net cost to the State of supporting Government and non-government hospitals and a number of related bodies was \$275 million, an increase of \$39 million compared with the previous year, and exceeded the original Budget estimate of \$225 million by \$50 million. Supplementary Estimates provided an additional \$17 million. The major factors contributing to the over-run on the original Budget were—

	\$'million
cost of new salary and wage award increases	30
price increases for services and supplies	5
shortfall in patients fees, etc., below original budget estimate	21

Perhaps that is the sort of lack of Ministerial control that was discussed by the Premier in his note to particular Ministers when he suggested that the belt ought to be tightened. Before dealing with the estimated receipts for 1983-84, I want to comment on taxation and some of the effects taxation has on industry. There is no question that reducing or lowering taxation is necessary to increase market demand and thus employment. There is no question that the lowering of taxes has a significant benefit for industry, quite distinct from the artificial stimulus of demand which is created by Government spending.

Secondly, lower taxes contribute to the containment of costs which assists competitiveness. There is no question that today one of the major problems facing industry is its lack of competitiveness. As someone who has been involved for a considerable time in industry, I know that one of its major problems is the cost of tax increases of the kind

about which nothing can be done. Lower taxes are necessary to take the heat off the demand for higher incomes. We all know that we need to keep up our disposable income, and if taxes go up there is no question that the only thing an employee can do is ask for more income. These attitudes seem to be quite opposite to that of the present Government.

In this Budget the total revenue is increased by 15.25 per cent or \$338.4 million. This is made up of an increase of 11.3 per cent or \$225.6 million in receipts of a recurrent nature and an increase of 38.3 per cent or \$112.7 million in receipts of a capital nature. Put simply, the State Government has \$338.4 million extra to spend this year than it had last year to run its everyday committed expenditure, to initiate new programmes of its own choosing and to attempt to repay some of its debts that have accumulated over the past year.

The \$338.4 million is an all-up added figure, because the Premier has chosen to consolidate his receipts and use or shift money from capital to recurrent use. This is an interesting backflip from his days as Leader of the Opposition when he was continually critical of the former Government (and the Dunstan Government did this previously) for using capital funds to balance up its spending. It is interesting, now that the boot is on the other foot, that it does not make much difference. We seem to get back to those four words again.

The backflip was done again in relation to the promise that there would be no tax increases. As will be seen in the Budget, tax increases about to be imposed on the people of South Australia are massive. The other interesting backflip is 'the mirage in the desert' statement. Suddenly, from the mirage in the desert, there is now a complete endorsement of the Roxby Downs project. Perhaps we ought to rename the Premier 'Backflip Bannon', because he seems to be an expert at this manoeuvring.

Major increases in receipts of a recurrent nature involve an increase in taxation of 14.2 per cent or \$78 million. That alone would pay off the deficit. Receipts from public undertakings will increase by 17 per cent or \$30.2 million. Territorial income is up by 45.4 per cent or \$5.5 million, and that is due to the Cooper Basin liquids scheme project which was established during the life of the Liberal Government. Receipts from the Commonwealth on recurrent expenditure are up by 11.1 per cent or \$109.6 million.

Of a capital nature there is an increase in programmes emanating from Loan Council amounting to \$12.5 million, and funds invested by State authorities are up by \$123 million, both of those being significant contributions from the Commonwealth Government. Taxation increases will have the most effect on the business sector, although some of them are applicable to many consumers as well. Receipts from land tax will be up by 20.5 per cent, placing an extra \$4.8 million in general revenue. It is interesting to note that this increase in land tax, even though it is put on to the landlord, is a direct cost on to the landlord which is thus put back on to many small businesses. Some constituents in my area have been forewarned that this increase in land tax will be as high as 400 or 500 per cent. This is due in part to a general revaluation of properties, but this sort of increase is astronomical.

Pay-roll tax, which is a tax on employment, is up by 5.2 per cent, or \$12.2 million, to \$235 million. I believe that the Government should be looking at ways of getting rid of this tax, which is an iniquitous tax on employment. The Government should be trying to broaden our tax base. The f.i.d. is an interesting new tax. We have been told that the Premier has not made up his mind what it will be but I think it would be a good guess to suggest that it will be 4c per \$100.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Did you believe that answer?

Mr INGERSON: I think that the Premier probably had to ask Mr Wran, his mate in New South Wales, whether it will be 4c per \$100, but I am sure he knows the answer.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: He seems to follow Mr Wran all the time.

Mr INGERSON: Yes, he seems to think that Mr Wran is pretty good, although Mr Wran may be in a bit of trouble, if one reads articles on Mr Greiner. Copies of the Bill providing for this duty have been circulated around, and this Parliament will probably be the last to know what it actually contains, but in the current year it is estimated that receipts from this duty will amount to \$8 million. One notes an asterisk suggesting that some stamp duties will be decreased. It is also interesting to note, however, that stamp duty will increase by 13 per cent or \$17 million. There is a note indicating that this has not been varied because it is not known how much the f.i.d. will bring in, but I am sure any f.i.d. measure will only have the effect of increasing income for the Government.

As regards business franchise, there is an increase of \$3.3 million in the gas levy, which is the levy the Liberal Government decided to take off in order to help control the price of gas. In this Budget, however, \$3.3 million is put back on again, and obviously the price of gas will go up, so we will again see the consumers of this State paying for the extravagances of this Government. The liquor tax will bring in an extra \$3 million or 14 per cent. Many publicans are concerned that this is another expense within their industry, and they see it as being a threat to employment in their area. The impost affecting petroleum of 1c a litre represents a 30.2 per cent increase or an extra \$11.2 million in Government revenue, and this will have an effect on tourism.

Any tax on petrol tends to reduce the consumption, and if people decide not to travel around the State or not to visit the State, there must be a dramatic effect on tourism. Tourism is the area to which small business has its greatest chance, and there must be some sort of effect on employment. The tobacco tax is to be increased by 46 per cent to bring in another lump sum of \$13.5 million. In regard to statutory contributions, another revenue raising area, ETSA will contribute \$2.9 million to the State kitty purely and simply because of the levy for the full year on the tariff increase.

In regard to public undertakings, the E. & W.S. Department will contribute a further \$23 million, entirely due to the increase in the price of water by 22 per cent and the fact that water and sewerage rates have increased by 16 per cent. Country people take the smack behind the ear, because irrigation and drainage costs have been increased by 28 per cent. Regarding recovery of debt services, the State cash reserves are reduced because of the deficit, and therefore there is less interest on the income side. This line has been increased by \$14 million. Why? Because the Government has now decided to insist that ETSA pays 12 per cent on its loan instead of the 6½ per cent that it has been paying for a long time. Who will pay for this? The consumers and business will pay.

Another very interesting increase relates to the line of the Chief Secretary: fines will bring in a further \$2.7 million. As I said earlier, there is an increase of \$6 million in the territorial area, purely and simply because of the liquids scheme. All these increases will give a total of \$225 million, or 11 per cent. With taxation increased by 14 per cent, or \$78 million, if one adds the interest charges from ETSA and the increased E. & W.S. charges of \$23 million, one finds that there will be a tidy sum due to back-door taxation of about \$115 million.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: The Premier said he wasn't going to do that.

Mr INGERSON: It is just another one of those broken promises.

Mr Ashenden: I think they call it 'fudge'—the broken promise you make when you are not making a broken promise.

Mr INGERSON: It is something like that. If this sum had gone towards paying off the debt, we would not question that action, but what the Government has said is that the taxation increases are due purely and simply to the now Opposition's mismanagement. The truth is that this taxation increase can be squandered by the Government, and that is the reason for the increase in taxation. If the sum is not to be squandered, why is there to be a deficit of \$5 million? Why has there been no attempt to pay off any of the back debt? As I said, when one adds the income from the capital programme, which, interestingly, has been increased by \$113 million, one finds that there is a total increase in receipts of \$338 million. One would have thought that from such an increase the Government would make some attempt to reduce the deficit.

But what has the Government done? Its committed expenditure has increased by 7 per cent, and it seems, if one looks through some of the programme performance papers, that the public sector staff has increased by about 1 200. This shows that the Government has chosen to put the majority of its eggs into the housing basket and short-term job creation schemes. There is no question that money spent in the housing sector is warranted and needed, and the Government should be congratulated for that course, but it is of concern that so much money is going into short-term job creation schemes which have what appears to be very little asset backing.

The Government has chosen to operate a \$5 million deficit, thus giving the State an accumulated deficit of \$63 million. The interest on public debt will increase this year by \$16.8 million, or 7.6 per cent. It is intriguing that the Government blames other areas for poor management and yet it has an interest bill increase this year of \$16.8 million. Admittedly, all this increase is not due to the current interest on the deficit, but is due also to some refinancing of other loans. Any manager knows that when loans fall due he is not likely to be able to obtain the same loan at a cheaper rate, but the Government is quite happy to accept an income increase of \$338 million and is not prepared to do anything about its debt. In fact, the Government is quite happy to spend an extra \$16.8 million on interest. What is interest? Interest is a total waste of a scarce resource: it achieves absolutely nothing.

It is a pity that with such a large increase in receipts some attempt has not been made to reduce the deficit. The people of South Australia must recognise and accept that they cannot spend more than they earn. There is no such thing as a free lunch—debts, once incurred, have to be repaid. As I said earlier, there will be an increase in the interest debt during the next 12 months of \$16.8 million. It is a pity that the Treasurer has not learnt that. I wonder whether he is as slap-dash in managing his own finances as he is in managing the finances of the people of South Australia.

What is needed? We need to recognise that one should not spend more than one has. We have to live within our means, and the Treasurer has to treat money as if it were his own. We cannot say, 'No, it doesn't matter, we can always increase the taxes. We will spend a bit more, and we will increase the taxes next year.' If there are any debts or deficits, we should attempt to repay them because, as I said, interest payments are totally wasted and unproductive. Increased taxation should be used to repay debts. If that had been done, there would probably have been very little criticism from this side of the House.

Staff in all departments and agencies should be attuned to maximum efficiency and productivity. That was a course that the Liberal Government held high in its priorities in regard to managing the economy of the State. We should spend money on projects that have long-term gains for the community and not on projects that purely and simply offer short-term options. We must balance the Budget by reducing expenditure. A letter to the Editor of the *Advertiser* from Mr Bertram Cox relating to what this Government is doing, under the heading 'Huge Budget deficits "calamitous"', states:

It is gratifying to see interest rates falling. This helps to restrain inflation as well as encourage housing and other business development. But Governments are threatening a reversal of this trend. The huge deficits budgeted for, both State and Federal, are calamitous. These deficits have to be covered by borrowing in a market with only a limited supply of cash. Such increased borrowings must cause interest rates to rise.

Unfortunately, in this decade the only expanding factor in our economy is our Governments and they do not produce anything, they only consume. All industry, agricultural, mining and manufacturing, requires a Government to help, not hinder, production of the goods we need. The more a Government spends, the less we citizens have to spend. It would be interesting to know what percentage of our taxes is caused by interest on past borrowings.

I can tell members that it is \$220 million. The letter further states:

This is a useless item of expenditure that does no good to anyone; even the recipients could obtain the same or better return from a productive investment. Government Budgets must be balanced by reducing expenditure, not increasing taxation. As individuals we have to do so, and it is so much easier for a Government. Expenditure tends to rise to use all available income.

In this instance it has been shown that there is an increase in income of \$338 million, but the Government has spent the whole lot, plus \$5 million more. The letter continues:

If Government revenues were doubled today, a deficit Budget would still be presented within a few years.

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

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON (Torrens): Before dealing with the education budget, I refer to page 10 of the Estimates of Receipts on the Consolidated Account for the year ending 30 June 1984. I specifically refer to the recurrent receipts from the Commonwealth Government. I believe that these are extremely important, because money paid by the Commonwealth Government to the State Government as tied grants for education must have an important impact on the State Budget: indeed, a very deleterious impact this year. At page 10, under the heading 'Minister of Education and Minister for Technology', we are told that the Commonwealth Government has granted money to this State under four headings: early childhood education; primary and secondary education; school to work transition; and technical and further education.

I refer to the estimated receipts for 1982-83, and will compare them with the estimated receipts for 1983-84. I shall not deal with actual figures because it is impossible to project them accurately. There is a reduction of \$2.2 million in the grant for early childhood education; an increase of \$2.2 million for primary and secondary education; a reduction of \$2.2 million for school to work transition; and an increase (indeed, a welcome increase) of \$4.65 million for technical and further education.

The programme in respect of school to work transition has been changed by the present Commonwealth Government, and is now known as the Participation and Equity Programme. Some of the money for that line has been allocated to other sections, especially in respect of primary and secondary education and technical and further education. So, the increases in respect of primary and secondary education and technical and further education, although

welcome increases, include some of the money previously allocated for the programme of participation and equity. Therefore, those do not look as good as one would think at first reading of the figures.

An additional sum of \$2.2 million has been provided for child care services, under the line for the Minister of Community Welfare, which was previously under the Minister of Education's line; but, even adding that to the line in respect of early childhood education, one finds that there has been a reduction in real terms in the amount paid by the Commonwealth Government to the State Government for early childhood education. If one ignores that \$2.2 million allocated under the line for the Minister of Community Welfare, there has been a 31 per cent reduction in money allocated by the Commonwealth Government for early childhood education.

Even if one allows that \$2.2 million to be included under the line for the Minister of Education, there has still been a reduction of between 7 per cent and 10 per cent in real terms in that line. Not only this Commonwealth Government, but previous Commonwealth Governments have consistently reduced the money available to the States for early childhood education. I object to the practice of the Commonwealth Government's involving itself in this or any other area of education that is normally the province of the States and later slowly withdrawing from that area: such action places enormous pressure on the State Government and the State Minister of Education. The same thing happened to my colleague the member for Mount Gambier when he was Minister of Education in the Tonkin Government: the Commonwealth Government consistently reduced funds by way of grants to the State for early childhood education. Such a practice is only to be deplored.

The Hawke Commonwealth Labor Government was elected a few months ago on certain promises, and the people knew that they were electing the Hawke Government on certain promises in respect of grants for education in Government schools. However, what do we find when the Commonwealth Minister for Education (Senator Ryan) issues her guidelines to the Schools Commission? What is available from the Commonwealth Government to the State Government in line with the promises made by the Senator's Party before this year's election? Three of the most important promises in the area of Government schools have not been honoured by Senator Ryan and by the Hawke Government.

One has almost a feeling of *déjà vu* when one is considering the promises made by the Hawke Commonwealth Government and realises the promises that have been broken by the State Government. Three of the most important promises made by the Labor Party before the Commonwealth election this year were as follows: first, that \$37 million extra would be provided in the first year of the triennium for school resources over the whole of Australia (but nothing has been provided by the Commonwealth Government); that \$9 million extra would be provided for primary schools, probably the most important area of education and an area that has suffered compared to other areas of education (in this respect, too, what has happened to the \$9 million that was to be supplied by the Hawke Government?—yet another broken promise, as no money will be available this year); thirdly, the provision of \$10 million for staff development (only \$7 million has been provided for staff development, which means another broken promise in an extremely important area because, as you, Mr Acting Speaker, would be the first to realise, it will be essential in coming years for the education system to be able to handle the advent of new technology in the school system).

So, we have three promises that have been broken by the Hawke Commonwealth Government, and its breaking of those promises will have a severe impact on the State

education budget. In dealing with the State education budget and comparing it with other figures, I realise that anyone can manipulate statistics to suit his own argument. Indeed, in this regard there will be at least three sets of figures: the Minister's figures; my figures; and those of the South Australian Institute of Teachers. After all, everyone looks at the State Budget differently, but it is important to analyse what has happened with this State education budget compared to the previous budget.

The first thing that has to be done is that some adjustments have to be made to the State Education Budget as presented in the papers by the Premier. The allocation for the Minister for Technology has to be removed from the figures, because one cannot compare the Budget this year with the Budget last year when an extra allocation of \$637 000 is included in this year's figures for the Minister for Technology. That is the first thing that has to be omitted for comparison purposes. I note with interest that the South Australian Institute of Teachers did not omit that in its figures on the Education Budget.

When one looks at the vote for the Education Department itself (and I repeat that I am dealing in proposed and voted figures only and not in actual figures), one has to make some adjustments in the department's estimates, because this year, as has been mentioned by other speakers, it includes accommodation and services which, for the Education Department, is a large sum of \$1.14 million included in the Budget this year for the first time. This amount was previously contained under the lines for the Minister of Public Works. So, to get a comparison with last year's Budget, one needs to remove that item from this year's Budget.

I also remove a new line of 'Maintenance of School Buildings, \$500 000', from the Education Department Budget for comparison purposes, and also the replacement of school furniture that was previously contained elsewhere. That then gives an amended figure for this Budget of \$505.458 million. Let me hasten to add that the Minister may wish to argue that the allocation for maintenance of school buildings, \$500 000, is a special grant this year and that it should be contained in the figures.

If he wants to argue that way, I will not vehemently contest it because it does not make much difference to the total figures, but emphasises that the education expenditure is dotted all over different departments, and it is extremely difficult to get a comparison when it is contained under so many headings. I believe that it is time that all Education Department expenditure was contained under the one line. That gives an amended figure of \$505.458 million, which compared with last year is an increase of about 8.61 per cent.

Referring to technical and further education, one finds that there has been an increase of 12.63 per cent, a very welcome increase in an area that is desperately crying out for funds, and also because that area has a lot to do with the training of unemployed people, particularly in the school-to-work transition area, and it is extremely important that funds are made available. However, I hasten to add that at least \$4.75 million of that increase is an increase in Commonwealth funding, not that that has any effect on the total result, but nevertheless it is from the Commonwealth and it should be noted.

I also point out that this year the Minister is imposing fees on all stream courses in technical and further education. The previous Government imposed fees of about \$1.45 an hour on stream 6 courses, the enrichment courses. As I understand it, and I can be corrected by the Minister if he wishes, that amount has been increased to about \$1.67 an hour, and that fee is to be applied to all other streams within technical and further education, except that stream dealing with unemployed people or that assist people to

obtain expertise so that they can be employed. That increase in fees will make a difference to the TAFE budget, and no doubt some of the increase in the expenditure reflects the amount of increased fees that will be coming in. We will be asking the Minister during the Estimates Committees just how much money is expected to come in from the increase in those fees.

Turning to Education, Miscellaneous, I wish to remove for comparison purposes from both the previous Budget and this Budget the amount for concessional transport passes for scholars. In the previous Budget this was an amount of \$2.297 million, and in this Budget it is \$5.275 million. I remove those figures for a very sound reason, because they do not make an equitable comparison as they stand. I realise this because, as Minister of Transport in the previous Government, I took action to see that the concession given to students travelling on the S.T.A. was reflected properly in the Education lines.

Previously, it had been reflected as the actual amount of subsidy paid: it is a subsidy, and had been reflected as the exact total amount of fare that students had paid. My officers advised me that the more correct way would be to reflect it as the difference between the adult fare and the fare paid by students travelling on public transport. If one wants to talk about marginal costing and avoidable costs, that can be debated at another time, but I believe that that is the more correct way of noting the amount of subsidy.

I believe, and I can stand corrected by the Minister if he wishes to investigate this further, that this year the amount of \$5.275 million for concessional transport passes for scholars represents the difference between what would have been paid by adults and what is actually paid by students. So, it does not give a fair basis of comparison with the previous year's Budget. That then brings the increase in the Miscellaneous line to \$6.34 million, which is a welcome increase—I do not doubt that for a minute. However, having gone through those three recurrent lines in the Minister's Budget, let us consider the total. One finds that the total increases, with those adjustments I have mentioned, comes to \$54.588 million, which under my calculation is an increase of 9.57 per cent.

Now is the time for me to remind the Minister that I did not say in a press release the other day that there had been a reduction of 2 per cent in the education budget. How could I when I was going to say in this place, and in fact had already released figures to the press, that there had been an increase of 9.57 per cent in the total recurrent budget? The Minister is smiling, and I am glad to see that he is happy. That, Mr Acting Speaker, if you take the Leader of the Opposition's excellent speech on this Budget, is about the right amount that the Opposition believes should be applied to Government departments across the board, because the Leader of the Opposition—

The Hon. Lynn Arnold interjecting:

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Wait until I finish. The Leader of the Opposition said in his speech that he believed that the Opposition would have brought about an overall increase of about 9.5 per cent. He hastened to add that there were areas in Government that would perhaps, because of need, have a higher increase than 9.5 per cent, and that there are other areas in Government, where there was not such priority, that would perhaps have a lesser increase than 9.5 per cent.

I make that point very strongly as I would not want to be misquoted outside the House. I would not want the member for Unley saying that I was advocating a reduction, or rather, in his words, that I was advocating that teachers should be sacked, although that is the way that remarks from this side of the House have been misrepresented.

I will now deal with the education budget in comparison with the total State Budget. I do this because the Minister, when in Opposition, was very fond of so doing. In fact, he did it last year both during the Budget debate and the Estimates Committees hearings. I do not believe that the figures revealed are earth shaking, but as the Minister did the exercise I have also done it. I hope that he feels flattered that I am following in his footsteps. If we take (as the Minister did) the vote for the Education Department alone as a percentage of the appropriation for the State and leave out special Acts we find that, on the adjusted figures for 1983-84, the Education Department will receive \$505.458 million out of a total appropriation of \$1 740.037 million, a percentage of 29.05. In 1982-83 the figures were \$465.373 million for the Education Department with an appropriation of \$1 501.886 million, a percentage of 30.99. There we see a reduction of minus 1.94 per cent for the Education Department as a percentage of the total State appropriation. We find that the amount is reduced by almost 2 per cent (and that is what I said in my press release). However, if we take the \$500 000 special allocation for maintenance of school buildings which I mentioned before the Minister came into the Chamber (which I have removed from the Budget for my comparison purposes as it was not there last year and which the Minister may argue should be included for comparison purposes), it results in only a .02 per cent difference.

Mr Ingerson: It is still significantly down.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: It is still significantly down. However, I wish to be fair to the Minister at all times in this matter. If we take the total education recurrent expenditure, including TAFE and miscellaneous expenditure, and compare it with the total State recurrent payments, including payments authorised by special Acts—in other words, the total (and I remind the Minister that I am only talking about voted and proposed amounts and not actual expenditure)—we have for 1983-84, \$625.145 million as a percentage of \$2 085.411 million, a percentage of 29.98. If we take the figures for 1982-83, we find that the education total is \$570.757 million out of \$1 820.889 million or 31.33 per cent. If we use that figure we find that the vote is down by a total of 1.35 per cent. I thought that I would do this exercise because I know the Minister is so keen on using it.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: What did your exercise come up with on salary increases, or Public Service pays?

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I will be happy to discuss that with the Minister in a couple of weeks during the Estimates Committees hearings, as I have only six minutes left during this debate. I wish to deal now with capital payments as that is an area in which there has been serious reductions. I will deal with capital payments line by line, an area where there have been serious reductions, and will include the line under Minister of Public Works. I am not criticising just the Minister of Education but all Ministers when I say that all education expenditure should come under the one line. I refer to education capital payments for the Education Department itself and note that there has been an \$850 000 increase under that line. To achieve a fair comparison I have added \$300 000 for furniture, which appeared under the Public Works line in last year's Budget, providing an increase of \$850 000.

If we add the furniture provision of \$50 000 for public works to the TAFE line we find that there has been an increase of \$215 000. I think that this line reflects an increase in Commonwealth funding, and I will have more to say about that later. I now turn to the South Australian Teacher Housing Authority. There has been a \$1.6 million grant from State capital funds to the South Australian Teacher Housing Authority. The amount voted last year was \$800 000, representing an increase of \$800 000 from State capital funds. Admittedly, the South Australian Teacher

Housing Authority is borrowing money of its own volition to pour extra funds into this much-needed area. I make the point strongly that last year the Authority did not take up its allocation of \$800 000. In effect, this year the Minister has given the Authority last year's grant and this year's grant in one. That is an important point, because the public should realise that the Authority did not take up its grant last year.

I now turn to the Minister of Public Works line. This is an important area which has seen a serious reduction. Last year \$26.7 million was voted the Minister of Public Works. This year \$24 million has been allocated. To be fair, I will adjust that figure by \$300 000 to allow for the provision of furniture. The reduction is not \$2.67 million but \$2.4 million.

An honourable member: They're going to put that into housing.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I will investigate that a little later. The actual reduction amounts to \$2.4 million. In percentage terms it is a 9.09 per cent decrease. In money terms and in real terms that is a massive reduction, and that is very serious. The Minister knows, as do most members of the House, that many schools are crying out for redevelopment, and I am referring not only to new schools. It is a serious situation when one sees such a large reduction in this area and, in fact, I suggest that the reduction amounts to something like 18 per cent in real terms in the money allocated for this line. I will take this matter further during the Estimates Committees. I believe that there was a slight increase in Commonwealth funding for this area; however, there has been a massive reduction in the State allocation. Finally, in relation to the capital line, there is a welcome increase for technical and further education. I will not mention the figures because I do not have time. If one takes the total capital payments for the entire education area, there is an increase of 3.82 per cent; whereas inflation in the June quarter in this State was 12 per cent. The Minister would be aware that inflation in the building industry is usually higher than the general inflation rate.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): It is a great pity to see in the Budget recently handed down that, once again, rural areas are harder hit than any other area in the State. A new petrol tax has been introduced; also, a liquor turnover tax, stamp duty on general insurance, a financial institutions duty, and a tobacco tax: in fact, some 37 State taxes and charges have been increased in the past 10 months. It is a great shame that this Budget has not been a more positive one at a time when the economy needs stimulus and development. Rural people will obviously have to pay a lot more for their goods because goods transported into rural areas usually include a petrol tax as an inherent part of their cost. The liquor turnover tax will result in tourists being less likely to spend their dollar in rural tourist areas. Therefore, this tax will affect country areas. I turn now to the stamp duty on general insurance. I think that many farmers have more insurance policies than most people in our community and that they will be paying more for these policies.

There seems to be no doubt that this Budget is another demonstration of the clear differences emerging between the Government and the Opposition in their respective approaches to economic policy. The former Liberal Government pointed out quite clearly that, if economic growth is to be achieved, long lasting and far reaching policies need to be implemented so that unemployment will come down, inflation can be tackled, and our investment in South Australia can be much more diversified than it is at present.

It seems that some of the strategies brought about by this Budget will stimulate the economy, and I refer in particular to the injection of funds into the housing industry—a positive move and one for which I applaud the Government. To

what extent it will help only the future will tell. Surely it should have been resource based industries, private investment industries, high technology industries, and tourism that received maximum attention in this Budget, but that has not occurred.

If one looks at the record of the previous Government one sees that it believed that it was essential to limit taxes to the maximum extent and to reduce them if possible. The reason for this was obvious: South Australians had been highly taxed during the previous 10 years of Labor Administration and, at the time that the Liberal Government took office in 1979, unemployment in this State was amongst the highest in the nation. When the Liberals came to power State taxes were cut as promised and the private sector was stimulated. Promises of economic development were kept and the State started to show real gains because it became the lowest taxed mainland State—a very positive achievement.

Certainly, it is a great contrast to the 37 charges and taxes that have been increased since the present Government came into power. It is unfortunate to note that the present Government is trying to lay the blame for the current economic problems on the former Government. It is trying to say that the former Government did not control its financial affairs properly, but the truth of the matter is that the last advice on the progress of the Budget that the former Government received before the election was a report from Treasury dated 12 October 1982. From memory, I think that was two days before the election was called. That report indicated 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. If we include the \$6 million deficit carried over from the previous year, that would mean that the accumulated deficit would have been some \$19 million.

Since December of last year the deficit on the Recurrent Account has deteriorated for three major reasons: first, wage and salary increases; secondly, natural disasters; and, thirdly, overspending by Government departments. In fact, it appears that some \$17.5 million, or 26 per cent of the over-run, 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. So, it is quite clear that the financial problems faced by this Government were not the result of the activities of the previous Government. In the main (and by 'the main' I mean well in excess of 50 per cent) the current Budget over-run is due to the present Government's own administration. Our Leader has clearly outlined in his reply to the Budget his strategy as to how, if the Liberal Government had been in power, no taxes or charges would have had to go up. It is not my intention to repeat the arguments that he has put forward; honourable members can look at the Leader's speech if they have forgotten what he said earlier in this Budget debate.

Following the comments on the Budget, I wish to bring to the attention of this House another monetary matter, but unfortunately a monetary matter that means some thousands of dollars loss for a constituent in this State; in fact, it was probably near the area of \$24 000. It brings to light what I regard as selective discrimination against, in this case, a fisherman. It is a real hit in the face for small business and for the person who has tried to do his best in his economic field. I refer to events in the rock lobster industry which date back in the main to the 1960s and which lead up to the current time. The person concerned is Mr Doug Hart, of Foul Bay, who started commercial scale fishing as early as 1953. In 1962-63 he went into rock lobster fishing. In 1968, with the Department of Fisheries proclaiming rock

lobster fishing a closed industry, the criteria for entry into that industry meant that one had to have accurate returns for three years prior to 1968. Boats were to be registered and the pot allocation for the northern zone, which is the zone in which Mr Hart was, was one pot per foot of boat length plus 10 extra pots. In other words, an 18 ft boat would have 18 pots, one for each foot, plus another 10, making 28 pots altogether.

Mr Hart at that stage was operating from a boat called *Cove Air II*, registration No. MMK. As it was an 18 ft boat it had a pot allocation of 28. The boat was registered in the name of someone else and when Mr Hart applied to the rock lobster fishing authority he was refused permission because, as a farmer and a part-time fisherman, he was the holder of a B-class licence and was therefore ineligible. Mr Hart protested at having his application refused and in the end, thanks to the direct intervention of the then Minister of Fisheries, Mr Hart was granted his rock lobster licence.

In 1970 Mr Hart bought a 32-ft fishing cutter called *Storm Eagle*, registered as licensed fishing boat No. LGT. Because the 28 pots licensed to the former boat, *Cove Air II*, were in Mr Crowther's name, Mr Hart was unable to transfer the 28 pots to *Storm Eagle*, even though he owned them and was the only person who had used them. As a result, Mr Hart bought a fishing boat called *Britannia*, licence No. L6J, which had a 44-pot licence with it. He bought the boat from a gentleman who lived at Edithburgh. In turn that Edithburgh gentleman bought Mr Hart's *Cove Air II*, together with the 28-pot licence; although Mr Hart could not buy it the Edithburgh gentleman was able to buy it under the regulations as they then applied. So, Mr Hart has a boat, *Britannia*, with 44 cray pots. After working those pots for one season Mr Hart transferred 42 of them to the other boat he had purchased, *Storm Eagle*, and sold *Britannia* as a shark boat. He had only 42 of the 44 pots because *Storm Eagle* was 2-ft shorter than *Britannia*; therefore, two pots had to be relinquished in the transfer due to the formula I mentioned earlier.

Unfortunately for Mr Hart, in December 1975, when he was returning to Kangaroo Island on one occasion, *Storm Eagle* was wrecked. He managed to keep the 42 cray pots and took them to Kangaroo Island. As a result of the sinking of the ship Mr Hart bought a 36-ft licensed fishing boat called *Ceres*, Licence No. L3H, with a 28-pot licence attached to it. He had to pay \$25 000 at that time for *Ceres* plus the 28 pots. Remember, he still had 42 craypots from the *Storm Eagle* on Kangaroo Island. He had 42 pots sitting on the mainland and 28 pots from his new boat the *Ceres*. At a meeting in Adelaide the then licensing officer (Mr Barter) in January 1976 allowed the transfer of the 42 pots from the wrecked boat to the *Ceres*, but declined to allow another professional fisherman (Mr Houston) to buy the 28 pots that had come with the *Ceres* because it was not departmental policy in 1976 to allow the sale of an authority.

So, Mr Hart put the 28 pots, which he had recently bought, in his shed at Edithburgh and returned to Kangaroo Island to pick up the 42 pots from the sunken *Storm Eagle* and continued cray fishing with the *Ceres* and his 42 pots. It was in March 1980 that Mr Hart decided to retire from the fishing industry and sell all his fishing gear. He applied to use four of *Ceres*' original 28 pots still in his shed at Edithburgh to bring his entitlement up to 46 pots and sell the remaining 24 pots.

The department allowed the transfer of 44 pots to the *Ceres*, but it would not allow him to resurrect the other 24 pots as it was not consistent with departmental policy at that time in August 1980. It seems strange that the department allowed the resurrection of some pots, which are obviously owned by Mr Hart, but has a different policy regarding the other pots. This is where discrimination in

this area obviously exists. Mr Hart decided to contact a solicitor at this stage, Mr Tim Jackson, and from that time on several letters went between many of the people involved, and I will refer to as many of those as is possible.

The first letter of 27 August 1980 is from the Department of Fisheries to Mr Hart allowing the four rock lobster pots, which were lost through metrication, to be taken from the 28 pots and added to the 42 pots, making a total of 46 pots that Mr Hart then had. Another letter of 30 October 1980 is to the Australian Fishing Industry Council from Mr Jackson, solicitor, on behalf of Mr Hart. That letter sets out the whole case in clear detail seeking AFIC's response to this matter. The letter of 31 December 1980 to the Department of Fisheries also outlines the matter that I have brought to the attention of the House this afternoon. By 12 July 1982 nothing had happened; there had been no action from the Department, although it did acknowledge the receipt of the 31 December letter. A reminder was sent on 12 July 1982 to the Department, and on 16 July a reply was received, including an apology for the delay in replying to the letter (of 31 December 1980). Some 18 months passed before anything was heard from the Department of Fisheries. A reminder letter after 18 months brought a reply. The reply to Mr Tim Jackson (dated 16 July 1982) regarding Mr Hart's problem stated:

I refer to your letter of 12 July 1982, and I apologise for the delay in replying to your letter of 31 December 1980. The history of Mr Hart's craypots is rather complex.

It is becoming apparent that the matter was very complex—the Department of Fisheries finally answered the original letter after 18 months. That letter was signed by a Mr Ward, the Assistant Administrative Officer. A reply from AFIC dated 26 August 1982 stated:

It seems that the Department of Fisheries is not the only organisation with a 'too difficult' basket.

That was stated because AFIC was also finding it a little difficult to deal with the problem and was perhaps complimenting Mr Hart on the fact that he sought legal advice. Further letters were directed to the Department of Fisheries, but little satisfaction was gained. In early 1983, Mr Hart contacted me to see whether his case could be taken further, and I wrote to the then Minister of Fisheries, the Hon. B.A. Chatterton, M.L.C. That letter (dated 25 March) was acknowledged on 11 April 1983, and not long after that the Minister of Fisheries resigned, and the Hon. Frank Blevins, M.L.C., became the new Minister of Fisheries. A reminder letter was directed to the new Minister, and he replied on 20 May, as follows:

It would appear that the case revolves around an administrative decision taken some years ago. I am confident that the Department of Fisheries has examined every aspect of this seemingly complex issue and has indicated to Mr Hart's solicitor that it believes that there is no valid claim by Mr Hart on the 24 pots to which you refer.

I then managed to arrange an appointment for Mr Hart to see the Minister very briefly—for perhaps five to 10 minutes—one afternoon, and the Minister promised that he would consider the matter in greater detail. The net result was a further letter from the Minister on 14 July 1983. The Minister, in answer to my letter regarding Mr Hart's complaint, outlined several salient points and stated:

I have given consideration to the points raised by Mr Hart in the course of this discussion. However, there are certain matters which should be kept in mind.

I have already outlined the first three points to the House. It was further stated:

(d) The issue of a further four pots to Mr Hart in June 1980 resulted from an application for reassessment of the maximum number of pots that may be used from an authorised vessel. The *Storm Eagle* replaced the *Britannia*, and I suggest that only two pots should have been issued to restore the number of pots originally operated by the *Britannia*. However, since this replace-

ment occurred in 1972, the loss of two pots was consistent with the legislation pertaining to the allocation of pots.

It is clear from that statement that the Minister or his advisers misunderstand the situation because that is simply a conversion from imperial to metric measurements, and the figure of four pots was due to a length factor overall and not simply a metrication one. At least it shows that the case has been considered in reasonable detail.

Mr Hart has not been able to progress much further and still has the remaining 24 pots in his shed. At their present price of between \$900 and \$1 200 each they represent a total value of about \$24 000. He cannot sell them because of selective discrimination by the Fisheries Department, or possibly by the Minister as head of that Department. Mr Hart is determined that he will not be hoodwinked out of \$24 000; he must be allowed to sell his pots, because he paid for them in the first instance. In the past, some pots have been transferred and the Department has allowed others to be resurrected and reused.

However, just as it makes a policy in one area it decides that it will not allow all of these pots to be sold. It is a reflection on the industry and on the way in which fishermen are being treated when a person stands to lose as much as \$24 000. This person had obviously planned that, on his retirement, he would be able to sell his business and make a profit, but now his selling price, and his profit have been cut by over \$24 000. This area needs further investigation. I know that Mr Hart will not stand by and allow these things to happen. I hope that the Department of Fisheries will consider the matter further so that it may be convinced that Mr Hart has a genuine case and therefore should not be penalised in respect of the work that he has done for the industry over the years and the money he has invested in it during that time. I have drawn this matter to the attention of the House and, if things do not proceed satisfactorily, more will be heard about it here from time to time. However, I hope that the matter can be resolved satisfactorily as soon as possible.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Before dealing with the main issues arising from the Budget, I apologise to members of the staff of the research library for something I said in this place on 18 August 1983, when I criticised statistical information provided to me because of certain omissions from it. On reading my speech I saw that I had failed to say that the fault was not that of the research librarians themselves, but that it had occurred in respect of information supplied to them by the office of one of my colleagues. I wish to set the record straight in that regard because I have the utmost respect for the ability of the officers concerned in the research library and the work that they do for Parliamentarians. As all members would know, I use the Parliamentary Library research service quite extensively. That leads me to refer to an article by Onlooker (whoever he or she is) that appeared in the *Sunday Mail* last Sunday. Under the heading 'The spy comes in from the cold...', the article states, in part:

Research, according to my dictionary, is supposed to eliminate the 99 wrong ways of doing something. So what does it say of our politicians when one discovers two-thirds of them hardly use the able facilities of the Parliamentary researchers?

The article then refers to the type and number of people who use the research library. The statement in the article that disturbed me is:

Meandering around the corridors of the House last week, I overheard an interesting conversation about which MPs...

Is that the way in which reporters obtain information, namely, by wandering around the halls of this Parliament and eavesdropping? If that were so, I would be deeply disturbed if people had to lock their doors and talk in

whispers. With the greatest respect to the majority of press reporters, I would have thought they would openly approach me, or anyone else, to ask for information that they want. However, the person who released the information referred to should have done his homework, and, indeed, the reporter should also have done some homework, because the article further states:

The top 10 users take up 30 per cent—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I am sorry to have to stop the honourable member, but I have allowed him to go along hoping that he might come back to the Bill before the House. I point out to the honourable member he is treating the debate as a grievance debate and not one on the Appropriation Bill. I ask the honourable member to please come back to the matter before the House.

Mr HAMILTON: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I thought I had made the point that the matter related to funding from the State Government and that therefore it was appropriate to refer to it. However, I will abide by your ruling, of course, Sir. In reference to some important matters concerning the electorate at large, I will first deal with the matter of housing. I refer to an article that appeared in this morning's *Advertiser* (page 3) headed 'Housing activity gathers pace', which states:

The recovery in Australia's housing industry gathered pace in the June quarter with work starting on 19 600 private sector houses—8.2 per cent more than in the March quarter after allowing for seasonal factors.

After counting flats, home units and town houses being built by private developers and governments, the increase over the March quarter was even more spectacular—13.2 per cent.

It is pleasing to note this increase in the housing sector, and I am sure that all members of this Parliament, irrespective of which side of the House they are on, would be pleased about this increase in housing industry activity, and, more specifically, about the amount of money that is to be provided by the State and Federal Governments for this purpose. In his Financial Statement the Premier stated:

We will also provide a significant boost to the housing industry through a major increase in the public sector housing programme. In 1983-84, with the assistance of the Commonwealth, we will allocate a total of \$224 million in capital funds to the Housing Trust and the State Bank for housing programmes. This represents an increase of \$35 million or 18 per cent over the last year. It will finance an increase of 3 100 units in the Housing Trust rental stock which represents the largest housing programme undertaken by the Government since 1967.

Quite clearly, the snowballing effect of this amount of money put into the housing industry will be dramatic, to say the least. I can recall the advertisements leading up to the last State election in which we stated that we would pay a significant amount of attention to that particular area because, as we are all well aware, where homes are built, the people occupying those homes will be required to buy refrigerators, washing machines, carpets, blinds, etc. Specifically in the white goods industry, this State would welcome an increase in demand as a result of those homes being built. If there are 3 100 homes built, in the 12-month period, and each of those homes required a new refrigerator, washing machine and airconditioner, that would be of considerable assistance to the many people looking for work in this State.

As announced in the Budget and in the mini Budget, the Commonwealth will provide a total of \$500 million to the States (including the Northern Territory) for public housing under the Commonwealth-State housing agreement in 1983-84. That is an increase of \$167 million on the 1982-83 funding level. As indicated, South Australia will receive a total allocation of \$62.3 million, comprising \$18.9 million in loans and \$43.4 million in grants. This represents an increase of \$20.3 million which, on South Australia's 1982-83 allocation, is an increase of about 48 per cent. In State funds, South Australia nominated \$127.6 million for housing

from its works and housing programme in 1983-84, and the Commonwealth agreed to provide this on the same concessional terms as the Commonwealth-State housing agreement moneys: 4.5 per cent over 53 years.

An additional \$26.8 million was also allocated to housing for State sources, including \$1.8 million to match the Commonwealth's allocation to the mortgage and rent relief scheme. In housing programmes the main emphasis in 1983-84 will be on the construction of new dwellings for addition to the Trust's rental stock. It is expected that 3 100 houses will be added to the stock this year, compared with a little under 2 400 in 1982-83. More than 18 per cent of these homes will be newly constructed; the remainder will comprise the purchase of existing homes throughout the metropolitan area, many of which will require repair and upgrading. Other programmes which are worthy of mention are the State Government's allocation of \$700 000 for emergency housing, office and administration under the Housing Improvement Act. All of these are most important to South Australia and, indeed, to those many people who are on the waiting list for Housing Trust accommodation.

Regarding construction activities, a total of 8 673 approvals were made for new dwellings in South Australia during 1982-83, representing an increase of about 7 per cent over approvals in the previous year. Public approvals accounted for 96 per cent of the increase; most of the additional approvals were for houses, rather than other dwellings. Approvals for new dwellings in South Australia stayed at a relatively high level to the end of June 1983, having reached a four-year high of 965 approvals in March 1983.

Commencements of new dwellings in South Australia increased from 1 790 units in the December quarter 1982 to 1 850 units (an increase of about 3 per cent) in the March 1983 quarter. A significant increase resulted in the number of public commencements from 288 to 592 (an increase of 105 per cent), whilst private commencements decreased from 1 500 to 1 260 units, or 16 per cent. The increased activity occurred only in other dwellings; commencements of new houses fell by 8 per cent to 1 260. On the private rental market, the vacancy rate was measured by the Real Estate Institute at 1.4 per cent in July 1983 compared to 1.5 per cent in June and 1.3 per cent in May. There have been only minor variations in the vacancy rate over the past few months.

In regard to rents, the average weekly rental for houses in Adelaide was \$92 as at June 1983, representing an increase of 19 per cent over the financial year. Rents increased further to \$94 in August 1983. It appears that these rent increases have eased slightly over the past six months

although rents are still very high. Under the Rent Relief Scheme, as at 31 July 1983, the Trust had a total of 3 873 households receiving relief. The average value of that rent relief payment was \$19 per week during July. The Emergency Housing Office is something about which most members of Parliament have received numerous representations over a period of 12 months. In regard to demand, a total of 18 593 households contacted the office seeking assistance during 1982-83—an increase of 24.5 per cent over the number of households that sought assistance during the previous year. A total of 7 292 households were assisted during the 1982-83 period. That comprised the following: families, 4 177 (57 per cent); youth, 1 855 (25 per cent); aged, 198 (3 per cent); and, others, 1 062 (15 per cent). The aged is an important area at which we must look, not only now but, most certainly, over the next 20 years in regard to providing for them within the community.

In regard to applications for Housing Trust rental accommodation, 15 596 new rental applications were lodged with the Trust during 1982-83. From January to June 1983, the proportion of non-working applicants increased from 64.9 per cent to 70.1 per cent. Of the working applicants, 86.5 per cent were receiving less than 85 per cent of average weekly earnings compared with 73.8 per cent for the first three months of the financial year. Applications from persons over the age of 60 increased from 11.9 per cent to 13.5 per cent over the six months to June 1983. That is an area that I would like to come back to, because the problems of the aged and their need for accommodation are matters about which I feel strongly, and I believe that they should be looked at more closely in all areas. The member for Coles may be interested in my comment that tourism is one area in which not enough has been said in relation to the need for promoting tourism for the aged in our community. I will elaborate on that on some other occasion.

The figures supplied by library research officers (and again I thank them for their assistance) indicate that the female aged population in the 60-64 years age bracket in 1981 was 30 868. The projected figure for that age bracket by the year 2021 is 51 315. In 1981 there were 2 205 females 90 years of age and over, and the projected figure by the year 2021 is 13 179. That is a dramatic increase. I seek leave to insert in *Hansard* without my reading it, a table showing projected population figures for females.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Does the honourable member assure the Chair that the table is purely statistical?

Mr HAMILTON: Indeed, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Leave granted.

TABLE 5—SERIES A: PROJECTED POPULATION BY AGE GROUPS AND SEX (INCLUDING MIGRATION)
SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Age group (years)	At 30 June												
	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1991	1996	2001	2006	2011	2016	2021
FEMALES													
60-64 ...	30 868	31 942	32 881	33 841	34 501	34 355	33 610	29 988	33 159	38 811	48 176	48 329	51 315
65-69 ...	27 390	27 550	27 705	27 463	27 854	29 221	32 591	31 934	28 547	31 600	37 030	45 964	46 178
70-74 ...	21 402	22 328	23 143	24 126	24 964	25 169	27 034	30 205	29 689	26 658	29 588	34 740	43 169
75-79 ...	14 546	15 155	16 065	16 890	17 587	18 515	21 996	23 791	26 699	26 408	23 898	26 675	31 510
80-84 ...	9 749	9 926	10 082	10 341	10 658	11 072	14 403	17 271	18 930	21 433	21 440	19 636	22 180
85-89 ...	5 272	5 390	5 469	5 556	5 768	6 024	7 099	9 387	11 417	12 793	14 677	14 927	13 937
90 and over ...	2 205	2 385	2 549	2 728	2 929	3 112	3 948	4 868	6 489	8 319	9 998	11 932	13 179

Mr HAMILTON: Similarly I refer to a table detailing the projected male population by age, including migrants, in South Australia. The table shows that male population in the age bracket 60-64 years in 1981 was 28 131, increasing

to 48 023 by 2021. In the 90 years and over age group the male population in 1981 totalled 739, increasing to 2 934 in 2021. That is a tremendous projected increase by the year 2021. Mr Deputy Speaker, I seek leave to insert in

Hansard without my reading it, a table showing projected male population figures in South Australia. I assure you,

Sir, that it is purely statistical.
Leave granted.

TABLE 5—SERIES A: PROJECTED POPULATION BY AGE GROUPS AND SEX (INCLUDING MIGRATION)
SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Age group (years)	At 30 June												
	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1991	1996	2001	2006	2011	2016	2021
Males													
60-64 ...	28 131	29 185	30 404	31 591	32 371	32 562	32 363	28 549	30 483	35 768	44 542	44 744	48 023
65-69 ...	24 419	24 365	24 191	23 743	24 000	25 008	29 064	28 920	25 590	27 380	32 158	40 007	40 262
70-74 ...	16 613	17 448	18 171	19 051	19 786	20 139	20 818	24 170	24 054	21 341	22 877	26 894	33 382
75-79 ...	9 958	10 381	10 879	11 458	11 908	12 403	15 110	15 655	18 106	17 995	16 003	17 169	20 168
80-84 ...	4 852	5 164	5 406	5 674	5 934	6 259	7 852	9 525	9 903	11 395	11 308	10 076	10 827
85-89 ...	2 051	2 023	2 036	2 108	2 223	2 370	3 099	3 889	4 704	4 917	5 636	5 580	4 986
90 and over ...	739	790	821	847	895	914	1 116	1 453	1 854	2 277	2 500	2 840	2 934

Mr HAMILTON: As I have said, I believe that this is an area that we should be looking at closely, not only in terms of the housing needs of elderly citizens of this State but more particularly in terms of retired people who are looking for something to do with their leisure time. I believe that we should encourage more retired people to spend on travel some of the money that they may have salted away. From my experience, and from the remarks of retired people who have visited my electorate office, I believe such persons have quite a few dollars salted away. Given an appropriate incentive to travel, they would I believe, spend that money in a way that would be beneficial to South Australia. Another area that we should be looking at in relation to tourism is that of the disabled. I would like to speak a lot more about that at a later opportunity in this Parliament because I believe that there are two areas upon which successive Governments perhaps have not placed enough emphasis in terms of their needs.

Returning to the housing area, I believe that the South Australian Housing Trust and, indeed, the joint venturers in South Australia should be commended for the amount of work and the close co-operation that we have seen over recent years, particularly in relation to Jubilee 150 projects. I understand that negotiations are in train in that area: some projects are completed and others are under construction. From recent contracts with prospective joint venturers, it would appear that success experienced in other areas has actually prompted and encouraged other communities to explore the possibilities of joint ventures in their own areas. Indeed, the benefits of the Trust's joint venture programme are becoming increasingly evident not only in the financial sense but in strengthening the ties between the Trust and the community at large, as well as other Government departments. The type of involvement initiated by joint venture projects between the Trust and community bodies (be they councils, private enterprise or local government groups) seems to have increased community awareness of the needs of the aged, upon which I have touched previously, the result of which is a focusing of support from within communities to provide support services for the aged. As I said, I can only commend those people within the Trust and those joint venturers who have provided that resource to provide those facilities.

In respect of what the Trust has done for the aged, one of the interesting projects opened up by the previous Government in Pedlar Street, Seaton, was a tremendous project in which a number of double unit houses were demolished

and some 28 units erected for the elderly. To the best of my knowledge and from talking to people in that area, it is a project that has received a great deal of support in the community and whether the Government intends to continue in that area remains to be seen. However, given the response that I have noted for the project, it is certainly one that has worked particularly well in the Albert Park District.

The number of rental dwellings allocated during 1982-83 to applicants on the waiting list totals 6 220, which was 412 (7 per cent) greater than the previous highest total for last year of 5 808. Allocations of new stock to first tenants reached 1 699, and further assistance was provided to 4 521 applicants by way of vacancies occurring in existing rental stock. Of the total allocations to new Trust tenants from January to June 1983, 68 per cent of applicants were not working compared with 62.7 per cent for the previous six months. The majority (73.7 per cent) of allocations was made to families, married couples both with and without families, and single parents. The most significant change in the age of new tenants was for those aged 60 years and over (from 13.4 per cent to 15 per cent). I believe that I have demonstrated that that is an area that has to be addressed in the future and I would hope that successive Governments, irrespective of political colour, would certainly continue to provide not only that amount but increasing amounts.

Finally, I refer to an issue that I have pursued ever since coming into this Parliament. In fact, in 1979 one of the first contributions I made in this Parliament related to the Alfreda Rehabilitation Unit at Royal Park. I have continued in that vein to pursue the need for a heated therapeutic swimming pool at that centre.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Is there provision for it in the Budget this year?

Mr HAMILTON: If the previous Minister will contain herself I will elaborate on that. I have pursued the current Minister of Health on numerous occasions. I hope that this money will be forthcoming. If a start is not made in this financial year, perhaps it will be made in the next financial year. I am hoping, from information that I have received that there have been further discussions in this area, to find ways and means to try to accommodate the needs of those people down there. I will see the completion of that rehabilitation unit there with a great deal of joy, because there is a need for not only those persons who are injured in their work places to be given the opportunity to use that pool but also for many other people who have problems—be they aged or whatever. It is one that, as I have said, I

look forward to, and I would like to go on record as expressing my appreciation of the time that the Minister of Health (Dr Cornwall) in another place has provided to me and for the time of officers of his Department. The number of people going into that centre is increasing, and I know that the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and some of its administrators have expressed their continued interest in and support of the activities in which I have endeavoured to enable the completion of that pool to occur.

Mr ASHENDEN (Todd): I want to address myself tonight to a number of broad issues in relation to the Budget which has been brought down by the Premier. It would be a long time since the State of South Australia has had a document, so bereft of ideas to get the State moving again, placed before this Parliament for its consideration. I intend to address myself, as I did in the Address in Reply debate, to a number of areas in which this Government has totally disregarded the residents of South Australia and the commitments which it made to them.

Certainly, I have no doubt whatsoever that come the next State election, whenever it is, the people of South Australia will resoundingly let the present Government know exactly how they feel about the way in which they have been treated by this Government. The Budget strategy, if one can call it that, underlines a number of points, none of which show any credit whatsoever on this Government.

The Premier had virtually no credibility prior to the Budget's coming down; now that the Budget has been presented he has absolutely no credibility whatsoever. I am quite certain that members opposite would be getting exactly the same feedback in their electorates as I am getting throughout the electorate of Todd, not only from those people who take the trouble to write to me or to telephone me at my office but also when I go to various functions within my electorate, whether they are school council meetings, school fetes, school gala days, presentation nights at sporting clubs, or whatever they are.

I have become quite used to the fact that a number of people on each occasion will come to me expressing their concern at the direction that this Government is taking. People are genuinely angry at what they see as the way in which they were completely and utterly misled by the Premier when he was seeking office before last year's election. Certainly, in the four years that I have been in Parliament, I have never known such an underlying anger to be present in so many people. As the member for Bragg pointed out about an hour ago, one major reason why Parliament and members of Parliament are held in such a poor light by the South Australian public is that the Premier and his Government have at no time considered that their word was worth anything. They believed that they were able to blithely make any promise when running for office and not expect South Australian residents to be upset if the promises were not kept.

If the Premier and his Government believe that, they are foolish. As I said, the groundswell of opinion in my district is something which, if I were a member of the Government, I would be extremely worried about. I feel confident indeed, although the Minister of Water Resources, who for a whole week has not told us of the water holding in his reservoirs (but I guess that we will get that tomorrow), finds this amusing.

The Hon. J.W. Slater interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: I suggest to the Minister that he come out at any time he likes to talk to the people in my district and see whether or not the point that I am making reflects the mood there. I will be most surprised if my district is the only one where the groundswell of opinion at present is so strongly against the Government purely and simply

for one reason—because people believe that the Government has gained office under totally false pretences. They believe that we now have a Premier who set out deliberately last year to mislead them, and I am sure that no-one, and certainly no member of this House, wants to feel that he has been conned. Yet that is exactly how people of South Australia feel at present. They put their trust in the Government's delivering its promises.

What have they found? None of the promises have been met. The Premier's and the Government's credibility, I can assure Government members, is virtually zero, and I would be delighted if the election for the next Parliament could be held at any time within the next month, because I know for certain that the present Government would be soundly defeated, and all members on this side would be returned with greatly increased majorities. Certainly, many of our candidates in the present Labor-held seats would be joining the Liberals in forming a new Government in this State.

Mr Hamilton: Don't hold your breath.

Mr ASHENDEN: Why does not the honourable member suggest to the Premier that he go to the people and test whether or not they see his Government as a good Government?

In the next 25 minutes I intend to show many areas in which this Government is not representing the interests of South Australia. As I said, the Premier's credibility was virtually zero before the presentation of the Budget. Now that it has been presented, his credibility is zero. In his Budget, the Premier has continued to increase taxes; he has indicated that he will continue to increase State charges, and shortly I will be going through some statements which our Premier made not many months ago.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: That's old hat.

Mr ASHENDEN: The Minister says that that is old hat. That is what members opposite would like to believe. The Government has acted on the theory that the public has a short memory and that the Government can do what it likes because within a few days the public will forget. However, I can assure the Minister that that is not the case in this instance. We now have a situation where the public in South Australia will not forget, and it will not forget what this Government has done. The Premier has not met any of his promises. The Premier cannot control his Ministers, and we have a group of Ministers who cannot control departmental spending. I think I can safely say that neither the Premier nor any one of his Ministers would last a week in private enterprise where, of course, if they were senior managers running a company, they would be required to be accountable to the managing director and to the board of directors.

Mr Ingerson: This managing director can't be trusted.

Mr ASHENDEN: That is right. The managing director of this Government certainly cannot be trusted. The board of this Government (the people of South Australia) want it to be accountable, but the Government is not being accountable. As I said, not one of the Ministers would last a week in private enterprise, because they would not be able to show the board of directors that they have the strength that is necessary to control departmental spending. More than \$23 million of taxpayers' money has been overspent in the last financial year since this Government came to office. What will the Government do? It will further exacerbate the situation by increasing Government spending by 4 per cent in real terms over the coming year.

Private enterprise, unfortunately, does not have the benefits that this Government has. The Government does not have to worry about selling its product: if it wants to increase prices, it just increases its taxes. No worries! As I said, the Government thinks that the people of South Australia will forget, but unfortunately one cannot think that way in

private enterprise. A board of directors cannot just decide to increase the price of its product to the consumer, because almost certainly it will find that it will not be able to sell its product. That is the big difference between public enterprise and private enterprise. Private enterprise is accountable, but public enterprise, under this Government, is not accountable to anyone.

It is obvious that the Premier and his Ministers believe that there is nothing wrong with allowing overspending. The Premier obviously tells his Ministers in Cabinet, 'We will increase more taxes and bring in more charges, and in that way we will try to balance the books.' This Government has made absolutely no attempt to control spending, and, as I said, not one of the Ministers would last a week in private enterprise. Of course, we find once again that the Premier has not met the promises or the commitments that he made when in Opposition. As a member of the Government Party in the previous Parliament, I can remember the Premier on many occasions roundly castigating the former Premier for moving funds from capital works. But what is this Premier doing? Not only is he continuing that procedure but of course he is doing so to a far greater extent than was the case under the previous Government.

So, once again I come back to the point—where can one find any credibility in relation to the Premier? The capital works that will be severely affected by this Premier are those works that would provide the greatest benefit to residents of South Australia in non-government held seats. Some people would call that pork-barrel politics. I believe it is an example of the way in which this Government is determined to punish any electorate that dared to return a member of Parliament who did not fly the flag of the A.L.P. The Finger Point scheme, in the District of Mount Gambier, held by a Liberal member, has been cancelled.

Mr Mathwin: For a long time, too.

Mr ASHENDEN: Exactly. The number of times on which the member for Mount Gambier was told that he was a oncer was incredible. Because of the sheer good work that that man has done in his electorate, he has been returned time after time. This Government has removed the Finger Point sewerage proposal from the Budget, and the people of Mount Gambier and the South-East will have to suffer. This Government has also cancelled the Cobdogla works. Once again, that work relates to a seat held by the Liberal Party, represented by a member who is hard working and who has converted what was one of the most marginal seats in South Australia into a seat that can be regarded only as a safe seat. Because of the honourable member's hard work—

Mr Mathwin: The constituents know when they have a good man.

Mr ASHENDEN: Exactly. Certainly, after the actions of this Government, the honourable member will be returned with a greater majority. The seats of Mount Gambier and Chaffey, previously held by the Labor Party, have been converted into quite safe Liberal seats. The actions of the Government in penalising the residents of those electorates are quite despicable. Also residents of the District of Todd were looking forward to having by 1986 a rapid public transport system to service their needs to travel quickly between their homes and the city or Tea Tree Plaza. However, we now find that one of the first actions that the Government took on assuming office was to reduce the funds for the O-Bahn project. Therefore, instead of that system being completed through to Tea Tree Plaza by 1986, it will now be completed only to Darley Road by that time, if we are lucky.

Last week the Minister of Transport had the gall to stand up in this House and say that he would be doing everything that he could to have that public transport system reinstated to its original programme to enable it to be completed by

1986. Yet, we see in today's *Advertiser* what those words are worth, because we find that the public servant who is in charge of the O-Bahn programme has stated quite clearly that by 1986 the O-Bahn system will be completed only to Darley Road. Surely that officer would not be making such a statement had he not been given information by his Minister that indicated that that was so. So, let us have no more of this nonsense of the Minister of Transport making statements in this House and in the *North-East Leader* that are designed to mislead the residents of South Australia and, in this case specifically, the residents of the electorate of Todd.

Not one of the Ministers on the front bench has any credibility at all, because every one of them has misled this Parliament and has made statements that have proved to be untrue. In the matter to which I have referred, we find that the Minister of Transport is no exception. The article in today's *Advertiser* simply reinforces what I have been saying to the residents of Todd, namely, that the election of a Labor Government has cost them dearly. It has cost them a rapid public transport system to which a commitment was given by the now Premier and the now Minister of Transport before the last election, namely, that if elected a Labor Government would ensure that the programme as laid out by the former Liberal Government for the development of a rapid public transport system would be met.

The Labor Party stated categorically to the residents of the north-eastern suburbs that, if it was elected, a full rapid public transport system would be in place by 1986. Although the Labor Party did not give a commitment at that time that it would be the O-Bahn system and referred only to a rapid public transport system (in other words, it could only have been a continuation of the busway or the implementation of a light rail system), a commitment was given that by 1986 a rapid public transport system would be available for all residents of the north-eastern suburbs. However, instead, we found that work on the O-Bahn project immediately slowed down as soon as the Labor Government was elected.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: Rubbish!

Mr ASHENDEN: By saying 'rubbish' in response to my comments, the Minister of Water Resources is showing his abysmal ignorance. I suggest that the Minister of Water Resources obtain a copy of the programme for work on the O-Bahn set up by the previous Government and compare it with the present state of development of the O-Bahn system: it is months and months behind schedule. Let me make quite clear that the programme as outlined by the previous Government was at the time of the last State Government election ahead of its planned schedule. Let us hear no more rubbish from members about the fact that a deliberate decision has not been taken by the Government to downgrade the O-Bahn project. It has, and as I move through the electorate of Todd, I am finding that people there are very well aware of this fact. There was a lot of political discussion and debate over whether we should have a guided busway or a light rail transport system. The point is that the Minister of Transport stated categorically to this House, shortly after the election, that now that he had had the findings of departmental officers and overseas research made available to him he had no hesitation in stating that the guided busway was an extremely good system of public transport and that he saw no problems with it.

Of course, that is a complete turn around from what the Minister and Premier were stating before the election. Let us forget that they turned through 180 degrees in their approach. What the residents of the north-eastern suburbs will not forget is that in this Budget, and in statements that have been released by this Government, there has been a downgrading of the priority of that rapid public transport

system to the north-eastern suburbs, and the residents of those suburbs are hurt by that downgrading as they were looking forward to such a system being implemented. They thought, when the Government made its statement that the O-Bahn would be continued, 'Thank goodness, the politicking is over. At last we have a Government and Opposition agreeing that a guided busway is necessary for the residents of the north-eastern suburbs.' Immediately after that, what did they find? The Government reversed its decision and said to residents of the north-eastern suburbs that the busway was only going to progress to Darley Road by 1986.

The member for Newland is not in the House at the moment, but I would be staggered if he is not receiving the same sorts of comments as he moves through the electorate of Newland as I receive as I move through the electorate of Todd; that is, anger and disappointment that this Government has not met its promise to those residents of the north-eastern suburbs regarding that rapid public transport system. Let us not forget that these residents have already been let down once before by a Labor Government in relation to rapid public transport. For many years the Dunstan Government promised a rapid system of public transport to the north-eastern suburbs. However, it was only when a Liberal Government was elected to the Treasury benches that a rapid public transport system came from the realm of a dream to the realm of certainty. Unfortunately, it is no longer a certainty following the defeat of the Liberal Government in the election last year. However, the residents of the north-eastern suburbs will not forget that it was this Government that cut away from under their feet a system that they had been looking forward to for so long.

I have already addressed myself to the broken promises of this Government. It is interesting to note that prior to its election South Australia enjoyed the lowest taxes in Australia and, in fact, in the previous financial year, State taxes were reduced by about 5 per cent. Unfortunately, the people of South Australia fell for the promises made by the Premier when he said that if elected his Government would neither increase existing taxes nor introduce new taxes. Fortunately, residents of South Australia are coming to learn that one cannot trust any member of a Labor Government. Had a Liberal Government been returned at the last election taxes would not have been increased this year. The only reason that taxes are being increased by this Government is purely and simply that its Ministers are unable to exercise proper financial control. As a result of this, families will be required to pay \$12.50 a week more in State taxes than they were paying at the time of the election. In other words, this Government has obviously decided, 'To hell with the welfare of residents of South Australia, to hell with the welfare of industry in South Australia, let us forget the fact that this State has been buoyant and that its industry has survived only because its costs of production have been lower than those in the Eastern States and therefore it has been able to sell its goods and produce interstate because it can manufacture more cheaply. Let us forget all that. Let us introduce a range of taxes that will not only hit the ordinary householder hard but will also hit industry hard,' because that is exactly what the taxes, such as the increased tax on petrol, will do.

Not only will the motorist who commutes pay more but every industry utilising transport will pay more. Because of this the cost of goods will go up. The Leader of the Opposition stated weeks ago that the financial institutions duty would be 4c in \$100 and that is obviously what it is going to be. We saw in the past couple of weeks little Premier John toddling off to Nifty and saying, 'What are you going to do with your f.i.d.? What about putting it up to 4c? I need the money desperately.' He went across to little John Cain who would have said that he was in a bit of trouble

also. John Cain would have said, 'We made all sorts of promises. Like you, Neville and the Prime Minister we cannot meet our promises; we have to get money so we will bleed the taxpayers of our States even more. We will increase our financial institutions duty from 3c to 4c so that when you introduce it in South Australia you will be able to charge 4c too.'

This is not just a matter of what this tax will cost the small person. Let us take, for instance, the case of any income earner who receives his money through his bank account. When his company or employer puts that money into the bank it will be taxed. When he wants to take that money out of the bank it will be taxed again. Every time he uses his money it will be taxed.

The Hon. H. Allison: The 'flow-on' theory.

Mr ASHENDEN: Yes, the flow-on theory. We find that the Government's tax will substantially increase costs to companies. It is one of the most iniquitous of taxes, a tax which the Premier promised, when in Opposition, he would not introduce into South Australia. That statement is worth about as much as his promise to the people of South Australia that, if elected to Government, he would not introduce any new taxes. If the financial institutions duty is not a new tax, I would like the Premier to tell me what it is. He said also that he would not increase taxes. However, we know what that promise was worth. It is also very interesting to note the way in which the Premier has turned about in relation to the financial management of South Australia. Prior to his election he stated that he was fully aware of the financial situation in South Australia. He said that he had been given information by Treasury officials and was certain that he knew exactly where South Australia would find itself.

Mr Mathwin: He had an in.

Mr ASHENDEN: Exactly. He said that he had an in and could go to the people and state categorically what he would do as he knew the financial state of South Australia. However, what happened on the night of the election when it was obvious that Mr Bannon was going to win the premiership? On that very night he said to South Australians:

I must caution you that we may not be able to fulfil our promises as quickly as we wanted to.

In other words, on that very night he was sowing the seeds preparatory to the attack he was going to launch, just as the Premiers of New South Wales, Victoria and Western Australia and the Prime Minister had done when trying to sheet home the blame for their economic mismanagement to prior Governments. We find that the situation gradually changed and that the Premier then got up and stated in this House that the deficit would be greater than \$70 million. That was early in the life of this Parliament. He stated that the deficit might be more because of the situation inherited from the Liberals. The Premier later stated:

On 3 May when I introduced the Supplementary Estimates, I gave details and reported that the overall deficit on Consolidated Account could reach \$72 million. I am now able to report that the final outcome for 1982-83 is better than the result I indicated last May.

Surprise, surprise! Those on this side of the House knew the situation was such that the previous scare tactics used by the Premier were exactly that—scare tactics. Even with the gross overspending allowed by this Premier and his Government, the deficit in South Australia was nothing like what he anticipated: it was \$57 million.

Had it managed its finances as any responsible Government would have done, that deficit would have been and should have been far smaller. The Premier has the gall to talk about the seriousness of South Australia's financial situation. Having said that, he then doubled the business franchise tax on tobacco, increased the cost of petrol in

South Australia by a cent a litre and increased the levy on stamp duty. The Premier then told us that a new financial institutions duty would be levied. All that is supposed to help South Australia get out of the situation that it is in! If that is the way that the Premier and his Government believe that economic management should be handled, goodness help South Australia over the next two years.

The Budget brought before Parliament is disastrous. If this Government's future Budgets are to be the same, I repeat that I am absolutely certain of its defeat at the next election, whenever it is held. I can only hope that a Liberal Government will be returned in time to save this State from the economic problems that have been brought about by the Government. The Government has completely reneged on promises that it made to South Australians, and in other areas it is continuing to mislead the public of this State. Also, make no mistake, South Australia's problems in relation to gas pricing lie fairly, squarely and completely at the feet of the Dunstan Government.

Despite the comments of the General Manager of A.G.L., who was probably doing what nifty Neville told him to do, the efforts of the previous Liberal Government (in first removing a tax on the Gas Company and then attempting to protect South Australians from unfair gas price increases) were very much hampered by the shocking and totally inept negotiations that were held by Premier Dunstan prior to settlement. All he did was ensure that New South Wales was well looked after while the interests of South Australians went right out the door.

Mr Trainer: What's your policy?

Mr ASHENDEN: My policy is completely in line with that of my Leader. Unfortunately, my time is about to expire. I have many other points to discuss and I will certainly be further developing the point that we have a totally disreputable Government with a Premier who has absolutely no credibility in future debates.

Mr MATHWIN (Glenelg): Obviously, I will refer to the Budget, which I believe was a rather shocking document. Even before the Budget was brought down, fees were rising and charges were going up. We had to wait with bated breath until the Budget was presented and we found that the little man was hit even harder. The ordinary man in the street suffered an increase in one of the luxury areas that he enjoys—the smoking of cigarettes. Generally, the smoking of cigarettes is a pleasurable pursuit for the working man. Those people who travel a lot and own a car or a motor bike suffered because the Government raised the price of petrol for the second time in about three weeks. The first petrol price increase was implemented by the South Australian's Federal colleagues, and the other increase was implemented in this House by the South Australian Government. However, that was not the only increase for the downtrodden motorist.

I am sure that everyone well remembers that those people who are naughty enough to be caught doing the wrong thing then suffered a considerable increase in on-the-spot fines. Of course, an offending motorist does not have to pay the fine on the spot but can attend court if he so desires. In many cases the public would be well advised to take that further step and actually appear before a court because, in many cases, an offending motorist would be faced with a fine less than the original on-the-spot fine.

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

INHERITANCE (FAMILY PROVISION) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PARLIAMENTARY LAW, PRACTICE AND PROCEDURES

The Legislative Council transmitted the following resolution in which it requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

That the Joint Committee on the Law, Practice and Procedures of the Parliament be authorised to disclose or publish if it thinks fit any evidence and any documents presented to the Joint Committee prior to such evidence and documents being reported to the Parliament.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the resolution of the Legislative Council be agreed to.

I think that the resolution speaks for itself. It is obviously a requirement that has been recommended to the Legislative Council by the Committee and, in turn, the Legislative Council has considered that the matter ought to be referred to this House. I can see nothing wrong with the resolution. I have sought and obtained authority to move the motion at this stage from the Opposition, which I understand will agree to the request as well.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I accept the motion on behalf of the Opposition. It is one which has been determined by the committee itself, more specifically because of the preparation of an excellent research document which should be circulated widely so that there can be adequate feedback from the community, the members of this House, the committees associated with this House and any other person who has a direct interest in the furtherance of this Parliament's performance on behalf of the people of South Australia.

The members of the committee are quite certain that this is a proper course of action. It is not seeking to circumvent the powers of the Parliament and the individual Houses, and, certainly, unless there is a like mind by members of the House of Assembly, members of the Legislative Council, and members of all political persuasions who are represented on that committee, documents will not be circulated. However, where there is agreement, the course of action can only benefit the deliberations of the committee and eventually benefit the deliberations of the Parliamentary system. I support the motion.

Motion carried.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Second reading debate resumed.

Mr MATHWIN (Glenelg): I have referred to the increases that this Government has imposed since coming to office, some well before the Budget was presented to this House, and, of course, those imposed through the Budget itself. I believe that I also mentioned matters in relation to broken promises which have been circulated in this House for some time, and rightly so.

The Government should never be allowed to forget that it came in under what in normal circumstances would have been false advertising. If any firm or organisation in private enterprise had advertised in the way in which the present Government did during the election period when it promised that there would be no increases in taxes or charges at all, and reneged on it immediately, it would be in for false advertising and would be in terrible strife with the various departments.

I refer now to a few matters in the Auditor-General's Report to which some attention should be given. Because of my interest, particularly in the Department for Com-

munity Welfare, correctional services and juvenile offenders, I have kept watch on this problem over a number of years in which I have been in this place. I was more than surprised when I opened the Auditor-General's Report, to see the vast increases in spending and costs in the Department for Community Welfare. On page 63 of the Auditor-General's Report, it states under 'Residential Care':

The Department provides a comprehensive network of services for children and young people. Assistance provided is by way of residential care facilities in the form of hostels and cottage homes, with a total capacity of 112 (112) and an average occupancy of 61 (55).

The figures in brackets refer to the previous year. I know that those facilities are available, and I wonder whether under that line any finance is provided for the area which one would have hoped would proceed far more quickly than it has: that is, community service orders. The delay in this area has been very disappointing to me. I do not blame this Government for all that; my own Government when in office was very slow in getting this scheme into operation, but it certainly has not accelerated under the present Government. There is far more that it can do with juvenile offenders in this area.

The adult area of correctional services and offenders has been increased and speeded up, but the Government does not seem to be speeding up at all in relation to juveniles. That is a great shame, because that is the area into which we should be getting and in which we ought to be trying to get some wins; by that I mean being able to turn some of these young people away from what would appear to be the road to becoming professional criminals. The report goes on to say:

The departmental cost of providing these facilities in 1982-83 was \$2,578 million (\$2,374 million) with an average net annual cost per child being \$42 138 (\$43 537).

But it is the next area to which I draw the attention of the House: that is in relation to the various training centres, as they are now called. We change them from time to time in order, perhaps, to make them look better. At one stage we had the McNally Training Centre, which has now, of course, been renamed (this was done some years ago) the South Australian Youth Training Centre. Then, what used to be Vaughan House is now, of course, called the Remand and Assessment Centre. I am greatly concerned about the vast increases in the cost of these institutions. Under the heading 'Training Centres' (page 64 of the Auditor-General's Report) this statement appears:

The department provides secure residential care for young offenders who have been sentenced or remanded in custody for assessment by the Children's Court. Their main centres, their net cost and occupancy rates over the past three years were—

A table then sets out the figures for all to see, although it is not great reading. In 1981 the net cost of the South Australian Youth Training Centre was \$2.676 million, in 1982 it was \$3.036 million and in 1983 it was \$3.427 million, certainly a vast increase. The capacity of the centre over those three years remained static at 80 inmates. However, average occupancy has decreased and, certainly, I hope that some of the people who would normally have been sentenced to this centre are now placed on community work orders. I doubt that that will be so, but that is what I would like to see. Average occupancy in 1981 was 70, in 1982 it was 63, and in 1983 it was 60.

The next set of figures are those that astounded me, not just as a member of Parliament, but as a member of the community and as a person paying taxes in this State; the average annual net cost per offender at what was formally the McNally Training Centre in 1981 was \$38 000, in 1982 it was \$48 000, and in 1983, in the year just finished, it was \$57 000. I emphasise that these figures relate to what was formerly the McNally Training Centre. That amount averages

out to \$1 096 a week, which is up \$107 a week and \$48 000 a year on the previous year. A colossal sum is involved in looking after young offenders.

Turning now to the South Australian Youth Remand and Assessment Centre, which most members will know as the former girls' centre situated near Northfield, the overall cost in 1981 was \$1.474 million, in 1982 it was \$1.642 million and in 1983 it was \$1.836 million. That centre had a capacity of 51, unchanged over the entire three-year period, and the average occupancy in 1981 was 33, in 1982 it was 29, and in 1983 it was 25. Again, the average cost in regard to each offender is most astounding and makes one most concerned. In 1981 the average cost per offender was \$45 000, in 1982 it was \$57 000 and in 1983 it was \$73 000. That was the sum required to keep a person at the South Australian Youth Remand and Assessment Centre. That \$73 000 per head can be broken down to \$1 404 a week. That sum has increased by \$308 a week per head over last year, and overall it is up \$57 000 per head on the previous year. A colossal amount is being spent in such a situation.

Turning now to the Lochiel Park Training Centre, the overall cost in 1981 was \$559 000, in 1982 it was \$568 000 and in 1983 it was \$685 000. These figures relate to 30 inmates at that centre, and that capacity remained unchanged over the three years in question. The average occupancy in 1981 was 13, in 1982 it was 12, and in 1983 it was 10. In 1981, the cost to keep a person in that institution was \$43 000; in 1982, it was \$47 000 per head; and in 1983, it was \$69 000 per head, which is \$1 327 per week per head, an increase of \$423 per week per head from the previous year or \$47 000 per head in a year. That is a colossal sum. It is about time the department gave more consideration to the situation. It is very costly to keep these young people in prison, or in Borstal, one might say. Of course, some young people will always have to be confined in institutions to protect the public, and it is only right that the community receive that protection.

Some of these young people, however, especially the very young, should be released on a work programme: they should do community work to offset the problems that they have caused in the community. Such a work programme will train young people to realise that at times one has to work, and it will give them some sense of responsibility. That type of scheme has been operating in other countries for quite a number of years, and the report that I presented to the House four years ago emphasised the success of this type of treatment for young offenders. Such a scheme is run, to great advantage, in West Germany, the United Kingdom, Canada, and a number of the States of America.

Yet, South Australia has been lagging behind in its duty to provide alternative methods for these young people. We should never consider as the main criterion the cost to the State or to the people of the State, but rather we should consider whether it is possible to do something for these young people (and many of them are only children) in order to try to steer them off the road to crime, perhaps to keep them from becoming professional criminals. If we allow young offenders to continue in this direction, we pay the cost, because they have to be kept in some sort of institution. These institutions are very expensive to build and to man, and they present a great deal of trouble.

When we consider this line in the Budget, I expect some good answers from the Minister's representatives, his staff, or the head of the department so that we can ascertain just how much progress has been made in steering young people from crime and in rehabilitating them through community service work. Young offenders could well do with such training. I am glad to see that \$16 000 has been expended for criminology research (page 66 of the report). Although that does not seem to be a very large sum, I was happy to

note that some money has been expended, and I hope that that allocation will be increased this year, because it is imperative in this field of correctional services, when one is dealing with young offenders rather than adult offenders, that proper records, assessments and honest statistics be kept so that we can ascertain whether we are on the right track in the treatment provided. If we are not on the right track, the departmental officers should see it not as a failure but as an indication that they are on the wrong track and should try different treatment for these young people.

I want to refer briefly to the adult facet of correctional services. On page 72 of the Auditor-General's Report details are given of the operations of the various gaols. In regard to the Adelaide Gaol, we all know that it has been there for a long time and that it has had very few alterations made to it. Electricity was supplied because originally it did not have that, but generally speaking it has changed very little over the 100 years or so that it has been used as a prison. The net cost of operations at the Adelaide Gaol in 1980-81 was \$2 983 199, and the cost per prisoner was \$12 749, with a net cost of \$3 715 622. That situation for the year 1980-81 was pretty grim. For the year 1982-83 the average cost per prisoner had increased to \$20 972.

In regard to the Women's Rehabilitation Centre there is a vast difference in the standard of facilities. That is a very modern and clean prison for the women of this State, although not very many women are there. Of course, that is a reflection on the existence of sex discrimination in the courts whereby not as many women are put away as are men. We must be fair and deal with people equally.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: There are not as many women offenders.

Mr MATHWIN: There is no comparison in regard to numbers and there is certainly no comparison in regard to the accommodation. Let me tell my friend and colleague, the member for Coles, that the accommodation is distinctly different. I believe that all honourable members should visit the prisons from time to time (as visitors, not as inmates, as it would be quite wrong of me to suggest that members go there for a spell).

It should be the responsibility of all members of this House to go and have a look at our prison system. Those members who have not been to places like Yatala and the Adelaide Gaol should go there immediately. The conditions at those prisons are shocking. In all honesty, when one sees the conditions at Adelaide and Yatala gaols one realises that we must be ashamed of ourselves. Of course, the women's prison is quite different. It is a modern prison and has few prisoners in it. It has all the conveniences that the men at Yatala do not have. The net cost of operations of the Women's Rehabilitation Centre in 1980-81 was \$588 245, and the average cost per prisoner was \$28 012. The cost per prisoner in 1982-83 had risen to \$41 915, which is nearly double the 1980-81 cost.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: You could put them up at the Hilton for less than that!

Mr MATHWIN: You could indeed. If these figures do not improve we might have to start doing that. When one balances those costs with the cost per prisoner of \$57 000 a year or \$1 096 a week in regard to young people detained at what used to be McNally, I suppose that the cost in relation to the adult institutions is quite reasonable. I remember that not long ago the young people detained at what was then McNally were costing us about \$40 000 a year; of course, it has gone up to a colossal figure. For the Yatala Labour Prison the net cost of operations in 1980-81 was \$6 447 733, and the cost per prisoner \$17 057. In 1982-83 that increased to \$29 356 per prisoner. That is a shocking situation, and a very costly one to the taxpayers of this State. In relation to the remand centre, which should have

been well on the way by now had this Government not stopped that work, the report states:

The project to construct the Brompton Adelaide remand centre was abandoned during the year. Preliminary expenses for design and other preparatory work amounted to \$930 000 of which \$900 000 was written off—

by this Government, because it wanted to change the situation. Referring to the Yatala Labour Prison's industries complex facilities, on which \$5.3 million had been spent to 30 June 1983, the report states:

These facilities were ready for use in April 1982 but remain unused.

That has resulted either from an argument involving staff who refused to man that centre or, as in the present situation, from the fact that, as I understand it, prisoners do not wish to use it. If prisoners are put into a high security prison and required to undertake hard labour and, in fact, do some hard work, I believe that they are obliged to at least do some work. It is the responsibility of the Government and the prison authorities to see that they do work when in prison.

It is no use keeping prisoners locked in their cells from 4.30 p.m. or 6 p.m. until the early morning. Having to spend 12 to 16 hours a day in their cells is shocking and ridiculous: it does nobody any good at all, and it has a very bad effect on the prisoners. That situation has to change, and change quickly. The staff at Yatala have to see the situation as it really is—that these people are human beings and deserve to have some time in which they can study and do certain other things in reasonable and decent circumstances. That needs to happen quickly, otherwise we will have more trouble on our hands. This Government has seen fit to improve the situation by putting medium security prisoners into a prison which is being built right next to the women's prison, and that will certainly ease the present situation.

In the brief time I have left, I wish to refer (at page 498 of the Auditor-General's Report) to 'Shortages and thefts', particularly in the Education Department under the heading 'Thefts of cash and irregularities', where one notes that \$1 889 cash was stolen from 30 schools. The cash stolen from three colleges totals \$283. In the Agricultural Department at Northfield a chain saw was stolen, which must be a favourite, because the Department of Marine and Harbours also had a chain saw purloined. Also, the Department of Marine and Harbours had an outboard motor stolen to the value of \$700. In the Education Department at various locations audio-visual and photographic equipment was stolen to the value of \$100 730; sporting equipment, \$32 910; workshop equipment, \$29 159; music equipment, \$15 608; office equipment, \$11 691; and grounds equipment (I suppose that means pruning shears, spades and shovels, etc.), \$6 951. All that equipment is missing from our schools.

Regarding the Public Buildings Department, I note that the salvage depot at Richmond lost a motor vehicle, which has never been recovered. Goodness knows what happened to that! I do not know what make of vehicle it was but it was worth \$4 000. The Government is very lax in this area and should be doing something about it. In the Department of Technical and Further Education, audio-visual equipment valued at \$450 was recovered out of a total of \$11 386 worth of equipment lost from various colleges.

People stealing from homes are getting into this type of equipment, but to see it disappearing in such great quantities from our schools worries me, as the taxpayer has to foot the bill. If it is not covered by insurance, the Government has to foot the bill, which means the taxpayer has to pay. Further, \$2 510 worth of workshop equipment and \$400 worth of photographic equipment is missing from various schools. That adds up to a considerable sum of money in items missing over 12 months. Whilst we always have a

line which startles us when we look at the vast amount of money involved, it still upsets me when this sort of thing continues along on the same footing and larger pieces of equipment go missing. One wonders how on earth a motor vehicle can disappear unless someone has taken it for spare parts.

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

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): We have listened to the golden tongue of the member for Glenelg, who is very perceptive when it comes to criminal activities in this State. He made some valid points about the conditions in this State's prisons. I also believe that everyone should go and see how bad things are, particularly at Yatala—I believe 'Dickensian' was the word used. He mentioned keeping prisoners in the Hilton. I believe that if we wanted to cut out minor crime in this State the best way would be to have offenders sit in the Visitors' Gallery for one or two weeks. I am sure they would never offend again, especially with the current Parliamentary debates.

Mr Mathwin: That is quite original.

Mr PETERSON: I thought it was quite good, too. Some valid points have been made about increasing costs, particularly tobacco and petrol costs, which upset me. I do not like to see costs increased.

Mr Mathwin: How do you feel about on-the-spot fines?

Mr PETERSON: I have not had one yet.

Mr Mathwin: You have a son in the force, though.

Mr PETERSON: No, he is in the army. I am upset about increasing costs. However, Governments are elected and judged by the people. They have to front up to the people every so often—that is the system and I believe it is a good one. That is when decisions are made. All the words spoken in this debate over the past week or so prove nothing. It may give some material for election pamphlets or publicity but the only time it is important is when people vote.

Mr Mathwin: The people on each flank can get on television, but we on the back benches can't.

Mr PETERSON: That is one of the things that I have been going to bring up with the Speaker. The member for Glenelg raises a valid point, namely, equal time on television in this place. With the cameras mounted as they are, those of us on the cross benches do not have a fair go, as people see only my bald patch.

Mr Trainer: You've got the best known scalp in Adelaide.

Mr PETERSON: Yes, it looks as though I am being got at for my scalp. I may add. I believe that this matter should be considered.

Mr Mathwin: Mobile cameras.

Mr PETERSON: Mobile cameras could travel along the centre of the Chamber giving all members equal time on television. I am sure that all members are photogenic enough to appear on television and that my beard would come up well in living colour. I believe that all members should be entitled to equal time on television. I now turn to some of the valid points in relation to the business of the State. In his speech, the Premier states:

We will also be mounting a major campaign designed to ensure that the State is successful in attracting the Royal Australian Navy submarine replacement programme. This programme offers the prospect of considerable employment and new development in high technology industries.

That is very true. It is a major programme in Australian terms, let alone State terms. Such a programme would have a significant impact upon our State. I do not think that details of the programme have been made public. That is a problem because people do not know what is involved.

The submarine replacement programme is a major defence project that is allegedly worth about \$1 000 million. It is

designed to replace the Oberon class submarine fleet currently serving with the Australian Navy. From what I have heard, the programme could result in the replacement of up to 10 conventional submarines and could begin later this decade, in about 1987. The basic shipbuilding and maintenance section of the programme would provide jobs for some 600 people, and apparently some 300 jobs would be created in ongoing support services for the new fleet. I note that the Government has suggested that it would be prepared to assist in the establishment of facilities for the programme, and a figure of some \$25 million has been mentioned in relation to the establishment of a workshop/dockyard.

I understand that two major cities in Australia are competing for the submarine replacement contract: the first is Cairns, which has a facility for building small ships such as frigates; the other existing submarine facility in Australia is at Cockatoo Dock. Cockatoo Dock has been plagued by industrial troubles. It is an old establishment with old facilities and machinery. It appears that the Navy would prefer an entirely new facility for the construction and maintenance of the new submarines. I think that South Australia has a real chance of obtaining the replacement contract.

The Federal Government requires a 60 per cent Australian industry participation in construction schemes such as the submarine replacement programme. The contract would be a substantial boost to our heavy engineering and technological industries. We are fortunate in this State in that we have the Weapons Research Establishment at Salisbury, because that would obviously participate in the supply of equipment for the submarines and it would make a complete all-round operation for this State, along with the heavy engineering, ancillary work and the high technology facets of the construction programme.

South Australia is also fortunate that it has a port that can cater for this type of construction. We have thousands of hectares of land adjacent to a sea-going channel, which is unique in Australia. Very few ports in Australia have anything to compare with the facilities available in relation to access to our deep sea channel. Another industry that is looking for land in South Australia, particularly at Port Adelaide, is the petro-chemical industry. Although the project has gone quiet at the moment, I hope that it again raises its head in the next few months. If the facility is built and work is created, I am hopeful that it will occur in the district of Semaphore in the Osborne section of the river adjacent to a substantial engineering company, Eglo Engineering which over the past few years has provided substantial employment for people in the Semaphore area. There is a bit of a downturn in this industry at the moment, but hopefully it will pick up.

Tourism is also referred to in the Auditor-General's Report and the Budget. We are all aware of the impact that the visit of the *Oriana* had upon our State. I see that today's newspaper still mentions *Oriana's* visit to Adelaide. It was a significant event. Of course, full marks go to the Government that made the brave decision to build the passenger terminal at Outer Harbor. It cost the State quite a bit of money. I believe that a lot of people are not aware that the shed that was there previously was falling down anyway. The No. 2 berth at Outer Harbor was built when Outer Harbor was constructed at the turn of the century, and it was a matter of either tearing the shed down and building something else, or letting it blow away.

Mr Lewis: It was part of the heritage of the State, in my opinion.

Mr PETERSON: There was a lot of heritage there, and a lot of work was done there. It had a lot of white ants, and a lot of galvanised iron, but it certainly was not of any significance.

One aspect of our State's tourism promotion on which I do not think we have concentrated enough and which was highlighted by the visit of the *Oriana* is access to good sailing water in the Gulf and the possibilities of using its scenic waters for tourism purposes. I have been told that it was once possible to do day boat trips along the coast out of Port Adelaide or from the jetties on the coast. It occurred to me when I was watching the America's Cup the other night that we have a perfect opportunity for this sort of activity to take place in our Gulf waters. We have two major deep sea cruising clubs, which both happen to be in my electorate—lucky me! One is the S.A. Royal Yacht Squadron and the other is the Cruising Yacht Club of South Australia. Both of these clubs hold major yachting meetings and races in the Gulf almost every Saturday, which I think provide a very colourful spectacle, to which many people do not have access. I often wonder whether it would be possible to promote some sort of boat shuttle system so that people could go out for the day to watch the yacht racing run by either of those major yacht clubs or the minor boat clubs along the coast.

When I say 'minor' I do not mean that in any degrading way: I mean the racing involving small boats such as rainbows, the herons and catamarans that race in all the many sailing clubs along our coast. They range from Outer Harbor and Henley and Grange right down to Christies Beach. On Saturdays a significant number of craft participate in a very colourful spectacle. This is a matter that I think could be looked at. It is a spectacle that people do not generally see. However, we could get people out to watch these races as there are many craft around that would be suitable for this purpose. For instance, many craft that run across to Kangaroo Island as a tourism passenger service could be used for a day to watch the yacht racing. I notice that in the Tourism Budget there is a line allocating \$51 000 (I think) for tourism research next year. That is an aspect that could be looked at because I do not think that anyone has looked at it yet and it could perhaps provide a new facet for our tourism industry.

I refer again to the Department of Marine and Harbors. As I said previously, I notice from the Auditor-General's Report that there has been a downturn in tonnages handled on the waterfront, the wharves of Port Adelaide and our ports in the past few years. A downturn in employment in the dockyard has also come about because of this. This downturn in employment in the dockyard is of great concern to me because it is a significant area of employment in my electorate and involves a Government department that has produced many good projects over the years. My fear is that that expertise will be allowed to fritter away and disappear unless we maintain a viable work force in that dockyard. However, shipping generally has changed. The emphasis and the type of shipping in Port Adelaide has changed over the years and this is also reflected in the figures shown in the Auditor-General's Report.

The tonnage is way down on what it used to be. In the 20 years that I was associated with the trade I saw a change from a conventional ship, sling-by-sling cargo type of operation, to one in which containerisation came about and changed the whole emphasis. In 1960 there were something like 2 500 men employed on the waterfront in Port Adelaide.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: You seem to be reminiscing.

Mr PETERSON: I am stating a point on the change in emphasis of the trade in Port Adelaide. There were about 2 500 men there; they are down to about 450 men now. This has changed: the mechanisation, containerisation, and new forms of handling the cargo have all brought about a revolution in the way in which the cargo is handled.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: That's good, isn't it?

Mr PETERSON: It is good in many ways, but it also has its bad facets; for instance, the point about bulk handling. I can remember, as can the member for Mallee, I am sure, when they used to load a bulk ship by cutting each bag. Obviously, that is not an effective or efficient way of doing it, but it did employ a lot of men. Those bags had to be filled out on the farm. They had to be carried.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: Which do you favour most: progress in this direction or retention of the manpower?

Mr PETERSON: The honourable member will not let me make the point I am trying to get to. I am just saying that the employment was there. We talk now about unemployment and changing technology (in particular, cargo technology), but we have changed the emphasis. Thousands of men were employed in those days. I doubt whether there are too many around who could neck a bag of wheat now, but it employed a lot of men. Even sewing up the bags employed people; all of that has changed. We have seen a revolution in the way in which materials generally are handled. We have seen a boost in the way containerisation, unitisation and pre-slung cargoes all have an effect on employment and also on the community generally. I suppose that it could become within the definition of a technological change that this has happened within the stevedoring industry.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: What has this got to do with the Budget debate?

Mr PETERSON: I am just saying that the employment and tonnage is down. The honourable member will not let me come to the point that I want to make. It has also brought about a change in the emphasis.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Ferguson): I ask honourable members to allow the honourable member to complete his speech in silence.

Mr PETERSON: Thank you, Sir. I need your protection against these ruffians in Opposition. The point that I was building to is that it has brought about a change in the way in which cargo is loaded aboard the ship and where it is done. We have had a system of shipping in Australia for some time called the 'Conference line shipping', whereby the shipping companies cut Australia into sections and take what they want. They put their ships where they wish and virtually select the cargoes they want to take. They dictate to Australia how and when and where their cargoes will be handled. This has happened now in containerisation. Am I getting any clearer? I asked a question the other day of the Minister of Marine about the concessions that have been given by the State itself, by the Federal Government and by the interstate Government organisations to keep cargo going through (either in or out of Australia) their States, and ports. We are at a total disadvantage now in that we cannot give these sorts of rebates. We are several days steaming away from Melbourne, for instance. We are many thousands of dollars in steaming time for a ship away from Melbourne, and we have a Conference line which tends to centralise cargoes in certain ports in Australia.

The answer given the other day by the Minister related to the Japanese and Korean lines. Japan is a major trading partner of Australia and of South Australia. That cargo is not going over our wharves. It is not creating work here or generating revenue for South Australia. The freight rates to the railways in the main go out of the State. They go to A.N.R. South Australian Railways now gets nothing at all out of the container rail freight; it goes to Victorian Rail or Australian National. Wharfage and container rates go to outside companies which do not operate in the State or which do not operate its terminals. The wharfage rate goes to a marine facility that is not a South Australian facility, but a Victorian facility.

For many years in this State progressive Governments have been dealing with the Japanese shipping lines, trying to get them to bring a permanent or regular ship call to South Australia. They will not come here. They have declined once again to come to South Australia because they have been given these financial rebates by interstate operators. 'Interstate operators' does not necessarily mean private people, but Government facilities, too.

The point I make is very significant because we talk here about trying to make our marine facilities viable. I think that this is in one of these documents somewhere: we are talking about another container crane for Outer Harbor. I do not know what a new crane would cost now—somewhere between \$7 million and \$10 million. I would like to see the crane there because it certainly would make us more viable, but it is hard to justify it while one cannot entice the trade here. It is like every bale of wool which, in effect, is containerised and is shorn in South Australia, and put into a container; in the main, they do not go over the wharves in South Australia. When a farmer here pays his wharfage rate, rail freight rate and shipping rate, it goes out of the State. That is all money which should stay. It cannot all stay here because A.N.R. does not operate, or give us money back, or we do not have a freight rail. But it does mean that all the wharfage and labour rates (the wages for loading that container) should stay here.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: Most of our wool is dumped at Port Adelaide and loaded directly on vessels—

Mr PETERSON: An expert! Would the honourable member like to substantiate that comment with figures? Most of it is dumped at Port Adelaide, which is the only such facility in South Australia. There are several ways: there are normal, medium, high density and now even jumbo dumps which were all developed for containerisation. It is said that all wool goes over the wharf in Port Adelaide, but that is incorrect. Although I cannot give an exact figure now (certainly, I can get it), I point out that all Japanese wool goes over the wharf in Melbourne.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: You are not saying that the jumbo dump at Elders-IXL at the new—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PETERSON: I am saying that the jumbo dump bales at the new Elder's facility are put into containers. As far as I am aware, all the Russian wool is loaded over the wharf at Port Adelaide, but that is not so for Japanese wool. The vast majority of United Kingdom-Continental wool is not loaded over the wharf at Port Adelaide. Certainly, I hope that I have been of some assistance to the honourable member, but that is a significant matter. Much money is not being kept in South Australia. Now we have the Federal Government facilities and State Government facilities in every State combining to prevent our getting such a container service in South Australia. The employment generated here would probably not be that great. I am not sure of the exact figure in manpower terms. The terminal at Outer Harbor has a manned operation which is efficient and which is one of the most efficient in Australia, as far as I am aware. It has a better loading rate of containers than any other terminal in Australia, yet we have to struggle and go cap-in-hand to get shipping companies to include South Australia as a destination because we are competing with other States.

Every State now has a major container terminal. Victoria has several and, with its capacity, can obviously handle all South Australian and Victorian requirements. In Sydney, the Botany Bay container terminal could handle the entire Australian container trade if it wished. We have a single crane at Outer Harbor and cannot even get a ship to call because shipping companies are getting rebates. There is no way we can match that, and that brings in another aspect of the standard gauge railway. There would be many benefits

for the State, and I believe that in the end there will be a standard gauge railway throughout Australia. When that happens, Australia will have centralised ports. The Conference Line will ensure that the ports are centralised to suit it: it is much easier to load and unload a ship at a single port rather than crabbing around the coast.

Mr Lewis: This coast is the dearest anywhere in the world.

Mr PETERSON: I heard that comment about Australia's being the dearest coast. Overseas shipping lines do not generally employ Australian seamen.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Comments are out of order.

Mr PETERSON: Some lines, such as A.N.L., run ships for the Japanese trade and on the PAD line, I think. I am not up with the details. However, in the main, overseas ships are not manned by Australian crews. The belief that they are manned by Australian crews is a bit of a fallacy. The seamen in many overseas countries work under conditions that are similar to the conditions of Australian seamen. In many cases, there is little difference. The standard gauge line will be a boon in many ways, but it can work against us in other ways. The original concept of containerisation was the land bridge system, involving a single port and rail and road transport containers across the country. A number of overseas shipping companies have practised this in America: on the west coast of America they have discharged cargoes and transported the containers to the east coast, from where they have been reloaded and transported to Britain and the Continent. There are risks in everything we do.

There are other problems in relation to trade in this State. The Adelaide Brighton Cement Company, a big employer, has been an outgoing and forthright company. It has tried to get out into the world to sell its wares, and it has done very well and been competitive. However, other countries have worked against Australia's trying to develop industries. When there was a shortage of cement in America, Adelaide Brighton Cement entered the market and established itself. According to an article in the *Advertiser* of 14 September, exports to the United States by Adelaide Brighton Cement have been further threatened by the United States Commerce Department decision to impose a 136 per cent duty on cement imports. The cement was shipped from Port Adelaide, so the shipping and other facilities provided at Port Adelaide were affected. That company set out to create business, but it was prevented from doing so, and this sort of thing happens in Australia because of competition between the States.

This same company managed to create a market in Queensland, but as soon as it was established in that State the Queensland Government jacked up and said that it did not want the company in Queensland. There were all sorts of manoeuvres to keep the company out of the Queensland market. This State is competing with six other centres which have the same interests and which want to protect themselves. Over the past few months I have been interested to hear comments about State protection for South Australian companies. It seems to me that the only way in which we can generate employment and give companies confidence and interest in the future is to look after and support our own.

A company in my district, Steel Mains, manufactures large water pipes for trunk mains. I received a letter from the Manager of that company who wants to speak to the Minister about generating trade in South Australia for his products. The company is a significant employer, it is Australia wide, but the South Australian branch is slowly being eroded, men are being laid off, and there are less employment opportunities—because we do not look after our own.

If we are not going to generate employment for South Australians, if we are not going to use the produce that is manufactured, or encourage producers and give them support, we can hardly expect others in other States to do it. They will not do it; they will look after their own, too. There was a debate earlier today about gas prices, and about the Premier of New South Wales looking after the State that he represents. I do not blame him, because that is exactly why he is there; it is his function to look after New South Wales just as it is the function of the South Australian Government to look after South Australia. Everyone here is elected to the South Australian Parliament; our responsibility is to the people of this State and the future of South Australia. We must have policies for looking after our own people, because no-one else will do that. No-one cares about us. The Western Australian Premier, for example, does not care whether people in South Australia are out of work. People in New South Wales do not care whether people are out of work in South Australia; the Tasmanians do not care; Victoria does not care about South Australia. It is our job to look after South Australia and to try to get some support.

We talk about State development, about projects, and about building submarines and a petro-chemical plant, but we are competing with the rest of Australia to do those things. We must compete every day in regard to what we make and sell and what we want. We need a positive policy of State support to look after our industries and our people, those who put us here. As I said at the outset, if we do not do that the electors of South Australia will exercise their right at the ballot-box in choosing a Government, which occurs every three years, which is the stipulated time. It is the responsibility and the duty of those here to do our best for the people of South Australia. We take a pledge and we have prayers here every day that we will do that. We must do so, and we must do it by looking after our own, by being positive and looking to the future. We must have some long-term plans about who we are going to support and about where we are going.

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

Mr EVANS (Fisher): The member for Semaphore picked up the fringe of an area that interests me. I commend him on some of the views that he expressed, particularly in the latter part of his speech. He referred to State finances and responsibilities and about where we are going as a State. I hope that the honourable member at some time during his life had the opportunity to bump into a gentleman called Playford, because what the honourable member has been saying is the sort of thing that Playford promoted and put into practice in South Australia over a long period of time while he had responsibility as State Treasurer. Although he was referred to as the Premier, his real position was that of Treasurer; there was no office of Premier. During those times the States had more control over their areas of operation and there was less control by the central Federal Government in Canberra, as was originally intended when the Australian Constitution was drafted. The Federal Government was created by the States; the States were not created by the Federal Government. The idea of the Federal Government being created by the States was that a central body would govern in regard to areas where the States could not. However, more and more the central Government is starting to govern in areas where the States should govern, and it is saying to the States, 'We will leave you a few of the crumbs to look after your areas of responsibility; you can let your people complain if we take too much power or too much money.'

In looking at State finances we must be conscious of the fact that a significant part of the State's finances is passed

back by way of taxes and other duties from the Federal Government. The greater the power of a central body, the greater is the voting power and the potential for distribution of money to the 12 million people who live on the eastern seaboard of a country that has 15 million people. In those circumstances, South Australia becomes insignificant.

The Australian Labor Party is very strong in its adherence to the view of there being more power in Canberra. I would hope that, in promoting that philosophy in this State, the Labor Party is conscious of the fact that it will become more and more difficult for South Australia to maintain sufficient resources in the Treasury (which is the matter that we are addressing at the moment in speaking to the Budget), to carry out the functions required of a State Government in a State with a small population with vast distances between communities which makes communication by road or other facilities all of the more difficult, as is the provision of services, such as sewers and power, and all those things that are important for what we call modern day life.

There is no benefit in divorcing ourselves from that area by saying, 'Look, the central Government will be good to us if we give more power to them; they will give us the money when we need it,' because Governments are elected by people. If there are 12 million people on the eastern seaboard casting votes, electing over 100 of the 125 people in Canberra representing the people in what is called the people's House, the House of Representatives, the possibility of our having a diminishing amount in this State from the Federal sphere is always evident, and it will be increasingly difficult for us to argue.

The honourable member said that we should be promoting the State. Every time there is a take-over in this State, whether it involves an insurance company or some other company, and the headquarters of the take-over body is in the Eastern States, it reinsures in the Eastern States and employs people for its headquarters in the Eastern States. In other words, money from this State is sent to the other States in the way to which the honourable member for Semaphore referred: involving wharfage and the transport of goods out of the State, with payments for or the benefit of that cartage going to other States. The same applies with every take-over. The only two significant examples of that not being the case is the National Railways, with its headquarters being established here, and Australian Bacon. With all the rest of the take-overs the money, employment, reinsurance and commercial interest are in the other States.

What can we do about it? Sir, your Party in the main agrees, along with some members from my Party, with the idea of a central arbitration system. I say quite categorically that that is the beginning of an even greater down-trend for South Australia. If there is a central body that says a fitter and turner, a school teacher and every other employee should receive the same salary in South Australia as his counterparts in Sydney or Melbourne get (bar a very small percentage), South Australia (800 kilometres from the nearest major market of Melbourne) would end up with a cost structure the same as Melbourne, Sydney and Brisbane.

If one starts a business and competes to sell the commodity it produces to the people who consume it (in the main commodities are produced for people or the activities that people carry out) and the cost is as high here as it is somewhere else, who in their right mind would start a factory in Adelaide? Let us be honest about it. It would be done only by a fool, by someone who saw a distinct advantage in the cost of living or an advantage such as housing (which is one area that is of benefit to people living in South Australia; we have a lower cost of housing and I hope it remains), or by someone who saw a benefit in producing a commodity that had a very low volume in

relation to cartage, so that a huge amount in a limited capacity could be taken to another State, thereby lowering the cost of shifting each item. In that case the cartage factor would not become a significant factor in the end cost to the user. That is the only type of commodity that a manufacturer would be likely to come to South Australia to produce. One could then go to technology and say that the previous Government, in getting Technology Park off the ground, was getting into one area where it would be able to compete if it could produce the technology. However, it is only a minute area in the overall operation of the State. Mr Speaker, your Party, the present Government, is concerned about people—

The SPEAKER: Order! I would appreciate it if the honourable member, whilst accurately referring to my Party, would not place as much emphasis on it so continuously, as I am the Speaker for all members of the House.

Mr EVANS: I realise, Mr Speaker, that you are a member of the Australian Labor Party and I was referring to it in that context. The current Government is the Australian Labor Party. I will not use it in that context again. The Australian Labor Party is showing a reluctance to support the mining of uranium. I agree that some, although not all, of its members show a reluctance to support mining at all if the company is owned by people who have shares in it (in other words, individuals or the private enterprise system). What hope do we have to compete in supplying services to our community, whether they be community welfare, health, subsidised public transport, water supplies or sewerage facilities?

How can we compete with other States if we say that we will leave uranium in the ground and not touch it when other States are taking hundreds of millions of dollars each year in royalties from those areas? From where do we get the \$100 million a year that Queensland, Western Australia, Victoria and New South Wales obtain from coal and other minerals that are taken out of the ground if we do not take the opportunity to mine our resources? Do we leave them there for the future and trust that we will not become an impoverished community, whilst hoping to mine the resources some time in the future and gain the benefit? If so, we are kidding ourselves.

I believe that Western Australia has enough iron ore to supply the annual needs of the world, on present-day figures, for the next 1 000 years. Western Australia alone has that sort of iron ore deposit. By the time it gets through that, we may have some other form of material produced by other means to replace iron or steel and will not have to rely on the natural occurrence of minerals such as iron ore. We do not know that answer. We are talking in the wilderness if we say we should leave it there for better times simply because we are afraid of the health factors or some pet hobby-horse that groups or individuals may have. As the member for Semaphore stated, we are competing with other States. I would like the Government—the Australian Labor Party—to tell the House where the money will come from to maintain and increase services in the community.

The people who are producing, whether they are working for wages or running their own business, believe that they are overtaxed. They cannot afford to pay any more tax and they say that taxes are high enough now. They are overtaxed, we have high unemployment and our goods are too expensive to sell overseas to the countries that need it. The standard of living in the Third World countries where our food is needed is such that they want some of the commodities that we have got. We are not keen to take some of their commodities, as it will put more of our people out of work, even though we could sell them here cheaper than we could produce our goods. However, we impose penalties by way of impositions and tariffs to protect our own employment.

Other countries do not have the money to buy more of our goods, thereby enabling us to maintain our high standard of living. Where do we go in that field as we are unable to compete? Such nations do not have four to five weeks annual leave with 17½ per cent leave loading, 12 days public holiday, 10 days sick leave, or flexi-time which, even Clyde Cameron believes, was and still is being abused.

How can we continue down that path? If fewer people are producing and less production is encouraged because less hours are worked for the same money and more benefits are supplied for the same wage (and in some cases increased amounts are paid to individuals for less production), what hope do we have of improving our position? It cannot be done, and I think we should all be conscious of that fact. The present Government was voted into office with a promise of no increases in taxes and charges. We should think about that. When charges for electricity, water, sewerage and other charges and taxes mentioned by various speakers are increased who, in the main, is most adversely affected? In some of those areas pensioners receive a benefit and a reduction—we know that. However, the rich, particularly the very rich, can afford those increases because they have the money.

Governments are not likely to pull the rich down too far because if the going gets too tough for them they shift their money out of the country and, if need be, they shift themselves out of the country. Those most adversely affected by increased taxes and charges are the families with young children who may have recently moved into their home, having to repay a first and perhaps a second mortgage, and possibly having to pay off some of their furniture. It is that group that is most seriously affected. Are we concerned about that group, and is the Government concerned? Has the Premier kept his election promises? The Premier said, 'Vote for me, vote for my Government and I will not increase taxes and charges.' The Premier said that his Government would not do that to the people of South Australia. Is the Premier prepared to face the families who have great difficulty in meeting their commitments (some of whose members have lost their jobs) and say, 'Bad luck, I should have understood the position and, if I did not understand it, I should not have made those promises; instead, I have sold you down the drain'? Is the Premier going to beat around the bush in an attempt to hide what he has done and say that the increases are someone else's fault and not his?

We know that the Premier is not the type of man to admit that he has misled the people. The people of this State know that now. Those on my side of politics say that people in the electorate will remember the broken promises at the next election. However, those of us in politics know that the memories of people in the electorate are very short and their concern over the charges and commitments that they have to meet does not last very long, unless they are still in queer street when they vote at the next election.

The area that is most seriously affecting people in my district is the cost of fuel. I believe in the user pays principle. In the case of areas such as the one I represent, on the fringe of metropolitan Adelaide, the public transport service provided is being subsidised by the taxpayer at a cost of \$70 million a year, and that subsidy is growing each year. People living so far from the centre of Adelaide have great distances to travel to their places of employment.

If the public transport system is inadequate, people in the fringe areas have to use their private motor vehicles, and the cost of doing so has escalated dramatically under the present A.L.P. State and Federal Governments. For example, for every litre of fuel sold, 28c goes in Federal or State Government taxes or charges. It is hard for people to accept that if they have difficulty meeting their commitments.

I am sure that not only people in my district are faced with this difficulty. Indeed, I know that A.L.P. members who represent other fringe areas of Adelaide are being made aware of the same problem by many of their constituents.

I want to place on record the appreciation of people in my electorate for the schools which have been completed in the past few years, particularly during the previous Government's term. The Aberfoyle Hub project was completed in that time, consisting of four schools, two of which were private. Although no Government funds were involved there, the Government co-operated to have those schools completed. Craighburn Primary School is operating quite successfully and has gained numbers very rapidly. The Heathfield High School additions are greatly appreciated and are now being effectively used, as are the additions and upgrading to the Bridgewater school.

However, what about Stirling East? It has been ignored. A committee quite rightly said to the previous Government, 'We think that the plans you have drawn up are too grandiose. We believe that you could do something less and still cater for the school.' It turned out to be a foolish statement by a school council and school community, because if they had said, 'Yes, we will take what you propose,' the necessary work would be under construction now. They did the right thing by the taxpayers, the department and the Government of the day and said, 'Look, you can cut out a couple of classrooms,' but what happened? The classrooms were cut out and the modification was agreed to by all concerned; there was a change of Government; and now there are some doubts about when the new proposition will go ahead, and there is a possibility that it may not.

Here is a responsible community and, in all the time I have been in politics, this has been the only case in which a committee has said, 'We do not need all of that. Cut some of it out. We will be happy with something less', and they could end up with nearly nothing. Eden Hills school would be one of the oldest in the hills, tucked away on the side of a hill with a playground, about the size of a tennis court, called an oval. It wanted a bit of upgrading and better playing facilities. The opportunity is there, but it is ignored. To its credit, the school fought for six years, and people said to me, as the local member, 'No, we do not want you to interfere. We want to do it through the normal channels. We do not want to ask a politician to intervene for us. We believe that if we go through the proper channels it will eventuate.' How foolish they were! I hope that the Minister of Education at least picks up that area of concern.

It is not my intention to use my full 30 minutes in this debate. I merely want to say this in conclusion: we are an over-taxed community. The cost of the commodities supplied by Government agencies are becoming too expensive for many low-income earners. Quite properly, in many cases Government agencies are helping the low-income groups but, unfortunately, the number of people in low-income groups is growing. So, if more people become dependent upon Government agencies and fewer people actually contribute to make up the funds by work effort (and that is what is happening), and at the same time an ageing community and a decreasing birth rate are occurring, we are heading for major troubles.

At a conference in Hong Kong recently, an Asian said that there is every possibility that Australia will become the impoverished white community and virtually the slum of Asia. It makes one think just how other people view our foolishness in trying to maintain or demand a standard of living that we cannot justify. I hope that the Government realises that one cannot go on charging people more and more for services that should be able to be provided at a lesser cost and that, if it does not encourage private enterprise and small business, the end result will be that we cannot

afford the bill placed on us by those who say that they cannot find enough through their own resources.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I do not intend, in closing this debate, to go through the various contributions that have been made in great detail by members opposite. A number of specific questions have been raised, but I believe that the more appropriate place in which to deal with them is in the Estimates Committees; that is why we have such a procedure. Those questions can, of course, be put directly to the appropriate Minister, accompanied by Ministerial advisers, in the course of Estimates Committees proceedings.

However, there has not been a great deal of substance in the contributions made by members opposite. There has been a lot of rhetoric and the opportunity to give vent to particular obsessions has been fully exercised. A number of members opposite appear to be in some kind of quandary: they all know that the community is placing more and more demands on the Government for services which require expenditure. The letters that they write to Ministers confirm that they are willing to take up those requests on behalf of their constituents, but to gain what they hope will be some kind of political advantage they come to this place demanding that the Government cut expenditure, and they criticise it for trying at least to maintain in these very difficult times the services which the community demands.

I will deal briefly with some of the points raised by the Leader of the Opposition. His contribution largely concerns the revenue measures that the Government has been forced to adopt. Most of what he said we have all heard before in a number of debates and press releases over the past few weeks. The Government has made its position quite clear on this matter, and for the Leader to constantly reiterate in his Budget speech the fact that we are forced to put up taxes is quite nonsensical. The community is well aware of the decisions that we have had to take and, I believe, understands the reasons for them.

The Leader's contribution, when one removes the repetition, the rhetoric and the padding, consists of three basic points: first, he claims that the former Liberal Government had been able to cut taxes without putting any strain on Government finances; secondly, that had the former Liberal Government remained in power the deficit this year would have been considerably less; and thirdly, he asserts that the Liberal Government would have been able to make significant savings in 1983-84 and thus avoid any increase in taxes.

Let us take each of these matters in turn. First, on the question of the former Government's tax record, it is true that by abolishing succession and gift duties and making remissions in a number of other taxation areas about \$30 million a year worth of revenue was foregone, but the South Australian community paid for that tax cut. It paid for it by massive transfers of capital works funds that meant the delay or abandonment of community facilities and the loss of jobs in vital construction industries at a time when we could ill afford it.

Also, it meant that reserves, which had been carefully developed over the years of the 1970s, were effectively pillaged in order to prop up and disguise the economic state that Treasury finances were in as a result of that decision. So, effectively, the Tonkin Government paid for this remission of taxes, of which it made so much, by seeing the cash reserves of the State run down and its financial capacity become severely eroded. The former Tonkin Government did not find any evidence of great waste and mismanagement, as it trumpeted before the election. It did not cut back expenditure to match its revenue concessions. Instead, it

built into our finances an imbalance which this Government has had to take action to correct.

Eventually, the crunch had to come. Eventually, one gets to a stage where one has used up the reserves and where one has run out of measures by which one can disguise the underlying financial deficit, and that occurred in 1982-83. We inherited that situation and had to try to do something about it. The Leader of the Opposition may now find it convenient to try to ignore the fact that he was a member of that Liberal Government, but he sat on this side of the House while the former Treasurer transferred over \$100 million of capital works funds to prop up Revenue Account. Those massive transfers and the run down of cash reserves, which were more skilfully hidden, were the only way the Tonkin Government was able to put off an increase in taxes. Secondly, there is the question of what would have been the size of the deficit had a Liberal Government been inflicted on South Australia for a second term. At this point in his speech the Leader ventured, I believe, into pure fantasy. Figures were concocted and assumptions made that have no basis in fact.

The Leader says that the \$23 million over-spending by departments would not have happened if the Liberals had stayed in power, but he ignores three points. First, when my Government took office on 10 November the review of the Budget by the Under Treasurer, which was published exactly one month later, revealed that considerable over-spending by departments was already in place: it had happened. Secondly, it also revealed that the Budget of the former Treasurer had been based on assumptions, particularly about staffing levels, which were totally unrealistic, and the wastage of staff to achieve Budget targets simply had not happened, and almost half the financial year had gone.

Thirdly, and this is one of the most dishonest aspects of the Leader's contribution, he simply fails to mention the fact that at least half of that \$23 million is the result of a decline in receipts in the health area, receipts which can be directly related to difficult economic circumstances being experienced. Was it the case that if the Tonkin Government had been re-elected it would have pursued by all rigour of the law and in every other way the collection of those foregone hospital bills? I suggest that, even if it had, it would have been trying to get blood out of a stone. Calculations had been built into the receipts side of that Budget which resulted in at least half of the departmental overrun and which the Leader has tried to pin on us. That is absolute nonsense and the three points that I have just put before the House completely overwhelm and overcome the arguments put by the Leader about the so-called savings a Tonkin Liberal Government if re-elected would have been able to achieve.

The final claim by the Leader concerns what will happen next year. Here this fantasy trip continues to the point of hallucination. He concocts a presumed saving of \$60 million for 1983-84 by assuming that \$24 million will be saved by some magical attrition of workers in the Public Service and that a further \$60 million can be saved simply by declaring that recurrent spending will be increased by 1 per cent in real terms. Taking the second point first, the Leader claimed that this Government has increased recurrent expenditure by 11 per cent. That simply is not true. The figure of 11 per cent has been arrived by the Leader's using a series of calculations which, I must say, have left even Treasury officers puzzled. Let us assume for the sake of the Leader's argument that the 11 per cent is accurate. He then accepts the Budget's projected inflation rate of about 7 per cent and, consequently, says that we are providing for a 4 per cent increase in expenditure. This is important: he is accepting a 7 per cent increase in inflation and is using this to

claim that we are increasing expenditure in real terms in what he describes as a grossly extravagant manner. All of this was stated in the speech of 13 September, but two weeks earlier on 30 August the Government released its capital works programme, which allowed for an increase in expenditure of about 11 per cent compared with last year, and on that occasion the Leader of the Opposition stated:

The \$80 million increase was a rise of 10.25 per cent compared with last year, but with inflation at 12.3 per cent the allocation represented a substantial cut in construction expenditure in real terms. The plain fact is that \$860 million today would allow less construction work than \$780 million would have permitted 12 months ago.

So two weeks before this speech the Leader claimed that inflation was 12.3 per cent so that he could argue that we had cut back expenditure on public works, and because the Liberals are in Opposition that is something that one does not do—it is bad: two weeks later, on 13 September, the Leader changed his tack and agreed with us that inflation was 7 per cent in order to prove that we were spending too much on recurrent expenditure—because that is a bad thing. I thought that we had got rid of that sort of hopeless statistical inconsistency when the Government changed from Liberal to Labor in November. However, it appears that the habits that the Liberals demonstrated so amply in Government have stayed with them in Opposition, despite the change of personnel.

Then there is the question of attrition rates. It is true that the Tonkin Government was able to reduce the public sector by natural attrition (as it termed it) and also by an early retirement scheme. But there is a limit as to how long that can go on. Attrition rates in some areas have declined to virtually zero. With the economy generally depressed, people simply do not want to voluntarily leave the public sector. Attrition also means that there is no balance of skills and there is no planning involved as regards which labour is displaced and which functions are thereby left unattended.

It is clear beyond any doubt that to achieve the sort of saving that the Leader of the Opposition claims could be made (and he has put a large tag, many millions of dollars, on the so-called savings) would require that public servants and other public sector workers in statutory authorities be sacked. The Leader's so-called alternative economic strategy would mean that, in order to achieve the sort of figure that he suggests for 1983-84, at which he in Government would aim, more than 4 000 workers would have to be dismissed from the Public Service in 1983-84. I hope that the Leader explains that very carefully not only to those who might be the object of those dismissal notices but also to those in the schools, the hospitals, and in the community generally who rely on the public sector services that would no longer be provided.

The concept is quite ludicrous, yet these so-called savings can be made, according to the Opposition. In fact, the savings are based on a wrong assumption in any case, and that is that the Government is massively increasing the size of the public sector. In fact, we have maintained employment levels to roughly those of 1 July 1982. Ironically, earlier in the Leader's speech he accused me of ignoring the basic accounting principle of comparing like with like—that is, of having a common base on which to make comparisons. A few weeks ago the Leader of the Opposition was uttering these strictures and was lecturing us about public sector employment and how it has increased. In order to try to prove his case, the Leader compared December public sector employment figures with the figures for April. He tried to compare one set of figures that were affected by the fact that contract employees, such as teachers, were not being counted with another totally unrelated period after the com-

mencement of the school term when contract teachers were back on the pay-roll.

It is reminiscent of what we experienced over the past three years when the former Premier and the former Minister of Industrial Affairs made the most extraordinary claims about employment growth. We have seen the basis of those claims in the reality of the State's economic predicament. I take great care to compare like with like and I do not particularly need lectures from the Leader of the Opposition about that. However, I suspect that he has ignored his own lectures and I would ask him to try to do the same with regard to any figures he is producing in this House or outside this House to the media.

I suggest that the Leader's reply was riddled with inconsistencies. It showed no coherent attempt to analyse the Budget or its objectives or give some sort of alternative analysis as to whether or not they might be achieved. Indeed, the Leader's speech in itself was a very strong indication of why the Leader of the Opposition was probably very wise to not expose himself to a wider audience outside this place at the Budget briefing seminar that was held. I can well understand why the Leader chose to keep his contribution within the confines of this House, where we are used to taking what he says with a grain of salt, and to not expose himself to people outside who might take his comments somewhat more seriously and analyse them more closely in that context. It is certainly not an alternative strategy for South Australia. It has all the hallmarks of having been devised by someone who does not really care whether or not he has to deliver it; assertions have been made simply in an attempt to try and get a headline, to try to appeal to all the different interest groups, not taking the hard decisions that must be taken by Government. That is a luxury that an Opposition can indulge in, but I would suggest that a responsible Opposition that really does see itself as an alternative Government (although there are certainly no signs of members opposite seeing themselves in that way) should attempt to grapple with the realities and not just indulge in nonsensical inconsistency.

The Government was left with a major financial problem, and the Leader of the Opposition well knows the extent of that problem. He knows of that inheritance because he was a member of the outgoing Liberal Government. Unless the then Premier kept his fellow Cabinet Ministers completely in the dark, the Leader would have known very well about the major problems that the Liberal Government would have faced had it been returned to office (if the State had had the misfortune to have that Administration continuing). The Leader of the Opposition must have known that expenditure targets that had been set were not realistic. He must have known that by the end of the first quarter of the year those targets were not being met. Indeed, I would suggest that the Leader must take a large part of the responsibility for the predicament that my Government was faced with.

I am not attempting to take refuge behind excuses or throw up my hands in horror and say, 'Well, it wasn't our fault; we will do nothing about it.' On the contrary, I believe that the Government has the responsibility of taking on the job of restoring the State's financial strengths and to attempt to work to a Budget designed to maximise the State's opportunities for economic growth and development.

The document that we presented meets the targets; it is a responsible document, carefully and honestly framed to deal with the State's problems. Some aspects of it have indeed been unpopular and have provided many headlines for the Leader of the Opposition in his attacks on them. However, I would suggest that underlying it is a return to financial stability and responsibility in South Australia for the first time for three years, and an opportunity to not

only get our house in order but to take full advantage of economic recovery and to ensure that this State is vastly strengthened as a result.

I move:

That the House note grievances.

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): We have had to wait for a week for the Premier to respond in any substance whatsoever to the alternative Budget strategy proposed by the Opposition in this Parliament. He says that it is a strategy where we do not care whether or not we deliver. Well, there is no doubt that in 901 days from now we will have to deliver the goods, because we will change from this side of the House to the other as a result of the policies that this Government has embarked upon since attaining office. We have seen today a Premier on the defensive, and no wonder the Premier has not seen fit previously to take issue with the economic strategy contained in the alternative Budget approach.

Clearly, the reason for that is that there was no substance in taking issue with it. Clearly we have seen that this evening in this Parliament when the Premier has attempted to take issue with various aspects of the alternative Budget strategy, quite unsuccessfully. He has dealt in generalities, and not specifics. He has been broad in his approach, and he has been prepared to again fudge various aspects of the alternative Budget strategy. He has attempted by rhetoric to excuse himself and the Australian Labor Party for breaking one of the most fundamental promises it made all through 1982, and more specifically through the State election campaign: that is, that the Labor Party in Government would not introduce or increase taxes during the life of that Government, that is, over three specific years of the life of the Parliament of this State. We have seen in a very short time after the election the Australian Labor Party going back on that promise, breaking that promise and specific promises to the people of South Australia.

Mr Meier: So much for their word!

Mr OLSEN: Indeed, we have seen quite clearly that this Government has not been prepared to keep its promises. If one looks at f.i.d. and its introduction, not a month before f.i.d. was introduced publicly to South Australia, the Premier was telling a group of business men in South Australia that there would be no f.i.d. introduced in this State. What do we see? Another promise broken specifically to those people, yet at the time he must have been aware, in framing the Budget strategy for 1983-84, that it was his intention to introduce a strategy that had as a component the financial institutions duty or tax.

Mr Meier: He hasn't worked out the percentage yet, anyway.

Mr OLSEN: Indeed, the Premier has continued to be evasive in his approach as to the level of taxation on f.i.d., and he has not been prepared to take this Parliament into his confidence in forward planning. Yet, contained in the Budget papers, is \$8 million for this year and \$16 million in a full year derived from f.i.d.; therefore, he must have some comprehension or knowledge of what the specific rate will be.

I am pleased that the Premier has at least been prepared to acknowledge (and compare this with the rhetoric of this Government over the past 10 months) that the size of the Public Service in South Australia was reduced by attrition. It is the first time the Premier or a Minister on that side of the House has acknowledged that the reduction in the size of the Public Service was not by any sackings whatsoever, as we on this side of the House were aware it was not, but that it was by the process of attrition; I am pleased that at last the Premier has been prepared to acknowledge that fact. Indeed, as my colleague the member for Davenport pointed

out in an interjection, there is scope for further reduction in the size of the Public Service in South Australia and, indeed, he nominated one area where there is excess capacity. Whereas under the former Government the contracts to the private sector accounted for 92 per cent of the construction dollars spent in South Australia, we are now seeing a reining in of that position by the Bannon Labor Government, despite the fact that 75 per cent of the people employed in Australia are employed in the private sector.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: We left Government with 200 surplus carpenters. They have reduced the numbers built since then to build them up.

Mr OLSEN: Indeed, when the Premier talks about so-called increases in Public Service numbers, they are not so-called increases in numbers. The documents tabled by the Premier in this Parliament indicate an increase of 1 300 persons on the total Public Service pay-roll. I acknowledge that some of them are Commonwealth public servants on the pay-roll in South Australia but, indeed, some 1 000 people at least have gone on the pay-roll in this State since the election of the Bannon Labor Government. Yet, the Premier has the audacity to sit on the front bench and say that he has maintained staffing levels in this State at July 1982 numbers. What utter rot! His own documents tabled in this Parliament clearly indicate that he has not. If we take average figures for employment for those people, as supplied by various Government departments from time to time, the full-year cost is \$23 million.

Mr Ashenden: A bit of a credibility problem again.

Mr OLSEN: A credibility problem indeed! I also mention my press release, to which the Premier referred, in regard to the increase of Public Service numbers from December through to April, indicating that some 2 000 people had gone on the pay-roll during that period. The Premier gave me a lecture and suggested comparing like with like, on a common base. I remind the Premier that, if he does not like December, he can take April 1982 and compare it with April 1983. I am sure that he will come up with a similar figure as between December 1982 and April 1983. So much for the argument about the contract teachers and the like inflating the figure I used for the purposes of illustrating that there has been growth in the Public Service in South Australia since the election of this Government! That is one of the basic reasons for tax increases on South Australians. The increase of 1 000 in Public Service numbers will generate \$23 million worth of cost in the full financial year. That is quite clearly why we are having revenue items to match expenditure items.

In the presentation by the Premier and Treasurer tonight, there has not been a challenge to the alternative Budget strategy. He has selectively quoted from excerpts of my speech, which took some one hour and 20 minutes to detail to this Parliament. Yet, he says that that package could have been given in a five-minute dissertation to a group of business and union leaders in another forum. What utter nonsense this man carries on with in trying to present the impression that he is a consensus and reasonable politician! I clearly indicated in the Budget speech that this Premier, when he gets consensus, abuses it. To give an example, I stated that, in relation to natural disasters and the cost thereof, quite clearly no Government could ever budget for such circumstances. I also said that it would be entitled to support for the introduction of a one-off tax for the purposes of recoupment of that amount and that amount alone: that is, a tax not established in perpetuity which would have an automatic increase year after year and be a new tax base for South Australia as this Government has done, but merely for the purposes of recouping the cost of those bushfires. The Premier has used that as an example to say that I have supported tax increases across the board—not one-off taxes

for the recoupment of specific amounts, but rather taxes that flow on year after year. That is clearly not the case, and the Premier knows it. It is a clear example that, when consensus is given on an issue upon which I do not believe there should be any partisan politics and which was a reasonable course of action for a Government to take in recouping that cost, the Premier clearly abuses such consensus.

I refer also to the situation relative to the railway line between Adelaide and Darwin. Yet again today, the Premier has stated how he has consulted his colleagues interstate, particularly in the Northern Territory, relative to the terms of reference and the composition of the committee to look at the Adelaide to Darwin railway line. There has been no consultation with the Opposition, which has joined the Government—after the Government got prodded to get up to the mark—in speaking up publicly for it. We had the announcement by the Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the presentation of an excellent economic document, stage 1, about the railway line connecting Adelaide to Darwin with the standard rail gauge link which I supported.

With the Premier I supported the common purpose to bring to fruition what I believe is a vital project for South Australia. What happened as a result of that support? Clearly, in deliberations in relation to the project, the Premier consulted not only his Northern Territory counterpart, the Chief Minister, but also the Leader of the Opposition of the Northern Territory. At the same time, the Premier sought to exclude from the consultation process the Leader of the Opposition of South Australia, despite the fact that we had said that we would support the Government in a Federal approach, or in any other way to bring the rail project to fruition for the benefit of South Australia. So much for consensus!

Mr Meier: He consults only when he can see personal gain.

Mr OLSEN: There is no doubt that the Premier is not genuine or sincere in his approach to this matter, and I wish to highlight that fact to the House tonight. I believe that the Premier has also acknowledged the former Government's tax record as being one of excellence. In his press release on increased taxes, the Premier referred to and acknowledged the fact that South Australia under a Liberal Government became the lowest taxed State per capita in Australia. In 1979 South Australia was in third position in relation to tax levels in Australia.

At the end of the Tonkin era, South Australia had become the lowest taxed State per capita in Australia. In 1981-82, South Australia's tax level fell by 5.4 per cent. That record is unequalled by any Government in Australia. That is a record of which any Government in the current economic circumstances can be justly proud. Indeed, our strategy over our three-year term in Government of reducing the size of the Public Service saved this State something like \$70 million. I wonder what South Australia's Budget deficit would have been this year had we not implemented that policy over our three-year term of Government. I wonder what the unemployment levels would have been in South Australia's private sector had we not implemented that policy, which resulted in a whole range of construction work being fed out to the private sector, which employs 75 per cent of South Australia's workforce. It is those interesting questions that the Premier sought not to allude to in his response to Parliament this evening.

Another factor that I refer to relates to the inflation rate. My comments relate to the fact that there has been an increase in the inflation rate in real terms of something like 3½ per cent, when one takes into account the one-off items. In comparing like with like and comparing common bases, the one-off items must be deducted from last year's expend-

iture columns. The Premier refused to even comment on that point tonight. The Premier refused to take issue with that point, because he has no ground on which to stand. Clearly, if the one-off items are removed (and I refer to the natural disasters, over-expenditure in Government departments and three or four other one-off items), one can establish a case using a 7.5 per cent inflation rate. That is Federal Treasurer Keating's figure and the Premier has adopted it. It is not my figure: it is the Premier's figure for the South Australian inflation rate for the 1983-84 financial year.

Clearly, the Premier's figures indicate that there has been a significant increase in real terms in allocations to Government departments for the next 12 months. The increased allocations have occurred at a time when most individuals have been effectively participating in a wages pause and have had to curtail expenditure. They also come at a time when companies and small business operators in this State have had to curtail expenditure, basically to survive, because of liquidity problems. Therefore, it should be appropriate for Government departments to be required to do exactly the same thing. I am not advocating a cut in real terms, because departments should not be dragged backwards. I have said that an increase restricted to about 1 per cent in real terms will allow for some growth in the allocation of expenditure to Government departments over the ensuing year, and that would achieve a significant saving in the expenditure columns.

The Premier did not even refer to that in his rebuttal response tonight because he knows quite clearly that he is wrong and has no ground on which to stand. There has been a process by which he has attempted to fudge the issue in relation to the Budget strategy that he has tabled before the Parliament. If one looks at the Australian Labor Party platform, one sees that Government services will not be curtailed, but what one does is match the revenue to meet the expenditure.

In the preparation of this Budget strategy, this Government has quite clearly formed its expenditure columns and has then gone about setting its revenue columns to match its expenditure columns. That sort of formula is one for tax increases the like of which we have not seen in South Australia in recent years and with which we should not have to persevere; they have been made necessary by the lack of financial management and expertise of a Government of this political persuasion.

The Premier referred to some money in the Hospitals Department and fudged and avoided answering. Even if part of that argument is right (and I question some aspects of that argument), there is still \$12 million unaccounted for by the Premier in his rebuttal of an over-expenditure of Government departments. Government has to be run like a business and like a household budget: one has to live within one's means and curtail expenditure. The previous Administration had a Budget Review Committee, and any department that overspent in one quarter would have to explain why it had done so and what it would do in the subsequent quarter to correct that over-expenditure. Therefore, at 30 June that department came in on line, so that the overall Budget came in on line at 30 June each year. If one looks at the performance of the Liberal Government in that regard, one sees that its performance has been exemplary.

I turn now to the financial institutions duty. I am pleased to see that the New South Wales Government has announced in its Budget a rate of 0.3 per cent for its financial institutions duty. Obviously, the trouble that the Premier and Treasurer has been having is getting nifty Nev up to the barrier to bring his rate up to 0.4 following the problems that he has had in relation to Joh's country in Queensland. Joh is sensible enough to keep the rates down there.

An honourable member: He won't last.

Mr OLSEN: He is a game man who says that Joh will not last in Queensland.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally interjecting:

Mr Oswald: Whom are you backing in Queensland?

Mr OLSEN: That will be a very interesting result, and if I were a member of the Labor Party I would not be crowing just yet: it is a little early for the honourable member to be crowing in relation to Queensland.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr OLSEN: However, let us have a look at the record: let us get down to basics. The Liberal Treasurer in Queensland, no doubt with the help—

Mr Mayes: There isn't one!

Mr OLSEN: The Liberal Treasurer in Queensland over recent years has adopted a policy of no gift duties, stamp duties, death duties and the like, and has been able to attract large sums of money to Queensland for investment. In addition to that, in recent years there has been no financial institutions duty in Queensland, and this has also attracted to Queensland significant funds from the major financial area of Sydney in order to avoid the tax.

In fact, Premier Wran was having great difficulty just inside the New South Wales border stopping his electors from going over the border to avoid the financial institutions duty in New South Wales. Clearly, that is the reason why some of the banks inside the New South Wales border (as the honourable Chief Secretary would no doubt know, having had Cabinet discussions about f.i.d. here) did not impose that duty: they were losing business over the border to Queensland. Obviously, Premier Wran was not prepared to move in that regard and was not prepared to get into bed with Premier Bannon to lift the rate to the highest level in the country. It will be interesting to see what Premier Cain has in his Victorian Budget tomorrow and whether the rate is 0.3 per cent or 0.4 per cent.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: We are waiting for the Minister of Tourism in South Australia to provide all members of the House with the Queensland Minister's calendar for our information. In relation to the financial institutions duty, the Premier needs to make available to this House and the people of South Australia the exemptions that ought to be given to a whole range of things, such as those to which I have alluded in press releases and speeches in the Parliament.

The financial institutions duty has been around for some time now. There has been procrastination by the Government, in relation not only to the rate that it will strike but to the range of exemptions that it is prepared to give for that duty. This Budget package introduced by the Government is fragile in that it projects a very significant deficit of some \$68.1 million on 30 June 1984. The Budget is based on the premise that wage rises will be contained to those levels that have been projected and that there will be no significant increase in the size of the Public Service.

If either of those factors gets out of hand between now and 30 June 1984, the deficit will indeed blow out significantly and this package put forward by the Government to the people of South Australia will disintegrate. It will mean quite clearly not only round two of tax increases which we have to have next year to eat into the Budget deficit of \$68.1 million, but round three of tax increases to take up any slack through an increase in Public Service numbers or through not being able to contain wage increases in the Public Service to the levels that have been projected within the Budget itself.

For that reason there has to be quite firm control and management of the expenditure of departments to the extent which this Government to date has not demonstrated that it is able to achieve. It is incumbent on the Government

to ensure that over-expenditure is kept to an absolute minimum. Failure to do that will spell quite significant repercussions for South Australian taxpayers.

Indeed, this Government is well on its way to taxing itself out of office and, clearly, the people of South Australia have reacted. The Government obviously knows that they have reacted. It bought two minutes of commercial television time right across the board to try to explain away its position in regard to the fundamental break of an election promise. What a waste of money it was at that! The Government must be somewhat embarrassed about the expenditure of funds in that regard, but it obviously demonstrates the Government's sensitivity in relation to the whole range of its broken promises and to their significant nature. The Government is not on the offensive, but is on the defensive.

I want to refer to one or two other matters briefly before my time expires. A number of questions were posed to the Premier today in relation to how he saw the dithering of Federal Labor Caucus on its uranium policy as affecting projects in South Australia, notably the Roxby Downs project at Olympic Dam. The Premier, in his usual style when he does not have an answer, spoke at length, went around the central issue, and did not reply to the substance. I remember that one of the questions was whether he had spoken to the South Australian Labor M.P.s who go to Canberra. He said that he did not really think that he had to because they all knew the importance of Roxby Downs to South Australia, but he did not answer whether he had discussed with Mr John Scott whether he thought that Roxby Downs was important to South Australia. I wonder how Mr Scott will vote in the Federal Labor Caucus in Canberra on the future of uranium mining and Roxby Downs. I bet that he does not act in the interests of South Australia or of his colleagues here in this Parliament.

An honourable member: What about Senator Bolkus?

Mr OLSEN: I have no doubt that the member for Elizabeth is giving good information to both Senator Bolkus and the member for Hindmarsh (Mr Scott) to leave them high and dry with the uranium policy. The Premier overlooked one fact: he got up and in unequivocal terms said that Roxby Downs can and will go ahead, that it is a project that fulfils A.L.P. policy and, therefore, that it can go ahead. But he cannot give an unequivocal answer to this House or to the people of South Australia because what he overlooks is that, clearly, export licences for uranium are in the hands of a Federal Government and not a State Government.

He can say what he likes here, but it is what is said in Canberra by his colleagues that will make the difference as to whether uranium mined at Roxby Downs even gets to market overseas. So, it is totally dishonest of the Premier to say that he can give an unqualified assurance to this Parliament that, in fact, Roxby Downs and mining can go ahead and there will be plenty of export contracts. I just wonder why the Federal Labor Party deferred for one month the decision on this report. Perhaps Prime Minister Bob Hawke has not the numbers and he has to work on his colleagues over the next four weeks to bring them into line. I agree with Prime Minister Hawke. I believe that he has his facts right on uranium mining. He knows what is right and for the good of South Australia in terms of the development of mines, and he knows what is good for the development of job opportunities in South Australia.

All we have to do is get his Labor colleagues in Canberra to give him the capacity to implement the policy so that Roxby can go ahead in order that jobs can be generated in South Australia. Certainly, I am pleased at last that this Labor Government can recognise this fact. Roxby Downs is no mirage in the desert. The Government recognises that, and the documents brought forward by the Premier indicate that this project can generate up to 23 000 jobs in the long

term. Resources in South Australia can generate 23 000 jobs according to the document that the Premier brought into this Parliament. It acknowledges what we have been saying in Government over the previous three years. So much for the mirage in the desert when this Premier was Leader of the Opposition.

I can tell the House that the Premier is a mirage. Whenever he comes to standing up for Roxby Downs, Honeymoon, Beverley, Roxby Management Services or the railway line, he is really a mirage. He ducks for cover on any of these significant issues because he has problems. His problems are obviously in the policy development area of his own Party.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: How is he going on the gas negotiations?

Mr OLSEN: I am pleased to be reminded of the gas negotiations.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Is he going to take Wran on?

Mr OLSEN: He did not win on the f.i.d. question with Premier Wran, and he has not a much better chance to win on the gas levy. The Premier has not answered the fundamental question why South Australians should be paying more at the well head for their gas emanating in South Australia than people in New South Wales would be paying. He has not answered that, yet he gives New South Wales consumers a significant advantage in costs in that State compared with this State. What about the advantage that we need in South Australia to maintain manufacturing industry, to protect jobs and to offset the transport costs to major markets in the Eastern States? All those questions have not yet been addressed whatsoever by this Government.

Indeed, whenever the Premier is in a corner he has the stock reply, 'The Government is considering a range of options.' It is not as simple a question as the Leader would have us believe: it is a very complex matter. However, that is the Premier's stock answer on any matter of this nature; we can almost guess and write the response for the media. The Premier has given a commitment, and it will be interesting to see whether he delivers. The Premier is going overseas on 28 September, and last week he said that within a fortnight he would have the gas problem fixed. It will be interesting to see, and we will be watching closely between now and Thursday week to ascertain whether the Premier has been able to fix the gas price question. Premier Wran has stated clearly that he will not buy any increases in gas prices.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: He got it wrong; he said that we wrote the contracts. He got that detail wrong.

Mr OLSEN: Yes, he did. I can understand his embarrassment at the facts and why he wanted to get it wrong. It was Premier Dunstan who determined in the contracts the formula with New South Wales. No wonder—

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Would you like to seek an extension of time?

Mr OLSEN: I would be delighted. How long would you like to give me? The Chief Secretary wants to move for an extension of time. The fundamental question in regard to gas prices is the cost to South Australian consumers of electricity and gas. That is the fundamental question that has to be addressed and, if this Government is prepared to take the right course and recoup via royalties to this State, it would then be able to generate the capacity by which it could reduce electricity charges to consumers in South Australia and abolish—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GUNN: I rise on a point of order. I believe that the Leader should have a 15-minute extension of time in view of the Chief Secretary's invitation.

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

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I would dearly love to follow up on a topic which is close to my heart and which was referred to by the Leader, and that is the Prime Minister's wellknown attitude to uranium before he was given a blow wave and polished up to be Prime Minister. His speech was also tidied up a bit. Mr Hawke came to Adelaide two or three years ago and stated, 'How absurd is this uranium policy of ours when we can do bugger-all to alter the world scene.' They are the Prime Minister's words, not mine. That is what the Prime Minister thinks. We suggest that he has problems with comrade Bolkus and comrade Scott, among others, and a lot of other comrades in Victoria.

However, I do not want to talk about them tonight: I refer to a matter that I was precluded from talking about in the Budget debate because of strictures of time, and that is labour costs. A lot of argument has been forthcoming in the public arena about the cost of labour and its effect on the economy of Australia and, of course, South Australia. One aspect of this question that Parliaments and Governments, particularly Labor Governments, do not address with any degree of depth relates to what are called on-costs. Labor Governments are fond of legislating to provide improved conditions for workers. There has been a feast of pace-setting industrial legislation involving long service leave, and now, of course, the South Australian Government is supporting the A.C.T.U. claims for redundancy payments that are before the Arbitration Commission. All of that sounds fine and dandy, except, if the legislation is enacted, unemployment will increase. It is not a question of whether one is philosophically opposed to that sort of legislation but of whether, if these costs are saddled on the employing community, fewer school leavers will be able to find employment.

I wish to deal with the effect of these on-costs (and this is a case in point), which are very dear to the heart of the Labor Party when it is in an expansive mood, on costs in Australia. A publication that was put out by the Australian Industries Development Association relates not to the direct costs of labour but to the effect of these on-costs when one talks about the costs to employers of keeping people on the pay-roll. This quite recent publication refers to the escalation not only of wages as such but also the increasing escalation of on-costs, which are increasing at an alarming rate, far faster than wages are increasing. The publication states:

The concentration of the debate upon direct wage costs would not have been significantly misleading if total labour costs had been growing in a fixed proportion to direct wage costs but as the results of the AIDA survey detailed in this article show this has not been the case and in fact wage cost movements are a biased underestimate of the actual movements in the total cost of employing labour in Australia.

I raise this matter in the context of legislation that the Labor Party promoted before this House, particularly in this session, in relation to workers compensation payments. It is not a question of our not being sympathetic to making conditions as amenable, agreeable and generous as we can for the working community (because we all have to work), but it is a question of facing reality and of looking at what a lot of these legislative proposals are doing to a person's ability to employ, to the unemployment rate, and to the chances of school leavers obtaining a job. I want to pursue this line further. The document further stated:

The results of the AIDA survey reveal the dramatic impact that on-costs are having on total labour costs. In the years 1974 to 1982 on-costs grew at a rate on average some 60 per cent faster—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I wish that members opposite who are interjecting would listen to what I am saying, because they would absorb the point that I am making, namely, that on-costs, that is, the cost of these other ancillary industrial matters, have grown 60 per cent faster than have direct wage costs. The publication to which I referred further states:

Ominously, the rate of growth of on-costs in calendar 1982 was 77 per cent higher than direct wage costs. On present trends 'on-costs' will constitute more than 50 per cent of direct labour costs by the end of the decade.

In other words, if there is an award rate of, say, \$15 an hour, a 50 per cent loading will have to be added to that for these other costs. In the time that I have remaining, let me quickly outline some of these costs. In regard to annual leave and leave loading, in the 1970s the rate was set at 17½ per cent. This was set initially, I thought, to compensate workers for the fact that when they went on holidays they did not get overtime payments. However, it then spread throughout the clerical section of the Public Service. Teachers and nurses now get paid more money when they go on holidays. As I have said before, my daughter is a high school teacher: she gets paid more money when she goes on leave, as do all teachers. What is the effect of all this? In regard to annual leave and leave loading, the document states:

Annual leave costs grew in 1982 only slightly faster than wage costs. However, leave loading payment grew by nearly 25 per cent over the year reflecting the trend to higher loadings in award negotiations (they now stand at 21.6 per cent of annual leave payments).

No longer is the figure 17½ per cent. We all thought that leave loadings would be paid at the rate of 17½ per cent. However, on average it is now 21.6 per cent. The document continues:

Leave loadings are, in fact, a typical example of an on-cost which has grown rapidly over the last decade. Introduced into awards in 1974 leave loadings now represent nearly 1.5 per cent of direct wage costs and add a little over 13 cents per hour to the cost of employing labour.

Another on-cost referred to is for public holidays, but I will not go into that. The next one referred to is for long service leave, and it is stated:

Long service leave accruals grew by 29.3 per cent in 1982 more than double the rate of direct wage increases.

Long service leave is an on-cost which must be built into the wage structure. That grew by 29.3 per cent, which is more than double the rate of direct wage increases. Compassionate leave, sick leave (I will not deal with that) and other paid work absences and benefits are referred to. Allowances are referred to as follows:

This item covered specialist allowances for such items as tool, tradesman, dirt, meal, height, laundry, etc.

That item grew at a rate of 11.5 per cent in one year. Reference is made to non-productive paid time, and superannuation, which is another on-cost. Superannuation is referred to as follows:

Superannuation grew rapidly in 1982 at 23-25 per cent compared with an average 17.4 per cent in the years 1974-82.

Workers compensation is referred to. This is the matter that is causing so much trouble. The Government legislated only this year to increase workers compensation (legislation to increase unemployment, as the Opposition describes it). Workers compensation insurance is referred to as follows:

Both over 1982 and in the years since 1974 workers insurance costs have been the fastest growing components of labour costs. In 1974 workers compensation costs contributed some 4 cents per hour to total labour costs. Six years later this had grown 10 fold to 40 cents per hour. Rather than slowing down the rate of growth in workers compensation, costs actually rose in 1982 by a massive 45 per cent.

In 1983 it looks as though it will be even higher than that. Pay-roll tax is then dealt with, as is employee amenities,

employee health, uniforms, training and other on-costs. The conclusion states:

As can be seen from the tables accompanying this article, concentration on direct wage costs as the cost of employment significantly understates the true cost of employing labour. The direct wage cost of labour in 1982 was \$8.85 per hour; however, the total cost to employers was in fact \$12.74 per hour.

In other words, the difference between \$8.85 and \$12.74 cents represents those on-costs.

Mr Ingerson: Yes, 50 per cent, and growing all the time.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes. That is the matter that is ignored when people talk about the cost of employing people, and it is an area for which the Labor Party is hell bent on increasing benefits. The Labor Party wants to put another great lump in the category of on-costs and it has supported a claim before the Arbitration Commission for an enormous jump in terms of redundancy payments. That is an enormous jump not computed in the paper. The article continues:

More significant however, than the absolute cost of labour is the trend revealed by the AIDA survey whereas in 1974 on-costs represented 33 per cent of direct wage costs, eight years later in 1982 they had risen to a little over 43 per cent and if present trends continue this proportion will rise to well over 50 per cent by the end of this decade.

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

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

ADJOURNMENT

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question before the House is that the House do now adjourn.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I think the Minister has to move that the House do now adjourn. However, he has not yet moved that motion. I have been sitting here waiting for the Minister to do that.

Mr LEWIS: I rise on a point of order—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable Minister of Mines and Energy.

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

That the House do now adjourn.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN (Davenport): Mr Deputy Speaker, once again we have the Opposition acting as Chairman or Speaker of this House to uphold the Standing Orders. Sir, I immediately wish to take up an issue concerning the north-south transport corridor. Last Tuesday I asked the Minister of Transport to immediately make public the Southern Area Road Network Strategy Report prepared by the Highways Department on the need for the north-south transport corridor. The Minister, in answering my question on Tuesday last, said basically, 'Of course I will make the report public. I promised it several weeks ago and the honourable member only has to wait until tomorrow before he actually receives a copy of that report in the post.' Interestingly enough first up the next day, that is Wednesday last, we had the Minister making a Ministerial statement in which he said, 'Look, I am sorry, I really do not understand what is going on in my office. I am not sure which reports are going where, or which reports are being prepared. I got the whole thing confused. I cannot give you the report that I promised only yesterday.'

The Minister went on to say, 'In fact, I promised you the wrong report. What has been posted out today is another report for the councils.' I have now received that so-called

other report. However, I stress the point that the important report (the one prepared by the Highways Department which contains the facts which would embarrass the Government, particularly the Minister of Transport—that is, the Southern Area Road Network Strategy Report) will not be released by the Minister. That is the one we are after and the one that deals with the facts.

Let us look at the other report which the Minister did release. It turns out not to be a report but rather a letter of 1½ pages which the Minister confused with the major transport report prepared by the Highways Department.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: It really is. The honourable member should sit down and listen to it. It is an incredible letter and I will analyse it. It is addressed to Mr B.D. Coates, Executive Officer, Southern Region of Councils Incorporated at Morphett Vale and states:

Dear Mr Coates,

Further to my meeting with yourself and the Chairman of the Southern Region on 2 August 1983, and your letter of the same date, I am pleased to provide the following information. In the summary of the major points reached at our meeting on 2 August, you listed four items which are a convenient framework for me to respond to your letter and the matters raised at our meeting. The first was that the land south of Sturt Road would not be sold—essentially this is correct. The only qualification I must make is that in some parts of the corridor there is land considerably in excess of that required to provide for a new road facility. Although the right of way will be retained, some excess land may be sold off.

The point that the seven mayors raised when they met with the Minister of Transport was that no land held for the north-south transport corridor was to be sold. That was the challenge put to the Premier. That was the challenge I put to the Minister of Transport when I debated the matter in the House. The Minister has not answered that challenge and will not give an assurance. He will only say that most of the land south of Sturt Road will not be sold off. That is completely missing the key point that the seven metropolitan mayors put to the Premier and the Minister of Transport. I will continue to quote the letter to show how ludicrous and inadequate it is. It continues:

I undertook to give you an indication of priority for projects in the southern region. I have therefore attached a map showing seven projects or groups of projects in priority order. This is the essential summary of the advice I recently obtained from the Highways Department.

It sounds as though we are about to get into facts and substance. However, it continues:

I draw your attention to the fact that the timing of construction shown on the attachment should be read as indicative only, and that each of the projects will be subject to detailed analysis over the years to come. These proposed improvements do not constitute a programme which has been adopted by the Government.

How incredible! Having put forward supposed undertakings, which is what the councils have been asking for as have the residents of the southern suburbs, the Minister puts up a proposal but says, 'Do not take any notice of the proposal—it has not been adopted by Government—it is indicative only.' The letter throws further doubt on the whole scheme as it states:

These improvements do not constitute a programme which has been adopted by the Government. It would be misleading to suggest otherwise as the level of need, the extent of development, financial circumstances, and other factors will play a role in determining the actual programme from time to time. Advice received from other organisations within and outside the State Government, such as the Department of Environment and Planning and your own organisation, influences the programme which is reviewed and approved annually as part of the budget process.

In other words, the Minister himself has said, 'Here is a programme, take no notice of it, it cannot be believed as it has not been adopted by Government and all of our programme will be adopted on a year-by-year basis. That is

exactly what the people living in the southern area fear. They believe that the Labor Government will apply no long-term planning to the transport needs of the southern metropolitan areas of Adelaide, that our transport plans will be on an *ad hoc*, year-to-year basis, depending on how things fall up for the Government. It is that point that concerns these people, and the Minister has now verified that concern. The Minister's letter continues:

Consultation with the southern region and the relevant councils will continue in the normal way.

The criticism of all of the councils involved was that there was no consultation before the announcement by the Labor Government that it would scrap the north-south transport corridor. There was no consultation at all. The Minister's undertaking that 'consultation with the southern region and the relevant councils will continue in the normal way' means that there will be a continuation of no consultation whatsoever. Some weeks ago I placed a Question on Notice, asking the Minister whom he consulted before the Government announced the decision to scrap the north-south freeway. After waiting for some five weeks I received a very long and wordy reply from the Minister. I refer to Question on Notice No. 83 today and the Minister's reply which states that, in effect, there was no consultation whatsoever. The first sentence of the Minister's reply sums up the inadequacy of consultation, as follows:

Wide public discussion has occurred on the north-south transport corridor over many years.

That is the Minister's idea of consultation—public discussion over many years. I know that people in the southern areas are concerned that the Minister will adopt his normal approach and that there will be no consultation whatsoever. The Minister's letter continues:

I expect to be in a position to discuss improvements to South Road between Darlington and Reynella in early 1984.

The next paragraph of the Minister's letter is the greatest hotch-potch of contradictions that I have seen in any Minister's letter. It states:

Your letter suggests that the principal difficulty with further widening of South Road is the additional cost involved. To place such a simplistic interpretation on my statement is taking the issue out of its planning and financial context. More accurately, a justification does not exist for further widening of South Road (Anzac Highway to Daws Road) in part because of the additional cost involved.

That is the very point that the Minister said did not exist to start with. It is a complete contradiction in three sentences, all in the one paragraph. I do not have time to read the rest of the Minister's letter; I will return to it in the grievance debate tomorrow.

The Minister's letter is the most embarrassing document that any Minister of Transport could have sent out to a group of people dissatisfied with the scrapping of the north-south transport corridor. No wonder the member for Unley is sitting back in his seat looking uncomfortable and embarrassed. The Mayor of Unley has said that he is most dissatisfied with the Government in relation to this issue. The Unley traders have approached me expressing their concern and dissatisfaction with the Government's decision. The Unley traders know that by the early 1990s Unley Road will be chock-a-block, bumper to bumper with vehicles, because there is inadequate transport—

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

Mr KLUNDER (Newland): I want to speak tonight about an alliance between two sectors within our community. It is a profitable alliance and unfortunately its cost is having to be borne by a number of citizens in our community who are not in a position to pay for it. I am referring to an alliance between the insurance industry and the legal profes-

sion. I make clear from the start that I do not consider it in any way an unholy alliance deliberately fostered to fleece people. Rather, it has become very profitable indeed and it will be very difficult to break the alliance unless action is taken in this House. Each partner in the alliance has something specific and unique to offer to the other partner. The lawyers obtain from the insurance companies the money to take litigation to the courts. Their role in this matter is very clear.

However, the insurance companies get from the legal profession something rather more unique. They get a power to delay by forcing cases through the courts. The easiest way to explain it to the House is perhaps to take a hypothetical question of an issue of \$100 000 which is a claim by an individual on an insurance company. The insurance company may know full well that that claim is a just claim. It may have received a number of claims like it in the past and it may know that that \$100 000 is roughly the correct amount that it will have to pay out in the long term. Honesty and courtesy would normally suggest that that amount of money should, therefore, be paid out.

Unfortunately, that is not the case. By pursuing this through the courts, an insurance company can take up to two years or more to finalise the case, and there are two very profitable parts to such a delay. The first is that the person who should be paid this money has usually had something fairly catastrophic happen to him in order to be able to make that sort of claim in the first place. In most cases, it follows that such a person is not in a position to accept the kind of delay that is involved, and this puts the insurance company in what some might call a strong bargaining position and what others might less charitably call a very close to blackmail position, because it is possible for the insurance company to say to the person, 'We know that you have a claim in for \$100 000. We will fight it every inch of the way through the courts and, if you are lucky, you will get some of that money in two years time. On the other hand, we are prepared to offer you \$60 000 right now.'

A number of people have come to my office because they have been in total despair about the possibility of their houses disappearing from under them, with the possibility of their business going totally bankrupt and, in many cases, they have had to accept that kind of offer from an insurance company, knowing full well that it was an incorrect and miserable offer but that they did not have the financial strength to stand off and fight it out in the courts. However, for the insurance companies there is a second advantage which is probably not quite so well appreciated. The advantage is that, while an insurance company has to pay that \$100 000, it will have added to that \$100 000 an amount commensurate with the inflation rate for the period of delay which means that, in two years time, it might well have to pay out \$120 000. However, that insurance company can invest that money at a vastly higher rate of interest and, on the short-term money market, that rate of interest can be as high as 20 per cent, which means that the insurance company picks up \$140 000 after two years, pays out \$100 000 capital to the claimant plus \$20 000 for the inflation addition, perhaps another \$5 000 or so to the legal profession for court costs and lawyers' fees, and ends up with a sum of \$15 000 in its pocket after two years of delay through the courts.

Unfortunately, I guess that that is something that most insurance companies have to do because, in today's rather competitive market, the insurance company that trades on human misery in this way actually ends up with \$15 000 out of every \$100 000 case that it fights, and an insurance company that honestly pays out when it should does not. In the market situation, it may be that those who trade in human misery survive, and those who do not, do not. That

is a wonderful comment perhaps on the capitalist system that we have! Meanwhile, lawyers on both sides are quite happy: there is a lot of litigation going on and a lot of money to be made. Therefore, they are very unlikely to cavil at the situation that applies, and one does not get any complaints whatsoever from those people.

It seems that the courts are caught in the middle. The judges must see that justice is done and that it is seen to be done. It seems fairly obvious to me that our judicial system is inadvertently caught in the position of assisting the more powerful of the two opponents before the courts. There would appear to be two separate ways in which one can tackle that problem. Of course, one is to somehow reduce the backlog of cases that go before the courts, and I guess that that would involve appointing more judges, building more courts, and having more of the paraphernalia of the legal system.

That would in the final instance involve the taxpayer in a cost that I would be reluctant to ask him to bear if there was any other way out of it. There seems to be another possibility and, to me, a much more attractive one, in that it makes it possible for most of the sides in this dispute to come out of it reasonably well and for there to perhaps be a little bit of money left over for other uses as well.

If the insurance company had to pay as interest on the sum of money that is eventually paid out a sum which is commensurate with the short-term market rate rather than the inflation rate there would be absolutely no reason why an insurance company would want to persist with cases purely in order to extend the term over which it would have to eventually pay out. That is one way. It would shorten the period in which people would actually end up getting paid unless there were some very good reasons why a particular case would have to be decided in the courts.

At the same time, it is unreasonable that one should give that sum of money plus the short-term market interest rate to the claimant. It would seem to me that he is entitled to the sum of money that he has claimed plus an amount for inflation—perhaps a little more because he might well have invested at a little more. But, in most cases, these people require that money for urgent use and are not likely to have it spare to invest at the short-term market rate.

I therefore suggest that the money that goes to the claimant is the amount for which he made the claim plus, perhaps, the Aussie Bond rate or some other rate commensurate to that. That, of course, leaves us with a certain amount of money in the middle, which could be up to 6 per cent or 8 per cent, being the difference between the Aussie Bond rate and the short-term market rate.

That money could very sensibly be used to assist in our legal aid system. It has the advantage, of course, that lawyers who so far have stood to lose by having less litigation will pick that money up in the legal aid system. Consequently, one would expect the lawyers to be reasonably happy. Certainly, the claimant would be happy because he gets his money sooner or he gets it with a little bit of interest added to it. Thirdly, the insurance company, of course, is not likely to be quite so happy, but it is now getting money that it is not really entitled to in the first place.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I want to highlight what I believe is a completely immoral act by the present Government and, more specifically, by the Minister of Agriculture in his handling of the policy on the licensing of slaughterhouses. The Meat Hygiene Act was passed by this Parliament after a great deal of discussion. It encompassed two Governments: the former Labor Government before 1979 and, subsequently, the former Liberal Government between 1979 and 1982. During that period there was a great deal of discussion with the industry, with local gov-

ernment and with members of both sides of the Parliamentary spectrum. There was a clear indication that it was quite impossible, even though it might have been desirable, to eliminate slaughterhouses from the country towns and to supplement or replace them by abattoirs.

The abattoirs were for the purpose of making certain that meat hygiene was totally controlled and that there was an inspection service which would detect any meat during the course of a pre-slaughter inspection or, subsequently, following slaughter, that was not fit for human consumption, and which was to have oversight of the management of the abattoir premises.

The second was an arrangement agreed to that, in those communities where the throughput was relatively small, where there had been an existing slaughterhouse for a long period and where local government exercising its responsibilities through the Board of Health would undertake regular inspections, there would need to be a registration of the facility and an improvement in the nature of the facility, more specifically as it related to the penetration of dust, the collection of fluids, the dispersal of blood, and the removal of offal and general hygiene. That was generally accepted.

In fact, it was quite reasonable that that minimum expectation by the public should maintain. In undertaking this arrangement for slaughterhouse activity to continue, the authorising body was to give the various slaughterhouses an entitlement of slaughtering units, a slaughtering unit being the equivalent of one sheep per unit, with cattle and pigs being accorded a certain number of units. In total, a slaughterhouse would have a number of units allocated to it. Because there was a need to upgrade a number of these facilities, the upgrading would require the raising of funds by the operator.

Clearly, the number of units allocated to the slaughterhouse was critical in any discussions that the operator had with his banker, and certainly in any cash flow considerations and a proper accounting approach to the redevelopment of that slaughterhouse facility. If a person was going to raise funds, there was clearly the necessity to determine that the funds to be raised to improve the facility could be recouped over a period, that the lending organisation would have its position protected and, more particularly, that the employment associated with that slaughterhouse and the integrity of the business of the slaughterhouse operator was guaranteed by the throughput that was permitted.

A number of the slaughterhouses, having been given those unit allotments, proceeded to raise the funds and, in good faith, upgrade their facilities. They maintained the necessary hygiene which was required of them by the local governing authority. I suggest that in every respect the slaughterhouse operations took a turn for the better, especially as a number of them were quite archaic before the measure was introduced and before operators accepted their responsibilities to the consuming public.

However, in a document circulated in January this year, the Chairman of the South Australian Meat Hygiene Authority indicated to a number of operators that the unit entitlement which had been granted to them and which had been the basis upon which they had entered into financial commitments with banks and other lending institutions was to be altered. There was to be a decrease in their ability to function by a direction of the authority. I believe that any Government (because the Government through its Minister would have known of this direction) which would put into jeopardy the financial viability and employment opportunity of an operator would be acting quite immorally and against the spirit in which these operators were given their entitlement and their authority, in effect, to raise funds for this purpose.

In this document, which was circulated in January, the Authority pointed out that there was a new policy statement. That is, after the game had started and while people were part way through a productive economic exercise that they had been authorised by the Government to undertake, they were told that the Authority considered that, in South Australia, an annual throughput of 8 000 sheep equivalent units was a reasonable upper limit for slaughterhouses and that wholesaling of meat by slaughterhouses was undesirable. So, having given the authority to operate and having inveigled people into a position where they were committed to a fund repayment situation, the Authority then stated that the policy would change and that the integrity of the operation would be likely to suffer as a result. The following time table was set out:

1. During the current licence year ending 12 May 1983, existing conditions relating to throughput and outlets will apply.

2. During the year ending 12 May 1984, licensees of slaughterhouses with throughputs exceeding 8 000 units will be required to reduce these by half the difference between 8 000 and the agreed 1983 throughput.

3. During the year ending 12 May 1985, licensees of slaughterhouses will not exceed the throughput limit of 8 000 sheep equivalent units per annum. In addition, these licensees wishing to continue wholesaling meat will be required to justify this activity to the Authority on the basis of community need.

The Authority would be pleased to assist slaughterhouse licensees to adjust within this policy, particularly those contemplating a change of status to abattoir.

That is back-door blackmail, suggesting that a person who has entered into a slaughterhouse project according to the rules would be able to continue only with that rate of throughput and that commitment to outlets by transferring to abattoir status at a much higher cost factor. I believe that the Government should take urgent steps to reverse the actions of the Authority to reduce the throughput that was given legitimately to those operators, because such actions have placed them in a position of potential disaster.

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

Motion carried.

At 10.28 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 21 September at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 20 September 1983

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

PUBLIC SERVICE

5. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. How many temporary positions have been created with the Public Service in the past 12 months?

2. How many of these positions have been made permanent?

3. What criteria are applied and what authority and approval are required in creating temporary positions?

4. How many temporary employees have been given permanent classification status for their positions?

5. Are temporary positions being created to circumvent Public Service Board approval in creating new permanent positions?

The Hon. J. C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

1. 917.

2. None. The Public Service Act does not enable temporary positions to be made permanent.

3. Pursuant to Section 108 of the Public Service Act, the Public Service Board can approve the employment of temporary officers. Section 108 (1) of the Act states:

Whenever in the opinion of the Board the prompt dispatch of business of a department renders assistance necessary, and the Board is unable to arrange for such assistance from other departments, the Board may engage temporarily such temporary officers as appear to it to be best qualified for the work.

In strict definition, the Public Service Act does not allow the creation of temporary positions; however, temporary officers are recorded against uniquely identifiable positions to facilitate recording and payment processes. The Public Service Board has authority for the employment of temporary officers; however, delegations from the Board have been provided to specified departmental personnel to authorise the engagement of base grade temporary officers for a period of up to 12 months.

Departmental delegates are required to maintain full and accurate records of such employment actions and all cases are subject to monitoring by officers of the Board. The employment of temporary officers may occur in the following circumstances:

- Where there is a short-term increase in workload which cannot be met by other remedies available to the department, including the re-deployment of existing staff, over-time, the alternative arrangement of leave schedules, methods review, or assistance from another department;
- Where there is a shortfall in staff resources to meet the transaction of business with the public, and as above, the situation cannot be remedied by other appropriate means;
- Where funds have been made available for a temporary situation only, or funds from other than State sources are not available on a continuing basis.

The employment of temporary officers may not occur where it:

- would be contrary to any current Government or Public Service Board recruitment policy/practice,
- exceeds approved staffing level,
- exceeds funds,
- prevents the usual filling of a vacant office,
- anticipates Public Service Board agreement of the creation of a new office,
- follows the rejection of a request for the creation of an office,

- relates to a new function, unless that function has the approval of Government or the Public Service Board as appropriate,
- is to 'cover' the absence of an officer(s) on recreation leave—except in exceptional circumstances.

4. None. Temporary employees in temporary positions cannot be made permanent without being appointed to a permanent office.

5. Temporary positions are not being created to circumvent Public Service Board approvals, as indicated by the criteria outlined under part III. Furthermore, preliminary employment figures indicate that the number of temporary Public Servants has decreased during the 12 months to June 1983.

ASH WEDNESDAY BUSHFIRE

36. **The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN** (on notice) asked the Premier: Is there to be an inquiry into the causes of the 1983 Ash Wednesday Southern Hills bushfire and for other purposes, and, if so:

(a) when is it to be undertaken;

(b) who will conduct it; and

(c) when is the report to be made public?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

(a) An inquiry is presently being held.

(b) The State Coroner.

(c) As soon as possible on its completion.

PRIORITY PROJECTS TASK FORCE

39. **The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. What was the total cost to upgrade the premises used by the Priority Projects Task Force at Warradale?

2. What have been the total operating costs of the Priority Projects Task Force (as distinct from funds provided to schools) for each financial year over which the task force has been operating?

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

1. The total cost of setting up the premises used by the Priority Education Programme (Priority Projects and the Priority Country Education Programme) was \$16 072. The area in question accommodates the Priority Projects administration/consultancy team, the Priority Country Education Programme administrative/consultancy team and officers of the Country/City Information Unit funded by the latter programme. Therefore, approximately half of the sum of \$16 072 could be seen as a cost against Priority Projects.

2. The following table shows expenditure from the past five financial years. Earlier figures are not comparable since there were separate administrations (and co-ordinators) for primary Priority Projects schools and secondary Priority Projects schools prior to 1978-79.

Financial Year	Programme Exp. \$	Admin. Costs (incl. Advisory Teachers' Salaries) \$	% Actually Spent in Schools
1978-79	1 710 691	143 666	91.6
1979-80	1 962 537	179 415	90.9
1980-81	2 161 489	172 147	92.0
1981-82	2 234 399	197 316	91.3
1982-83	2 531 683	221 294	92.0

All personnel costs include an 11.6 per cent on-cost charge on salaries, charged by the Education Department to cover personnel management and insurance, etc. The percentage actually spent in schools figures indicate that administration

and advisory services consistently absorb less than 10 per cent of the total grant. This figure is one of the lowest (if not the lowest) in Australia. The percentages shown probably exaggerate the cost of programme administration as more than half of the annual totals shown in column 2 have been spent on the salaries of advisory teachers whose work goes on in the schools and cannot properly be deemed an administrative cost. If advisory teacher costs are treated as school level expenditure the percentages spent in schools should be increased by approximately 4 per cent in each year, that is:

1978-79, 95.6%
1979-80, 94.9%
1980-81, 96%
1981-82, 95.3%
1982-83, 96%

PORT AUGUSTA GAOL

53. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. When was the new cell block at the Port Augusta Gaol completed?

2. How many of these cells are currently unoccupied and for what reasons?

3. Is it intended to comply with the recommendations of the survey carried out prior to the completion of that cell block which indicated the number of staff required to enable that facility to function properly and, if not, why not?

4. When is it anticipated that the cell block will be fully utilised?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

1. The new cell block at the Port Augusta Gaol was completed in late 1982.

2. All of the cells are currently unoccupied. The reason for this is that no provision was made by the previous Government for additional staffing needed to bring the new cell block into use.

3. No survey was carried out prior to the completion of the cell block to indicate the number of staff required to enable the facility to function.

4. It is anticipated that the cell block will be fully utilised later in 1983 after a number of new staff have been trained.

RANDOM BREATH TESTS

67. **The Hon. D.C. BROWN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: When does the Minister intend to establish an inquiry into how the operation of random breath tests can be improved, who will be responsible for conducting it and what will be the terms of reference?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The question of a review of the random breath test legislation as promised in the Government's policy is under consideration at present, and a submission will be made to Cabinet shortly following which Parliament will be advised.

ROAD TRAFFIC BOARD PERMITS

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

1. Who is responsible in the Road Traffic Board for the issue of permits for loads that exceed the normal mass or dimension limits?

2. What guidelines are used as the basis for granting such permits?

3. Are the permits issued on an *ad hoc* basis and, if not, why does so much inconsistency exist in granting such permits?

4. Have the conditions for granting such permits changed in the past year and, if so, for what reasons and what have been the changes made?

5. Why were transport companies permitted to carry two large round bales across a normal truck last year, but those same operators prohibited from carrying the same load this year?

6. Will the Minister investigate immediately the basis on which such permits are granted by the Road Traffic Board and ensure that in future they are granted on a consistent, predictable basis which is understood by the transport industry?

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

1. The Road Traffic Board accepts responsibility for the functions carried out by its staff and by those to whom it has delegated its powers under the provisions of the Road Traffic Act, 1961-82.

2. Unless specifically approved by the Road Traffic Board permits are only made available for indivisible loads which cannot be made to comply with the statutory limits. For specialised vehicles, the publications 'Model Specifications and Control Conditions for Road Trains' and 'Recommended Mass and Associated Dimensions Limits', prepared by the National Association of Australian State Road Authorities (N.A.A.S.R.A.), are used as guidelines for the issue of permits.

3. I am satisfied every endeavour is made to ensure that applications are considered on a consistent basis. Variations arising from differing weights, dimensions, road and traffic conditions may give an impression that the granting of permits is not always consistent.

4. Permit conditions relating to the movement of over-width transportable buildings were varied following reports of widespread damage after the movement of buildings from Leigh Creek and Woomera and an upper width limit of 8.0 metres established for the issue of permits (statutory width limit 2.5 m) for the movement of existing buildings. Procedures are being established to cater for existing buildings exceeding 8.0 metres in width to be moved providing the route can adequately cater for the load. As from 1 October 1983, permits will only be available for new transportable buildings which do not exceed 7.0 metres in width at the walls, 8.0 metres at the eaves; these limits and the date of implementation were established in consultation with the Housing Industry Association.

5. Although baled hay is a divisible load and could be loaded in accordance with the statutory limits, the Board has made permits available for loads up to 2.75 metres in width. Permits are also made available for loads of the larger hay bales, on a farm to farm basis, within a 40 km radius of the property, for loads of up to 3.36 metres in width. Permits will also be considered for longer journeys for the large hay bales at widths of up to 3.36 metres in cases of natural disaster such as bushfires, drought, floods, and so on. Permits have been made available for these purposes in the past 12 months.

6. The Chairman of the Road Traffic Board has reported to me on this matter and I am satisfied that the basis on which permits are granted is as consistent as practicable, having regard to changing circumstances in the industry.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HOUSING TRUST FUNDING

79. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing: For the 1983-84 year, what level of funding has been promised by the Commonwealth for the South Australian Housing

Trust and how many houses or units for rental and purchase, respectively, are planned to be constructed?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The South Australian Housing Trust expects to receive the following externally sourced funds in 1983-84:

Commonwealth Government, \$49.7 million.

State Government, \$109.4 million.

The Commonwealth has yet to confirm the level of funds nominated from the State's Loan Council Programme, to go to public housing on the concessional Commonwealth/State Housing Agreement loan terms and conditions.

It is anticipated that this level of funding will permit around 3 100 additions to the trust's rental stock, the majority of which will be newly constructed. Approximately 500-600 units will be acquired by purchase. In accordance with the decision of the previous Government, the trust no longer constructs houses for sale.

NORTH-SOUTH TRANSPORT CORRIDOR

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

1. Which bodies or groups were consulted before the Government decided to scrap the north-south transport corridor and when did this consultation take place?

2. When does the Government intend to start selling the land held by the Highways Department for this transport corridor?

3. Were all local government councils affected by this decision consulted before it was made and, if so, which councils were consulted and when and, if not, which ones were not consulted and why not?

4. How much money will the Government receive in each of the years 1983-84 to 1985-86, from the sale of this land?

5. What population and transport projections and statistics did the Government use as the basis for their decision and was there any discrepancy between these figures and those provided by the Highways Department and, if so, what was the discrepancy?

6. Was the department consulted on the various options being considered by the Minister and, if so, what was its response?

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

1. Wide public discussion has occurred on the north-south transportation corridor over many years. The various attitudes and views of the many bodies and groups affected by the corridor are known and it was considered that the best way of crystallising these views was to initiate action by the preparation of a Supplementary Development Plan eliminating the corridor. All groups and bodies will now have the opportunity to express their opinions during the public exhibition stage of planning.

2. As soon as practicable.

3. See 1. above.

4. At this stage the amounts are not known.

5. The population figures considered were the current Department of Environment and Planning forecasts of population. The transport projections used by the Government were prepared jointly by the State Department of Transport and the Highways Department.

6. Yes. The Highways Department responses were well prepared and contained valuable advice to the Government.

EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

84. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: What effort has been made to attract employment opportunities

in the southern metropolitan area similar to the campaign to encourage industrial/commercial development north of Adelaide announced on 5 July 1983?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The campaign to encourage industrial and commercial development north of Adelaide is the responsibility of the Northern Adelaide Development Board. The Board was established in 1980 by the Northern Metropolitan Regional Organisation to promote economic development in the region. Principal support is from the local government councils of Elizabeth, Gawler, Munno Para and Salisbury. Support is also given by private industry and the State Government. No similar board exists in the Southern regions. However, representatives of the Southern Metropolitan Regional Organisation have discussed with me and officers of the Department of State Development their ideas of assisting and developing industry in that region. These discussions have been fruitful and I look forward to being advised of their final outcome. I emphasise that these initiatives are of a grass roots nature and I congratulate the organisations concerned in marshalling local resources in this manner.

MARITIME MUSEUM

87. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: What is the proposed site of the maritime museum at Port Adelaide, when is it envisaged that work will commence on this construction, and from where will the finance be provided?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: A Commonwealth grant of \$1.1 million has been allocated for the development of the South Australian Maritime Museum at Port Adelaide as a major project of Jubilee 150. The Museum will incorporate a waterfront site on the northern bank of the Gawler Reach where preliminary site works have been initiated by the National Trust and buildings in the Historic Area of the Port Adelaide Centre, the former Ferguson Bond Store and Weman sailmaker buildings. The establishment of the Maritime Museum will bring together several significant collections currently in scattered locations and poorly displayed and will involve historical organisations, including the National Trust and Port Adelaide Historical Society and the local council.

The establishment phase of the Maritime Museum will be the responsibility of the History Trust of South Australia and the Special Projects Unit of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, and operating costs of the Museum are to be met by the State Government. A working party is preparing a concept plan and development strategy for the Museum, which will be opened during the State's Jubilee 150 year in 1986. Site works are expected to commence early in 1984.

G.M.H. AND B.H.P.

88. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: What special relief has the Premier requested from the Commonwealth to offset the jobs lost from G.M.H. and B.H.P. Steel Division?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Over the past 10 months the State Government has concentrated its attention on persuading the Commonwealth to adopt appropriate industry policies to ensure the continued viability of the motor vehicle and steel production in such a way that would best advantage South Australia. Other areas in which the Commonwealth has been asked to assist the expansion of employment opportunities in areas other than steel and motor vehicles include: capital works; high technology and sunrise industries; housing; and, tourism.

In addition, the State Government will be encouraging the Commonwealth to develop a range of positive assistance measures and policies for industries that have a future in South Australia. This will be done through our membership of EPAC and participation in the forthcoming Technology Summit, Industry Ministers' meetings, Premiers' Conferences and through our submissions to reviews such as that being presently conducted into the Industries Assistance Commission.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HEALTH COMMISSION ACT

89. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary representing the Minister of Health: In response to the recent review undertaken of the operation of the South Australian Health Commission and Health Services Advisory Committee, what changes are to be made to the composition of the commission and of the committee, and what proposals will be implemented to ensure greater accountability within the commission?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: It is proposed to amend the South Australian Health Commission Act to provide for the changes in the composition of the South Australian Health Commission and the Health Services Advisory Committee as recommended by the review team. An implementation team has been set up to review the report of the review team and to implement recommended changes as appropriate.

HOSPITAL DEBTS

100. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary representing the Minister of Health: Further to Question on Notice No. 230 of last session, what has caused the increase in hospital debts for 1982-83 following the significant fall during the previous year?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: As indicated in the original answer to Question on Notice No. 230, the bad debts written off in each year generally relate to accounts raised in previous years. Broadly, the reasons for the variations in the level of bad debts written off are:

- The 1980-81 total included old debts written off as a result of a review of all outstanding debts, initiated by the S.A. Health Commission.
- While the lower 1981-82 total includes some write-offs arising from that review, it mainly reflects a low level of raisings in 1979-80 and 1980-81 and the effects of the 1 November 1978 changes to health insurance arrangements.
- The increase in 1982-83 arises from: a significant increase in raisings in 1981-82 and 1982-83; a change in health insurance arrangements from 1 September 1981, with a higher potential for remissions on grounds of hardship; the inclusion of both remissions and bad debts in total; and, the issue by the S.A. Health Commission of revenue collection and debtor review guidelines.

O-BAHN BUS PARKING

105. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Is there any intention to use land in the western parts of Currie or Hindley Streets for parking O-Bahn buses between turnarounds and, if so, will the access route be via Grenfell Street?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: It is currently proposed to use land on the northern side of Currie Street between Gray and Clarendon Streets for a layover area for busway buses. Negotiations concerning the precise location are proceeding. The access route is proposed to be via Grenfell Street.

FRUIT FLY ROAD BLOCKS

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

1. Does the Minister intend to maintain fruit fly road blocks at all existing interstate entry roads and, if not, from where and when are personnel to be removed?

2. Does the Minister intend to expand, maintain or reduce agricultural extension services personnel during 1983-84 and, if so, in which regions or districts and what specific adjustments are intended?

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

1. It is the Government's intention to maintain fruit fly road blocks at all existing inspection sites.

2. During the 1983-84 financial year it is intended, as far as possible, to maintain the same level of resources in agricultural extension as for 1982-83.

PUBLIC EDUCATION PROGRAMMES

108. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: What plans does the Government have to conduct, through the Department of Environment and Planning, public education campaigns similar to the 'Good Neighbour' campaign?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Public education campaigns conducted by the Government through the Department of Environment and Planning are administered through the department's Community Awareness Programme. The 1983-84 Community Awareness Programme includes a continuation of the 'Good Neighbour' campaign. The community announcements produced for television will be repeated during the period December 1983 to February 1984, which is the critical period for air and noise pollution. Programming will be carefully selected to reach specific target groups.

The Community Awareness Programme comprises a number of other public education campaigns. A major display on the department's role in the community has been produced and initially exhibited at this year's Royal Adelaide Show. It is intended that sections of this display will also be exhibited at other venues around the State. The other campaigns include World Environment Day 1984 celebrations, a weekly 5UV radio programme commencing February 1984, a further promotion of the Greening of Adelaide Project, and several forums on environmental protection and planning issues.

OFF-ROAD RECREATIONAL VEHICLES

109. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: What is the policy of the Government relating to the use of off-road recreational vehicles on Crown land?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The State Government is committed to the protection of sensitive areas, on Crown lands and elsewhere, from disturbance by off-road recreational vehicles and is working towards more effective management and more responsible use of these vehicles. Currently the Government is pursuing a course of action which involves the channelling of off-road recreational vehi-

cles into areas which are more acceptable. An inter-departmental working group is encouraging the establishment of off-road recreational vehicle parks on suitable Crown land areas and, once such parks are set up, the use of sensitive Crown lands will be very actively discouraged.

SEMAPHORE CUSTOMS STATION

114. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: What stage has been reached concerning the future use and management of the Old Customs Boarding Station at Semaphore?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Approval has been given for the Old Customs Boarding Station at Semaphore to be leased as a community use building to a local community group. The group will undertake day-to-day management and maintenance of the building.

LONG-BILLED CORELLAS

115. **The Hon. D. C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: Has the research programme carried out by the Victorian Government, with financial assistance from the South Australian Government, into the long-billed corella and associated crop damage in the South-East of the State been completed and, if so:

- (a) what conclusions were reached; and
 - (b) is a report to be prepared and, if so, will it be released to the public
- and, if not complete, when is it anticipated that the programme will be finalised?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Although the research programme has been completed by the Victorian Government, the final report is not expected to be available until December. Whether or not it will be released to the public will be determined after it has been received.

STATE SUPERANNUATION FUND

120. **The Hon. D. C. BROWN** (on notice) asked the Premier: Is the State Superannuation Fund financing the redevelopment of the Grenfell Street Mail Exchange site and, if so, who is the developer and what finance is being provided by the fund and on what conditions?

The Hon. J. C. BANNON: The South Australian Superannuation Fund Investment Trust is the owner and developer of the Grenfell Street Mail Exchange site. No other party has a financial interest in the site. The development will cost approximately \$20 million.

COOBER PEDY HOSPITAL

129. **Mr GUNN** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary representing the Minister of Health:

1. Did the Minister or his officers indicate or suggest to the former Executive Officer of the Coober Pedy Hospital or to the members of the Hospital Board that, if the Executive Officer failed to resign, the Minister would sack him and the Board?

2. Does the Minister intend to appoint or allow the Board to appoint a new Executive Officer?

3. Who initiated any complaints in relation to the Board or the Executive Officer and what was the result of the inquiry?

The Hon. G. F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

1. No.

2. Yes.

3. A local medical practitioner. The result was the Chief Executive Officer resigned.

TAPLEYS HILL ROAD REPORT

131. **Mr OSWALD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. How long does the Highways Department expect to take to complete its report to the Minister on Tapleys Hill Road, Glenelg North?

2. Will the Minister announce the proposals for that road within the next three months and, if not, will he advise what is causing the delay?

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

1. Approximately 5 weeks.
2. An announcement will be made as soon as practicable after the report has been considered.

SCHOOL LEAVER RECRUITMENT PROGRAMME

146. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Treasurer:

1. What is envisaged by the School Leaver Recruitment Programme?

2. Will this programme correct the anomaly of an 'ageing' Public Service?

3. Will disabled school leavers be given equal opportunity of employment?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

1. Cabinet has approved a number of strategies to increase substantially the proportion of young people recruited to the Public Service in 1983-84. The Board's target is a total of 300 recruits in the 15-19 age group by 30 June 1984. All recruitment programmes are now being weighted in favour of this group. However, the majority of these recruits will be drawn from the annual School Leaver Programme, which commenced in August 1983, with a field of approximately 2 000 young people including a number of Aboriginal and disabled school leavers. Testing programmes have now commenced and interviews are scheduled for late October. The Government has made \$150 000 available for 100 school leavers to commence on 9 January 1984, in anticipation of departmental vacancies in the period January-June 1984. It is also anticipated that further positions will become available for school leavers after this time towards the overall target of 300 young recruits.

2. The emphasis on the employment of young people in 1983-84 is in part an acknowledgement of the need to redress the existing age imbalance in the Public Service. The recruitment of 300 teenagers, of course, will not in itself address the entire problem. Further strategies will be required on an ongoing basis.

3. Applications have been invited from young disabled people through schools and appropriate community agencies. The interests of disabled applicants have been taken into account in the development of the school leaver selection process, including aptitude testing and interview arrangements. Disabled applicants will be referred to the Board's Special Placements Officer for decision and placement action.

OFFICIAL VISITS

147. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Treasurer: What official visits will be made to South Australia this financial year, by whom and when?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The following official visits have already taken place this financial year:

- Ambassador of Pakistan, 26-28 July 1983.
- Ambassador of Saudi Arabia, 9-11 August 1983.
- Consul-General of Israel, 5-6 September 1983.
- Iraqi Minister for Agriculture and Agrarian Reform, 9-11 September 1983.
- Ambassador of South Africa, 14-16 September 1983.

An official programme was prepared for a visit by the President of Italy in October 1983 but the tour has been postponed. The Ambassador of the Netherlands will make his official visit to South Australia from 2 to 4 November 1983. It is expected, as in the last financial year, that approximately 24 official visits will be made to South Australia this financial year.

QUESTIONS 67, 68 AND 83

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

1. When does the Minister intend to answer Questions on Notice Nos 67, 68 and 83?

2. Why have these questions taken so long to answer and what specific problems do they pose?

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

1. These Questions have now been answered.
2. The Questions posed no specific problems. All Questions on Notice are answered as soon as practicable.

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

161. **The Hon. D.C. BROWN** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. Why has there been such a delay by certain Ministers in answering Questions on Notice?

2. Will the Premier instruct his Ministers to reply within two weeks unless special problems arise?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

1. Some questions seek time-consuming answers.
2. All questions will be answered as quickly as is possible.