

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 11 September 1984

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

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

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

DEATH OF Mr L.C. HUNKIN

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): By leave, I move:

That this House expresses its regret at the recent death of Mr L.C. Hunkin, former member of the House, and places on record its appreciation of his meritorious service; and that as a mark of respect to his memory the sitting of the House be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

There was a brief announcement yesterday of the death at the age of 100 years of Mr Leslie Claude Hunkin, CMG. That brief announcement I think and the one or two details that accompanied it did not really give a full idea of the extraordinary life of public service of Mr Hunkin. He was born in Tasmania in January 1884 in a family of 10 and came to Australia—South Australia—in the early part of this century.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That was prior to Federation, so, in fact, there was no Australia to come to. One of the extraordinary things is that this man, who died only a day or so ago, was born before the Federation of the Colonies of Australia. In South Australia he was very active in the trade union movement. He became Secretary of the Shop and Warehouse Employees Union, which later became the Storemen and Packers Union, and he was an industrial advocate for the United Trades and Labor Council and his own and a number of other unions in the industrial tribunals.

He was also involved in business as the founder of Hains Hunkin Ltd. In the case, incidentally, of the United Trades and Labor Council, it is extraordinary to note that earlier this year Mr Hunkin attended the centenary dinner of that organisation. He was, in fact, born a few months before the United Trades and Labor Council was founded.

He then entered politics, as the member for East Torrens, and he held a seat in this Assembly from 1921 until 1927. Again, it is remarkable to note that it is 57 years since Mr Hunkin occupied the benches in this place. He then became Public Service Commissioner, a position he held for some 20 years from 1929 to 1949—an extraordinary period of the development of South Australia, including as it did, first, the devastation of the Depression, then the post-Depression recovery, the Second World War, and post-Second World War industrialisation. In all of those areas Mr Hunkin had a leading role to play, and he was one of that group of public servants who established a reputation for public sector activity in South Australia which was second to none at the time.

During the war he was Deputy Director-General of Manpower; that was from 1942 to 1946, and for his work in that field he was awarded the CMG. His positions in the public sector included Commissioner of the Board of Industry, Chairman of the Classification and Efficiency Board, Chairman of the South Australian Forestry Board, a member of the State Advisory Committee on Finance, Chairman of the Budget Committee, a member of the Grants Committee,

a member of the Teachers Salaries Board, and South Australian representative on the Federal Commission investigating the overlapping of State and Commonwealth departments. That is a truly remarkable record in the Public Service over very many years.

Mr Hunkin's great age is only one of his remarkable features, but certainly it is remarkable. He was never one to divulge his secret completely, although he did not smoke at all. In fact, he did drink in some moderation, believing that that added to one's life as well as to one's pleasure in life. By 1978 he had outlived his life insurance policy: he had taken it until death or the age of 95 years, and lived to cash it in. He was a very regular attendee at the races, and for almost the whole of his life he was actively involved in the racing industry as a recreation.

I had the pleasure of inviting Mr Hunkin to dine at Parliament House on a number of occasions on which he clearly demonstrated that his mind, his memory, and his knowledge of public affairs and events were totally unimpaired by his years. In 1981 he remarked (and I think these remarks were reported publicly) that he wanted to see Bob Hawke become the next Prime Minister of Australia—as indeed Mr Hawke did. This, incidentally, was in the context of a discussion with Mr Hawke's uncle (a former Premier of Western Australia, Mr Albert Hawke), who was living in South Australia and was a member of the 1924 to 1927 State Parliament in which Mr Hunkin was also a member. In January this year Mr Hunkin attended a lunch in Parliament House to celebrate his 100th birthday. I can recall one or two of the anecdotes which he gave then and which indicated how good his memory was and how effectively he could put in context the events of today and of former days.

There is one thing I might refer to in the context of his keen interest in the racing industry. He was recalling that, when at the races at Victoria Park on one Saturday afternoon in 1924, he had received an urgent call from the then Premier (Mr John Gunn) to attend a meeting, to be held that evening at Ashton, at which the Government was to be strongly criticised over problems that had arisen in relation to riparian rights and an attempt by someone to dam one of the streams in the Adelaide Hills. The Premier was unable to attend that meeting and had managed to track down Mr Hunkin at the races and enlist him to go to the meeting. Mr Hunkin said that the meeting had been very successful, that he had made a strikingly effective speech on behalf of the Government about what it was doing in that case but that one of the locals then had stood up and really given him the rounds of the kitchen. He said that he retired hurt on that occasion: his briefing had proved quite deficient. The local who had done this happened to be Thomas Playford. That was the first time Mr Hunkin had met Thomas Playford who, of course, ultimately became Premier of this State for a very long time.

My last meeting and discussion with Mr Hunkin was only a couple of months ago when he came in to see me to raise some of the questions surrounding Maralinga and the Royal Commission which was being established. He had a fairly detailed knowledge of some of the arrangements that were made in the early 1950s in relation to land being made available to the Commonwealth—and ultimately, of course, to the British Government—for the Maralinga tests to take place. Again, he demonstrated a very strong grasp of the contemporary significance of the issue, and threw some very interesting highlights on the negotiations that took place at that time. So, right until the very end of his 100 year life, Leslie Hunkin indicated concern for the public good in South Australia, and that is an indication of the amazing length and period of public service that he has given.

It is a matter of great regret that he is no longer amongst us. I guess, philosopher as he was, his aim achieved of having turned the century he could retire gracefully and quietly from the scene, as he has done. But, he will certainly be well remembered by many of those who have come into contact with him. It is interesting that the knowledge of him directly as a man of affairs and interest spans whole generations, dating back from the period before Federation to today—1984. For his daughter Audrey, his son Ron, and other members of his family, I would like to put on record the South Australian Parliament's supreme gratitude for having such a person so dedicated to the public good of South Australia in our midst for so long.

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): I join with the Premier in expressing, on behalf of the Opposition, our condolences at the death of Mr Hunkin, who was one of those covered by Stewart Cockburn in his much acclaimed book, *The Patriarchs*. While in just four pages it is not possible to cover a life of some 100 years, I believe that Stewart Cockburn's portrait of this remarkable man shows him to be very much a practical and down-to-earth person, with a wide experience from a wide spectrum of life—politics, public service and in business.

Some of his comments in that profile, particularly those relating to the industrial relations scene, are based on what one would call hardnosed experience and deserve to be noted by all members of this Parliament. Mr Hunkin had vital responsibilities in the Public Service from 1929 to 1949. During the war years, as head of the Manpower Development Deployment Service, he made a most important contribution to the organisation of the war effort at home.

I think that in the article written by Stewart Cockburn a number of the facets of this man shine through: he was a man of determination and some grit. At the age of 19 he went into hospital for a year to battle for his life against tuberculosis. I think that indicates a man with some determination and some grit. The article states:

A former Labor MP, he grudgingly administered the cuts at the direction of a bewildered State Labor Government, itself caught in the banker-dictated so-called Premier's Plan. But Hunkin bitterly opposed 'brutal staff reductions' also urged by the banks and ratified under the plan.

He put his money where his mouth was, so to speak. This comment is contained in the book:

That was how the first Razor Gang in Australia's history was thwarted. Government workers still in jobs garnished their own wages to help keep their mates off the dole.

He was a man of some humour, as shown in his activities, who apparently allowed his sense of humour to come to the fore when recalling, for instance, how he used to do his stint campaigning for the ALP on the stump at the Speakers Ring at Botanic Park on Sunday afternoons. It is with some relief, Sir, that I add that there is no Speakers Ring at Botanic Park these days. He was a man of compassion. I quote further from that article:

Voltaire said: 'To understand all is to forgive all.' If only employers and employees alike could concentrate more on understanding and less on confronting each other.

It seems to me that with those comments we are able to paint a picture of a man of compassion, a man of determination and a man of some great willpower, who has provided a service not only to this Parliament but also to the Public Service in this State over many years. I think that the last quote contained in that four page article on Mr Hunkin describes the man:

You aren't afraid of dying when you get to my age, but so long as I can have reasonable health I'd like to notch up that century. As the Premier has indicated, Mr Hunkin achieved that objective earlier this year. He is a man whom this Parliament

ought to recognise as one who has made a very significant contribution in many walks of life in South Australia over those years of distinguished service. I join with the Premier in offering our condolences to Mr Hunkin's family and to record our appreciation of the services that he has rendered to South Australians.

The SPEAKER: I think that I may on behalf of all members of the House of Assembly support the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition. I shall make the usual arrangements for Mr Hunkin's family to receive a copy of these remarks. I ask members to support the motion by rising in their places.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

[Sitting suspended from 2.17 to 2.26 p.m.]

PETITIONS: PORNOGRAPHY

Petitions signed by 47 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to withdraw pornographic material from prisons were presented by Messrs Evans and Lewis.

Petitions received.

PETITION: HILLS WATER

A petition signed by 77 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Minister of Water Resources to upgrade the quality of water supplied to residences in the Adelaide Hills, establish a water filtration plant to serve this area and, until this occurs, reduce the rates charged for unfiltered water was presented by Mr Evans.

Petition received.

PETITION: EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

A petition signed by 20 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to ensure that the course in early childhood education at Magill campus of the South Australian College of Advanced Education be retained in its present form was presented by the Hon. Lynn Arnold.

Petition received.

PETITION: GOVERNMENT CHARGES

A petition signed by 939 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to stop increasing taxes and charges by reducing spending by Government departments was presented by Mr Olsen.

Petition received.

PETITION: CHILDHOOD SERVICES

A petition signed by 79 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to improve childhood services without jeopardising funding for kindergartens and consult the Kindergarten Union before legislating any changes was presented by the Hon. Lynn Arnold.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answers to questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 2, 4, 13, 16, 25, 26, 29, 30, 37, 44, 46, 53, 57, 58, 61, 65, 68, 69, 78 and 79; and I direct that the following answer to a question without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

SALES TAX AVOIDANCE

In reply to **Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY** (23 August).

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I refer the honourable member to the Ministerial statement made by my colleague, the Minister of Mines and Energy, on 23 August 1984.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

The SPEAKER laid on the table the Auditor-General's Report for the financial year ended 30 June 1984.

Ordered that report be printed.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: STATE BUDGET

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The State Budget for 1984-85, which I presented to the House on 30 August, set out as the Government's primary economic objective the need to do everything possible to stimulate growth within South Australia's regional economy. In that context, I pointed out that the Government, in framing its Budget, had given particular attention to the way in which the action it takes can stimulate employment. The Government has, of course, made clear its policy concerning employment within the public or Government sector, and the Budget documents set out in detail the current position concerning employment levels.

In summary, the Government has decided to maintain direct employment at approximately its existing level. It does not believe that it should expand the public sector any further at this stage, despite demands for increased services in some areas of Government activity. However, it is clear that significant employment is supported in the non-government sector through the expenditure programmes of the Budget. The Government believes that this employment should be identified, as far as is possible, not only so that members can understand the broader impact of Budget expenditure but also to provide the Government with information to assist its financial planning.

I referred to a special paper dealing with this issue when I presented the Budget. That paper will be tabled at the conclusion of this statement. The paper sets out the estimated employment impact of various expenditure programmes within the broad categories of capital works and housing, incentives and grants to private industry, grants to non-government bodies, State promotion, and special employment and job creation schemes. It also provides additional information on the labour market and the size of the Government sector in relation to the total number of persons employed in South Australia.

However, its primary focus is the employment supported within the non-government sector. It attempts to identify that employment which is linked to a particular Budget programme rather than unravel all the connections between

Government activity, the economy, and employment. Nevertheless, it is clear that the number of jobs generated by the consumption spending of those in public employment, and by the considerable expenditure of Government agencies on goods and services within the private sector, would be considerable.

In presenting this paper, the Government realises that the information concerning employment numbers is, in many cases, based on estimates. It also recognises that within the total range of Government decisions and actions there are partial offsets to employment creation. However, it believes that the estimates of employment contained in the paper are in fact conservative. The paper identifies an employment impact of State Government expenditure in the non-government sector which is slightly in excess of 15 000 jobs, the main impact deriving from the capital works and housing programmes.

Members will be aware that by reversing the previous Government's policy of using ever-increasing amounts of capital works funds for recurrent purposes it has been able to expand activity in this important area. The Budget also maintains the high volume housing programme established in 1983-84. Another significant aspect brought out by the paper is the decline in the number of public sector employees measured as a percentage of the total number of persons employed in South Australia. The Government has always believed that, in the face of the recession which South Australia has been experiencing, public sector employment was necessary to sustain a basic level of consumer spending and economic activity. The Government believes that this policy has been justified by the rise in private sector employment, which has meant that the proportion of public sector employees in the work force has now been reduced.

This paper represents a first attempt to identify the consequences for employment of Government expenditure programmes. The Government believes that it can be refined, and indeed improved. It is our intention to develop this concept and to present a similar paper with subsequent Budgets. I now table the paper 'Employment Aspects of the 1984-85 Budget', and move that it be printed.

Ordered that paper be printed.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Pursuant to Statute—

National Parks and Wildlife Act, 1972—Regulations—

i. Hunting Fees.

ii. Wildlife Fees.

iii. Fees.

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

iv. Development at Cummins Area School.

v. Construction of Classrooms at Galwer High School.

vi. Erection of Classrooms at Banksia Park High School.

vii. Erection of Demac Unit at Modbury Primary School.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

i. Advances to Settlers Act, 1930—Revenue Statement, Balance Sheet and Auditor-General's Report, 1983-84.

ii. Geographical Names Board of S.A.—Report, 1983-84.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

Motor Vehicles Act, 1959—Regulations—

i. Accident Towing Roster Scheme.

ii. Fees.

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

By Command—

- i. Task Force to Investigate Multiculturalism and Education—Report—Education for a Cultural Democracy, June, 1984.

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Tertiary Education Authority of South Australia—Report, 1982.

By the Minister of Tourism (Hon. G.F. Keneally)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Chiropractors Act, 1979—Regulations—Recognised Institutions.
- ii. Food and Drugs Act, 1908—Regulations—Dangerous Substances.
- iii. South Australian Health Commission Act, 1975—Regulations—Hospitals and Health Centres prescribed for Audit Purposes.

By the Minister of Local Government (Hon. G.F. Keneally)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. District Council of Blyth—By-law No. 28—Traffic.
- ii. District Council of Elliston—By-law No. 25—Caravan Parks.
- iii. District Council of Munno Para—By-law No. 23—Dogs.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Business Names Act, 1963—Regulations—Fees.

By the Minister of Water Resources (Hon. J.W. Slater)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Renmark Irrigation Trust Act, 1936—Regulations—Penalties.

By the Minister of Public Works (Hon. T.H. Hemmings)—

Pursuant to Statute—

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: KANGAROO ISLAND FLOOD DAMAGE

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Minister of Transport): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I report to the House on the flood damage on Kangaroo Island which was inspected on Thursday and Friday 6 and 7 September 1984. Heavy flooding was reported on Tuesday 4 September to have occurred on Kangaroo Island due to heavy rain over the previous three days.

Rainfall figures for various centres supplied by the Bureau of Meteorology for the 96 hours up to 9 a.m. on 4 September were as follows: Cape Willoughby 40 mm; Penneshaw 36 mm; Kingscote 32 mm; Parndana 78 mm; Cape Borda 58 mm; and American River 51 mm. Unofficial recordings quoted figures of about 100 mm in a period of 30 hours.

The effect of the falls received on catchment areas already saturated by winter rains was to cause widespread flooding in low lying areas and local flooding over roads at culverts and bridges. Many roads were closed for varying periods due to the high water levels, but damage was generally limited to culvert locations where part of the road was washed out, usually on the downstream side. Structural damage found up to the time of inspection was limited to a concrete floodway at western River Cove, half of which was washed away, and a stone pitches side wall of a ford some 13 km south of Penneshaw was also damaged.

Severe erosion occurred at Longwater Hole Bridge over the Cygnet River on the road to Stokes Bay, partly undermining the pile cap of the western abutment. This will

require stone pitching of the embankment to provide protection against future flooding. A timber bridge on Churches Road at the western end of the Island, which collapsed several weeks ago, was also inspected. It had been in poor condition prior to the winter and was due for replacement. It is estimated that the cost of temporary and permanent repairs to road scouring, replacement of the concrete ford, and reinstatement and protection works at Longwater Hole Bridge, all in the District Council of Kingscote area, would not exceed \$100 000. Similarly, repairs to damage in the District Council of Dudley area caused in the period under review would not be expected to exceed \$10 000.

It is pointed out that the above figures are based on an inspection of selected roads only, and at the time of inspection there were still many minor roads which had not yet even been examined by the councils concerned. No serious damage was caused to the sealed rural arterial roads maintained by both councils on behalf of the Highways Department, although some were closed for a time due to flooding. I have directed that departmental officers discuss with the local governments on Kangaroo Island funding for those repairs, and hopefully that can be done as a matter of urgency.

While I am on my feet, I refer to the report which appeared in this morning's *Advertiser* and which alleged that a spokesman from the Department of Transport said that the member for Alexandra had claimed that the damage would cost in excess of \$1 million and that that claim was an exaggeration. I point out to the House that that is total misreporting, and I apologise to the member for Alexandra for that. The reference is totally false. At no time did the member for Alexandra mention any figure, and I think all members know that: he mentioned no figure at all.

My interview with the officer from the Department revealed that in his discussions with the reporter from the *Advertiser* it was mentioned that the damage was estimated to involve millions of dollars. The member for Alexandra's name was mentioned, and somehow or other he was reported as having said that it would cost about \$1 million. As I have said, that is totally false, it is misreporting, and I apologise to the member for Alexandra for that misunderstanding. At no time did he mention any figure at all. I do not think that he or any member of this Parliament would be in a position to make an estimate of that kind of damage, which was quite severe.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Education): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: In June the South Australian College of Advanced Education circulated a paper for discussion about the future of the Early Childhood Education programme run through the de Lissa Institute at Magill campus. Proposals raised in the document entitled 'Recommendations for the Structure and Content for the Bachelor of Education and Diploma in Teaching (Pre-Service)' raised grave anxieties in the community. The proposals under consideration at the college were viewed even more seriously when frequently and wrongly linked with misinformation circulating at that time about the role and purpose of the South Australian Government's planned new Children's Services Office. The proposals were the subject of hundreds of letters and signatures to petitions calling for the Government to protect the Early Childhood Education course in its present form.

On 28 August, I announced in this Parliament (in answer to a question from the member for Coles) my intention to establish a working party to examine a number of questions relating to the college proposals. My decision to establish the working party was prompted by the very real concerns expressed in the community about the implications of changes in the provision of early childhood education at the college. The Government has, of course, a proven strong commitment to the early years of education, demonstrated for example through the instigation of the Coleman Report and the proposed establishment of the Early Childhood Services Office, which will enhance educational and care services in this State. The group's task will be to ensure that appropriate liaison occurs among all interested parties about the extent and nature of the programmes. It will also assess the appropriateness of the programmes to the restructuring of early childhood services presently being considered.

It is intended that the working party will be thoroughly aware of the concerns of various people and groups with an interest in the matter. Wide consultation will therefore be an important part of its brief. I am now in a position to announce membership of the working group and its terms of reference. The group will be chaired by the Chairperson of the Tertiary Education Authority of South Australia, Mr Kevin Gilding. There are three other members, and their credentials are in this document which I will not read but which I will table for people to read their credentials. The three other members are Dr G.R. Teasdale, Ms Carol Treloar, BA, and Ms Barbara Edmonds. The recommendations of the working party will be referred to appropriate bodies, including the SACAE for further consideration and action. In particular, the Tertiary Education Authority of South Australia may be requested to take account of certain concerns in its course approval processes. The working party will report to me by the end of November 1984.

The working party's terms of reference are as follows:

1. to consider the provision of early childhood education programmes having regard to both expressed community concerns and the proposed restructuring of early childhood services;
2. in terms of the above to pay attention particularly to:
 - the relationship of present course offerings at SACAE to the professional development needs of staff at various levels of pre-school through primary education;
 - the relationship of proposed course offerings at SACAE to professional development needs of staff at various levels of pre-school through primary education;
 - the relationship between the early childhood programme at the South Australian College of Advanced Education and other relevant programmes including that within the Department of Technical and Further Education;
 - the number of graduates likely to be needed in the light of Government policies for provision of early childhood education;
 - the need for postgraduate studies and the means by which they might be provided;
 - the desirability of introducing at the College any other relevant programmes related to early childhood studies;
 - conditions of transfer to college programmes for graduates of Department of Technical and Further Education, and, more generally, career opportunities for college graduates; and
3. to propose the most appropriate measures to ensure continuing liaison and co-operation among edu-

cational institutions and between such institutions and interested groups within the community.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: THEBARTON WORKSHOP

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: On Wednesday 29 August, the member for Light asked that I inquire into allegations that 'officers of the Department of Mines and Energy have been obtaining petrol at discounted Government rates from the Department's Thebarton workshop'. He said that the Opposition had been given information by a former employee of the Department who claimed that petrol had been made available from the workshop for use in the private vehicles of employees. On the basis of the honourable member's question, I requested that the Director-General have the matter investigated. I have now received a report on the investigation carried out by the Department's Acting Senior Administrative Officer. The report revealed that the Department does not sell petrol or fuels of any description to its employees. The investigation has produced no evidence to suggest that this rule is being breached either officially or unofficially by staff at the Thebarton Depot.

The only evidence produced which might form the basis for the kind of claim made by the Opposition's informant concerns an incident which occurred about 10 years ago. During a petrol crisis which occurred in 1974, or thereabouts, it appears that three employees, who did not have access to any form of public transport, were each sold one four gallon container of petrol at the standard Government rate, plus an on-charge. This information has not come from departmental records, but from the memory of a current employee who was involved at the time. Because 10 years has elapsed, and records are kept for only seven years, there is no way of officially verifying the employee's recollections.

Currently, petrol issues and receipts at the depot are controlled and supervised in the strictest possible way. All issues of petrol have to be accounted for and stocks together with procedures are checked on a regular basis in accordance with audit regulations and the Supply and Tender Act.

The fuel pumps are kept padlocked both during and after working hours. Keys are kept in the depot's central store and anyone wanting petrol must obtain the services of the duty storeman. An isolating switch situated within the store must be operated by the storeman before the pumps can be used. All fuel issues are recorded on fuel issue sheets and a signature is obtained from each driver against the quantity issued. Stock records are maintained on stock cards and the issue sheets are reconciled against the stock. Fuel tanks are dipped at least once a week and reconciled with the stock records. Any discrepancy must be immediately referred to the senior stores officer who is required to account for any discrepancy.

Unlike the situation which apparently applied in 1974, petrol is not now made available from the depot to departmental employees during petrol crisis situations, not even to those staff involved in manning petrol crisis centres. Staff on crisis duty are transported in Government vehicles, given Cabcharge vouchers or in extreme circumstances issued with a petrol voucher.

I do not know what more I can tell the member for Light. If his informant is able to add anything to his previous claims or can contradict any of the information I have placed before the House, then I suggest he has an obligation to place that information formally before me and any evidence in support of it so that it can be investigated. I should

also inform the House that a copy of the report into these allegations was forwarded to the Auditor-General on the same day as it was submitted to me.

QUESTION TIME

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

That the time for asking questions without notice be extended to 3.52 p.m.

Motion carried.

MEMBERS' SHAREHOLDINGS

Mr OLSEN: Does the Premier agree that the member for Elizabeth in this House and the Hon. Ms Levy in another place have breached the Constitution Act and are no longer members of this Parliament? During the past week, the member for Elizabeth and the Hon. Ms Levy have received payment from the Totalizator Agency Board for the sale of their shares in Festival City Broadcasters Limited, operators of the 5AA radio station. The value of the member for Elizabeth's own shareholding in 5AA was \$115 691 as a result of the successful take-over bid by the TAB, and the value of the total shareholding of the member and his immediate family was \$173 546. The value of shares held by the Hon. Ms Levy was \$13 547.

The SPEAKER: Order! As I see the situation at the moment, the Leader of the Opposition is seeking a legal opinion from the Premier. His question was directed in this fashion: have two honourable members breached the Constitution or parts of legislation which might relate to the Constitution? The Leader has, from the granting of leave of the House, then proceeded to detail certain facts. Does the Leader wish to distinguish the situation?

Mr OLSEN: Mr Speaker, I have asked a question of the Premier, and with leave of the House I am putting facts to back that question.

The SPEAKER: As I understand the question and the way the facts are being laid out, the Premier is being asked to interpret the Constitution. I am afraid that I cannot put any other construction on the matter. Therefore, I will have to rule the question out of order.

Mr OLSEN: With respect, Mr Speaker, I am specifically asking a question of the Premier whether members of this Parliament have breached the Act and forfeited their seats in this Parliament.

The SPEAKER: In that case I do rule that the question is out of order.

SUBMARINE REPLACEMENT CONTRACT

Mr HAMILTON: Can the Premier advise the House on the significance of statements made by the Kockums shipbuilding firm for South Australia's bid for a submarine replacement contract? The article on the front page of this morning's *Advertiser* outlined the investment of millions of dollars in Australia by Kockums, a Swedish company, which is quoted as saying that it favours South Australia as a base for many of its activities, not only submarine construction. Kockums also stated:

... it would be fair to say that no other State has organised itself better on a Government basis than South Australia.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I appreciate the honourable member's interest in this matter. In fact, the quote on which he finished, which came from this morning's newspaper report in the release that the Kockums shipbuilding company issued, further stated, having stated that no other State had organised itself better on a Government basis than South Australia:

I think everyone agrees on that.

I would say that a goodly proportion of South Australians agree on that, but I would not claim that everyone agrees. However, it is pleasing to see such confidence from such a company. The report further states (and I think that this is very relevant in terms of the company's attitude):

'Therefore we know who we are talking to, and we feel a commitment from the South Australian State Government and the companies operating there that they are fully committed to go for the submarine project. We also see quite a substantial industrial infra-structure there.' He said that certainly similar infra-structures would also be available in Victoria and New South Wales. 'We are representatives of a small nation of only 8 million people and the size of South Australia and the size of Adelaide is something we can live with. I am very happy with the situation in South Australia.'

That is certainly a very fine feather in our cap and a distinct step forward in our bid for the submarine project. However, in response to the honourable member's question I would say that, while the confidence shown by Kockums in developing South Australia as its Australian base is definitely encouraging, there is still a long way to go before that contract is won. The decision eventually will be taken by the Federal Government following nomination of two or three final tenders and the funding of the feasibility study which will be conducted over 12 months. It is only after this stage that there will be a real indication of the site for the project. There is certainly fierce competition amongst the other States, particularly from New South Wales, although Western Australia, Queensland and Victoria have all been mentioned and have all talked about possibilities in their States.

I say, 'particularly from New South Wales' because there was an announcement yesterday (or perhaps at the end of last week) that the New South Wales Government would spend some millions of dollars upgrading the Newcastle dockyard to attempt to suit it for the submarine project. I would simply say that our assessment is that that money is wasted if it is directed to submarine construction and that one of the strongest things that South Australia has going for it is the possibility of a green field site, building the operation on the infra-structure we have, but building it as an integrated structure and not grafting it onto an existing shipbuilding facility.

Therefore, I believe that on efficiency, skills and cost effectiveness our claims will be very hard to overlook. However, let me repeat again that, despite technological expertise, despite the preparations we have made, our industrial record and a number of other considerations, there are still two important hurdles to be overcome; first, the Federal Government's decision to construct the submarines in Australia and, secondly, to make South Australia the location. I am confident that we are well ahead of the pack at the moment and the bold statement by the Kockums company certainly gives us great encouragement, but we have still a lot of work to do.

MEMBERS' SHAREHOLDINGS

Mr OLSEN: Will the Premier investigate whether the member for Elizabeth in this House and the Hon. Ms Levy in another place have breached the Constitution Act and are therefore no longer entitled to sit in the Parliament? In my previous question I nominated that it was as a result

of selling their shares in the TAB and the take-over of SAA by the TAB, and I indicated that funds would flow personally to the member for Elizabeth of \$115 691 and \$173 546 to his family, and that Ms Levy would benefit by \$13 547.

The payments to both members were made by cheques drawn by the TAB, funded by a loan from the South Australian Government Financing Authority and approved by the Premier. I have legal advice that the agreement which they have entered into with the TAB to sell their shares contravenes section 49 of the Constitution Act and that as a result under section 50 of the same Act their seats in Parliament are automatically declared void.

This matter was explained by the present Chief Justice when, as Attorney-General, he introduced amendments to the Constitution Act in this House to clarify the circumstances under which members of Parliament can deal with the TAB. Those amendments, introduced by the Hon. Mr King (as he was then) on 7 November 1971, specifically limited permissible dealings between members of Parliament and the TAB to contracts of agreements in respect of any bet. In his explanation of the legislation Mr King clearly set out that any other dealings with the TAB by members of Parliament exposed members to the risk of forfeiting their seats.

The provisions of the Constitution Act and the Racing Act establishing the TAB and defining its powers, read together with the statements of the present Chief Justice in this House in 1971, put beyond doubt the fact that in this case the two members are in breach of the Constitution Act and therefore are no longer members of Parliament.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is debating the matter.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is an extraordinary way of framing the question. I will certainly investigate—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: The other one was ruled out.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, the question asking me to express a legal opinion quite properly was ruled out of order. Anyone who is familiar with Standing Orders knows that it is out of order to seek a legal opinion from a Minister. The question as reframed has, quite properly, been allowed. Some of the explanation accompanying it I believe was getting very close to the bone, indeed. The facts of the TAB purchase of radio station SAA have been laid out quite clearly before this House, before the public and before the business community, along with the reasons for the purchase and the manner in which it was done. There is absolutely no problem in that purchase. Indeed, last week, or two weeks ago, that purchase was supported by the Broadcasting Tribunal in its agreeing to the transaction going ahead.

I make those points to put it on the record and dispel the innuendo in which the Leader of the Opposition likes to deal, and which he is very good at, that in some way something shonky is going on in relation to the TAB's legitimate desire to secure an outlet for racing broadcasting.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I thank the Leader for his assurance that there was no such innuendo and that he supports the SAA take-over. That certainly was not his attitude previously. Now that we have cleared away that aspect, I will certainly investigate what the Leader has said. I would appreciate the Leader's providing me with a copy of the legal advice on which he claims his question was based. It would be in the public interest for him to do so if he is seriously pursuing this matter rather than trying to score some cheap political points. I would appreciate a copy of the legal advice, but I would suggest that, because of company structures and other things, the matter obviously is something that would need to be examined. I do not wish

to hazard an opinion—I am not qualified to do so—but I will ensure that properly qualified officers do that.

If the implications are that honourable members who are shareholders in companies are not in a position of making profits or gaining benefits from those companies, I find those odd remarks to fall from the Leader of the Opposition, who I understand supports that sort of thing taking place to the greatest extent possible. I hope that it is not a case of sour grapes on his part that he was not involved in the transaction in the first place. I choose to treat the Leader of the Opposition's question as though it were seriously made, have the appropriate matters investigated and ask him again to supply as soon as possible a copy of the legal advice to assist in that investigation.

EDUCATION FACILITIES

Ms LENEHAN: Can the Minister of Education tell the House what plans his Department has for the provision of educational facilities in the Hallett Cove and Karrara areas to serve children from the Hallett Cove, Karrara, Trott Park and Sheidow Park areas? I ask this question in response to the pressing need for further primary school facilities in the Hallett Cove and Karrara areas and also for the growing demand for secondary facilities for students not only from the Hallett Cove and Karrara areas but also from the Trott Park and Sheidow Park areas.

Recently I convened with members of the local community, planners from the Education Department and other community service providers a meeting to establish a priority list for educational needs for students within the Hallett Cove and Trott/Sheidow Park areas. I then submitted to the Minister a submission based on this meeting requesting that the Department give urgent consideration to meeting these needs.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for her question and say that the short answer is 'Yes': we are proposing to provide education facilities in the areas mentioned by the honourable member. I mentioned on another occasion the excellent work that has been done by the local member in studying the educational needs of her community and the submission that she presented to me, as Minister, detailing a number of the problems that she felt existed in the area. One of them regarded the need for secondary education facilities in the Hallett Cove, Karrara, Trott Park and Sheidow Park areas.

That matter has been the subject of investigation by officers of the Education Department who have made recommendations to me. I have taken those recommendations into account on the basis of the views expressed in this submission and those expressed by people within those areas. I can announce today that the Government proposes to build a new school to be operating by 1987 which would be an R through 10 (that is, a reception through year 10) school: it will have a primary component and a junior secondary component. Indeed, it will be the first such R through 10 school to be built in the metropolitan area. There are some of these schools in country areas, but this will be the first in the metropolitan area, and it will provide some, educationally, very attractive ways of solving the legitimate education needs of people to come in that area.

I suppose one should answer the question why at this stage it is not proposed that there be an R through 12 school for the local community. Much study has been done of the demographics of the area and what the secondary population is likely to be of the school in question. The studies that have been carried out indicate that, while there may be a

peak enrolment that may support a viable year 8 through year 12 component, at this stage we do not have information to suggest that the stable enrolment of that school would support a proper range of educational opportunities being available at that site. So, we have determined that an R through 10 school is the more appropriate choice and that we would then ask students to continue their year 11 and 12 studies at one of four high schools that are readily accessible to the area: Mawson, Seacombe, Dover and Brighton, depending on their particular interests or choices.

However, if the demographics change or if it appears that the stable level, not the peak level, enrolment will be in excess of that which has been estimated, we will certainly consider extending the year range to year 12. Indeed, I have instructed that the design work be undertaken in such a way that it will preserve that option being available for the development of the school.

Another point that needs to be borne in mind is that this R through 10 school will provide another primary school for an area that desperately needs extra primary school places. So, we hope that the decision that has now been made for this R through 10 school to be constructed and to open in 1987 will help ease the very real pressure on the present schools existing in that area, plus providing a neighbourhood education facility to the residents of Hallett Cove, Karrara, Trott Park and Sheidow Park.

MEMBERS' SHAREHOLDINGS

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I direct my question to you, Mr Speaker. In view of the probability that Mr Peter Duncan is no longer a member of this House, will you ask Mr Duncan to stand aside from the proceedings of this House whilst his Constitutional position is clarified? There is considerable uncertainty about the position of Mr Duncan following the sales of his shares in Festival City Broadcasters to the TAB. The Constitution Act states that the seat of any member who breaches the relevant section relating to contractual agreements with the Government or its agencies shall be declared void. As the Premier cannot clarify the matter, will the Speaker ask the member not to participate in the proceedings of the House in view of his likely disqualification?

The SPEAKER: The short answer is 'No'. Obvious courses are available, one of which is that the Premier carry out his undertaking that he has given to the House today and get opinions from the law officers. There are other options which, in view of the research that has been done by the Leader and the Deputy Leader, lie open. I will not canvass them, but any constitutional lawyer knows them full well. I will not be asking the member for Elizabeth to stand aside.

ELECTRICITY POWER LINES

Mr MAYES: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy indicate what process of public consultation is intended on recommendations from the W.D. Scott investigations into electricity distribution in bushfire prone areas commissioned by the Electricity Trust? Last week on a current popular radio talk back programme a member of another place commented on a recent report from W.D. Scott regarding the undergrounding of distribution supplies in the Adelaide Hills. That person referred to this report and indicated that he did not understand the implications nor the future steps that the Government would be taking in the consultations with the public.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I did not hear the radio talk back programme referred to, but I was told that a member of another place had been on the show making some comments which suggested that he was not aware of the current situation. The present situation is that the process of seeking public comment on the recommendations of the Scott study has already begun.

The General Manager of the Trust, Mr Leon Sykes, and the study leader, Mr David Shetliffe, have already held meetings in Adelaide, Mount Gambier and Clare at which representatives of local government and environmental groups have been given briefings on the study findings. In addition, the Trust will be writing to all relevant local government bodies and environmental and community groups formally inviting them to comment on the recommendations. The Trust will be asking that these comments be submitted by the end of October and will welcome comment from any other interested individual or group with a contribution to make. All comments received by the Trust will be referred to the consultant for evaluation.

For my part, I would especially urge all residents of high fire risk areas to study carefully the findings of the Scott Report. If they cannot obtain access to a copy through local government, copies are available from the Trust. If they have comments which they believe should be given consideration, I would urge that these be conveyed to the Trust or directed to the consultant. I hope that the production of these recommendations will not be a signal for lines to be drawn and battle to commence or for further polarisation to occur between the various groups with a stake in this matter. I hope that the recommendations will form the basis for a programme of measures which will substantially help to reduce the bushfire risk and which will have the broad support of the community.

There is no doubt that, whatever course of action is finally chosen, it will require long-term commitments from the Trust, consumers, State Government and local government and community groups. It is equally clear that the success of the course of action chosen (which will not take place until after consultation has occurred) will depend to a very large extent on the degree of on-going community support which the report and the study receives.

TOW TRUCK REGULATIONS

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Will the Minister of Transport immediately withdraw the application forms sent to tow truck operators last week, as those forms grossly infringe the rights of privacy of individuals? Last week the Tow Truck Inspectorate sent three quite separate application forms to each tow truck operator. One of the application forms relates to the application for an accident towing roster position and requires individuals who personally own and operate a towing business to list all personal assets and liabilities. That form, a copy of which I have before me, has no qualifications put on it. On page 4 it states: 'Assets. List your approximate total figures of all assets, including the value of those assets.' It then states: 'Liabilities. List your approximate total value of all of those liabilities,' and then at the bottom the applicant is asked to put his net worth. There is no doubt that the information required on this form goes much further than the information required to be given to this House by members in the pecuniary interest declaration.

The applicants are asked on the back of the second form to list all persons who are applying to be allowed to drive a tow truck, and their court proceedings and appearances. One question on the form is, 'Have you appeared before a court in South Australia or elsewhere?' Then, for each

appearance, whether they were found guilty or not guilty, and they are asked to list each offence, the court and the date and other information, including all details relating to traffic offences.

I point out that it is quite incredible to ask people to list perhaps a fine for speeding or some other offence that occurred 20 years ago and to give a precise date and other information about the offences. Furthermore, I believe that it is an infringement of the rights of privacy for any employee to have to divulge that sort of information. I therefore ask the Minister to immediately withdraw both these forms, because there is no doubt that they breach the fundamental right to privacy that any person has within our State. I certainly would not give that sort of information to the Government.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I am not prepared to indicate today that I will withdraw those forms, but I will say that I am prepared to review them. Quite frankly and personally, I do not see that they are essential or really very necessary. However, we did seek an independent opinion as to whether there was any breach of civil liberties or an infringement of privacy. We had an opinion from the Crown Law Department that there was no infringement of privacy or any attack on civil liberties. I am prepared to review whether the forms are necessary. As I mentioned, personally I do not believe that they are; I do not see what real value they are to the new regulations applying to the tow truck industry. I will certainly review the position, but I will not indicate at this time that I will withdraw them completely.

JAPANESE TOURISTS

Mr TRAINER: Can the Minister of Tourism state the potential that exists for attracting large numbers of Japanese tourists to our shore by what might seem to be the rather unlikely promotional techniques of frill-necked lizard coins and of sample free trips for honeymoon couples? These were two proposals recently made by the member for Mawson which were badly misreported in the afternoon tabloid and which were the subject of harsh criticisms in last Friday's edition of that tabloid. Those criticisms were based on a misunderstanding of her recommendations, particularly her suggestion that we should arrange for several promotional give away trips as prizes in competitions in the Japanese media aimed at getting maximum coverage for South Australia as an alternative honeymoon resort for newly wed couples from Japan—a major section of the Japanese tourist market that we need to attract.

A recent full page advertisement published in a Singapore newspaper (the *Sunday Monitor* of 24 June) was brought to my attention. It suggested to me that there was great potential for attracting newlywed couples from many parts of Asia and that a promotion package of the type described would be excellent in conjunction with the direct Singapore to Adelaide flights that now exist. The advertisement was placed by a firm, the Sino/American Travel Corporation. It promotes special Singapore Airlines flights, incorporating wedding celebrations in mid flight and 'glorybox' gift vouchers from various Singapore companies. The advertisement, headed 'The world's first bridal jumbo superjet, mass wedding and honeymoon tours', states:

Good news to all couples. Make it your date: Sunday 23 September 1984.

It points out that under the lunar calendar this is a particularly good year for nuptial celebrations. It also says:

The date of 23 September falls on the 28th day of the 8th month in this year's calendar—a most auspicious day, bringing good fortune and children to all couples who are planning to tie the nuptial knot.

On this day, for the first time in the history of aviation, the captain of an SIA flight will officiate as your guest-of-honour on your memorable wedding celebration in the clouds.

It further states that every couple will receive as part of a package deal what is described as a:

Value for money honeymoon tour to various destinations in the United States.

It further points out that they can have the world's first wedding reception in the air, and it gives details of a whole series of gift vouchers from various firms that people taking part will receive, such as a \$150 gift voucher by courtesy of First Furniture Centre; a \$100 gift voucher by Thompson Broadway; a \$300 gift voucher by Szechuan China Palace Restaurant and Fujiang Restaurant; free travel insurance; a \$100 gift voucher by courtesy of a large well known department store; a \$50 gift voucher for bridal makeup; and so on.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for his question. I was very surprised to see some of the reported comments both from journalists and from letters to the Editor on the excellent report of the member for Mawson's study trip to Japan in which, among a number of very sensible suggestions, she indicated that we should take advantage of the popularity of the frill-necked lizard in Japan and that also we should offer a prize to a Japanese honeymoon couple of a trip to South Australia as a part of promotion of South Australia's being an ideal destination for Japanese honeymooners.

I want to say something about both those suggestions, having just returned from Japan where I obtained knowledge first hand of the importance of the frill-necked lizard to the Japanese market and the importance to the tourism industry of attracting honeymoon couples. I know that in a sense the frill-necked lizard is the subject of some fun amongst Australians, because we have all known of these lizards for some time, and it has come as quite a surprise to us that the Japanese are so entranced by this Australian animal. The effect that the frill-necked lizard has on the Japanese community is quite incredible.

A major company in Japan uses the frill-necked lizard as its motto, and has had quite outstanding success. In Japanese departmental stores one walks past people wearing T-shirts with a frill-necked lizard on them and notices that the shelves are stocked with frill-necked lizards, and so on. There is some indication that the craze is falling off slightly. Nevertheless, it is a craze, and the frill-necked lizard is identified as being an Australian animal and it has given Australia a prominence in Japan that one would have to spend millions and millions of dollars to obtain if seeking to derive an equally successful promotion through one's own efforts. The honourable member's suggestion was very sensible. The fact that it was criticised by South Australia just goes to show how much more work we need to do in South Australia to build an awareness of the importance of tourism and the things that create a tourist market.

In regard to the suggestion about a trip for a honeymoon couple, I was surprised to see the headlines in the news, stating something like 'Love trips recommended by MP'. They might not be the exact words, but that is my memory of it. That was a bizarre misrepresentation of what the honourable member had said. The member for Mawson suggested that an enormous market existed in Japan. Recently I was at the Honolulu airport when three jumbo jets arrived full of honeymooners—two were from Japan and one from Korea. It was a very interesting trip through the immigration and customs areas. It was very pleasant; everyone was quite happy, and at that stage, anyway, all the marriages seemed to be lasting fairly well. It was apparent that there is an enormous market.

In Japan I was able to follow up the importance of the honeymoon market. It is one of the four most significant

segments of the Japanese tourist industry. If we in Australia neglect the importance of that, we will miss out on millions of dollars worth of tourist income as well as on the benefits to be derived from what I believe to be a very lucrative segment of the Japanese market.

The honourable member suggested that the South Australian Government ought to sponsor a prize to be offered on one of the major Japanese television station programmes for a honeymoon couple to come to South Australia. This would give prominence to South Australia in Japan and also we in South Australia could give prominence to the lucky honeymoon couple visiting South Australia. As yet we have not decided to do that, but it is a sensible suggestion that is worth looking at. I throw out the challenge to the South Australian tourist industry (and I have done this twice since arriving back on Sunday) to lift its game in relation to providing for Japanese tourists to South Australia.

I have said before that it is a chicken and egg situation: the local tourist entrepreneurs have not invested, and will not invest, their money until there is evidence of tourists coming. On the other hand, tourists may not come unless they see South Australians gearing up to provide for the special needs of the Japanese market. At this time four and a half million Japanese travel overseas annually, and it is a growing trade. Some 80 000 come to Australia, while 9 000 come to South Australia. There is so much more that we in South Australia can do in promoting our State as an ideal tourist destination. The honourable member's suggestions are sensible and ought to be considered as such. I think that the reaction from both responsible journalists and the uninformed correspondents to newspapers indicates that we really have to go a long way to convince South Australians of the importance of tourism, and particularly of the importance to South Australia of the Japanese market. It is the Government's intention to do that. Recently we released a magnificent brochure, and before the end of this financial year we will have in Japan a presence that will certainly promote South Australia more effectively than we have been able to do until now.

SPEECH PATHOLOGY

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Is the Minister of Education aware of the proposal by the South Australian College of Advanced Education to reduce enrolments for the speech pathology course at the Sturt campus of the College, and will he use his advisory powers under the Act to review the decision made by the College? The Minister would be well aware of the importance of special education and of the acute shortage of speech pathologists in the education system. Over the past three or four days I have received numerous submissions from concerned members of the community indicating that they deplore the decision made by the College to reduce student numbers for the speech pathology course. Those persons have pointed out the seriousness of such a decision in view of the serious shortage of speech pathologists which exists now and which will exist in the future.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Certainly, I will make inquiries about the situation with regard to the education of speech pathologists at the South Australian College. The honourable member is quite correct: there is an acute shortage of speech pathologists in South Australia. Indeed, I receive a number of letters from members of Parliament and constituents in various districts throughout South Australia asking why a certain position may not be filled in regard to speech pathology. Very often the answer simply is that we cannot get anyone to fill such a position that may exist. So, I am well aware of the shortage of speech pathologists. As I indicated in my Ministerial statement earlier this after-

noon, I am prepared when the occasion arises to indicate my advice to the College about what I believe should happen. There are advisory and intercessory powers, but the College still has the legislative authority to make its own council decisions.

But I suspect that one of the things that may apply here relates to triennial funding proposed by the Federal Government for the South Australian College obviously for the next three years. There is a serious problem in that respect, and I appreciate the difficulties confronting the South Australian College. Indeed, on coming into Government we appreciated the difficulties it was having as a result of being an amalgamated College out of four campuses—originally five colleges—causing financial problems for the College. As a State Government, we put \$250 000 towards the College to help it overcome those difficulties, but clearly that in itself was not enough.

I have made a number of representations to the Federal Government. Most recently I have agreed with Robert Fordham (Minister of Education in Victoria) that the two of us should jointly sign a letter—because he has colleges in his State in a similar situation—and send it to the Federal Minister asking for her special consideration of the financial needs of these colleges. The financial consideration comes from the fact that it is not a simple matter to take separate colleges, amalgamate them into one and hope that it will all fall into place within a very short period. In that sort of reorganisation, short-term financial assistance is needed to help the College adjust to that process.

Some financial assistance has been included in the triennial programme of the Commonwealth, but I believe that it is not enough, and I am strongly arguing with the Commonwealth that there should be more. I make that point because, while on the one hand it might be fine for me to use my advisory powers and say, 'You should not do this, that, or the other,' frankly the problem facing the College is a financial one, and it needs extra funds to maintain its level of programme activity that we in this State believe it should be maintaining. It is not simply sufficient for me to use my advisory powers: I really am obliged to make an approach to the Commonwealth Government very strongly on behalf of the College. I have done that and will continue to do that until the situation is satisfactorily resolved for the South Australian College.

FREEZE BRANDING

Mr FERGUSON: Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport consider seeking a conference with breeding owners in South Australia to introduce freeze branding in South Australia for all thoroughbred horses? The quality of freeze branding has long been recognised in pacing and trotting circles where all new foals are freeze branded. It is absolutely essential that every step be taken to prevent a Fine Cotton fiasco in South Australia. Freeze branding is not painful and is widely supported by many trainers. Victoria will introduce freeze branding of racehorses on a trial basis early next year. Introduction of freeze branding would increase public confidence in this vital South Australian industry. A further advantage would be that if foals are branded when they are with their mothers there would be no doubt as to the breeding of a horse when placed for sale. This would only further enhance public confidence in this important industry.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I understand that the freeze branding method is probably more effective and more lasting than normal branding. It certainly makes a horse more readily identifiable. I point out that the decision in these matters, of course, lies within the racing industry itself.

However, I believe that all the principal clubs, including the South Australian Jockey Club, have discussed the matter, and as a consequence, as the honourable member has already said, the Victorian Jockey Club or other Victorian clubs will introduce freeze branding on a trial basis during this year or the next.

I support the move. As I said, I would not like to be in a position of telling racing authorities their business. However, it is important, from a public protection point of view, that the sort of events that have occurred interstate over the past three or four weeks do not occur again, particularly in South Australia. Of course, I support anything that makes it easier for racing authorities to protect the interests not only of the public but of the racing industry generally. Basically, I support the honourable member's proposition, but the decision that needs to be made should be made by the racing authorities themselves.

MEMBERS' SHAREHOLDINGS

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: In view of the answer provided by the Attorney-General this afternoon that it had occurred to him that members benefiting from the TAB share sale might be in breach of the Constitution Act and that as a result of that belief he had called for Crown Law advice as to the consequences, will the Premier obtain and table a copy of that advice for the benefit of all members of this House?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In response to the Leader of the Opposition I have already undertaken to obtain a report on the matter. As the honourable member would well know, my recourse would be to consult my colleague the Attorney-General and ask him to commission such a report from the appropriate Crown Law officers. At such time as that report is at hand, obviously a decision will be made as to what extent and how details will be provided.

RENT RELIEF

Mr PLUNKETT: Can the Minister of Housing and Construction tell the House how many households are receiving rent relief, whether demand is growing and whether there are sufficient funds available to meet the demand? Many constituents who are renting privately have come to me with the problem of high rents that they cannot afford. I have been able to successfully refer most of these tenants as applicants for rent relief assistance to the Housing Trust, which administers the scheme. However, I understand that funds for the scheme may not be adequate to meet the total need.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The rent relief scheme has been of great assistance to thousands of South Australians comprising the private rental market. In fact, more than 5 500 private tenants in South Australia are currently receiving help under this scheme. More than 10 000 low-income households have so far been assisted, and the scheme is obviously meeting a genuine need in the community. Up to \$30 a week is currently available, depending on an applicant's circumstances. The average level of assistance is about \$20 a week.

The demand for rent relief is growing, and the funding level has risen to meet this demand. The scheme is jointly funded by the Federal and State Governments, and the State Government has lobbied strongly over the past year for an increased allocation. This Government will again this year meet the increased cost of rent relief. The pressure on rent relief funds has been heavy in all States, but South

Australia has stretched its funds further as a result of better management and slightly lower rents.

Victoria stopped taking new applications last September because of overwhelming demand, although South Australia would not take such drastic action. The Federal Government has increased the levels of assistance now available under the Federal Budget's increased supplementary rent assistance scheme. That is an increase of 50 per cent—that is, from \$10 to \$15—so it seems that we can carry on as we have done over the previous year.

IRRIGATION RATES

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Has the Minister of Water Resources considered my proposal in relation to the payment of irrigation rates, in that a cheque dated on or before 30 June and received within three or four days of the due date should be deemed to have been paid by 30 June? The Minister would be aware that the legislation relating to the payment of irrigation water rates and the fact that interest does not accrue until after 30 June was designed to fit in with the Government's legislation principally in relation to the payment for wine grapes, in that winemakers are not required to make the major payment for grapes until on or after 30 June. However, the reality is that growers do not receive payments from the wineries usually until the third, fourth or fifth day of July, and consequently most irrigators tend to post their payments for water rates on 28 or 29 June.

However, a number of irrigators find that they are now suffering the consequences of the penalty interest on the outstanding amount and, even though they have written a cheque on 28 or 29 June and posted it, it has not been received by the Department by 30 June, so that the interest becomes payable on their account. Quite obviously, if it was not the intention of the irrigator to pay the account by 30 June there would be no benefit in paying that account until 31 July, because there would be no increased penalty. Obviously, any person who has written a cheque which is received by the Department within two or three days of the due date intended that it be paid. I believe that Ministerial discretion could be applied in that instance.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I appreciate the point that the member for Chaffey has made. Certainly, the intention of applying penalty rates was to try to catch up on what I call recalcitrant payers and not other persons who intend to pay. I think that the matter is worthy of consideration. There should be some discretion perhaps from a Ministerial viewpoint, and I will certainly consider the matter that the honourable member has raised. As I have said, it is not the intention of the Department to be Draconian in the application of penalty rates, even though the legislation was supported by the member for Chaffey and the House in general, the intention of course being to ensure that the rates were paid by a particular date. In the circumstances outlined there certainly ought to be discretion. I will investigate the matter and advise the honourable member accordingly.

TREE TRIMMING STANDARDS

Mr GREGORY: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy say what action ETSA has taken in respect of tree trimming standards to implement the recommendations of the W.D. Scott review of electricity distribution policies in bushfire prone and environmentally sensitive areas? ETSA's continuing programme of tree cutting to provide the proper and necessary clearance for power lines is always distressing for

many members of the public who do not wish to see the trees in their local area disfigured or in some cases removed entirely. The report makes a number of general recommendations in regard to setting tree cutting standards and the improvement of the training of tree cutting gangs.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The matter that the honourable member raises is an important one, and I welcome the opportunity to give the House some details on the tree cutting actions of the Electricity Trust. The Trust already issues an instruction to staff known as '3A6L'—tree cutting and clearance to power lines, which sets out full details of the line clearances that are necessary. Safety requirements dictate that these standards be maintained, and I hope that that fact receives a reasonable degree of community acceptance. I do not think that that has been the situation in the past.

Total undergrounding, as is indicated in the report, is cost prohibitive, and the undergrounding of bushfire prone areas would take many years. Tree trimming will therefore be a permanent part of Trust activity, although if the community demonstrates sufficient preparedness to participate financially in large scale undergrounding it may be possible in time to diminish the extent of the problem appreciably. I can understand that when people see a favourite tree which has been trimmed heavily for the first time it is not surprising they are left with the impression that it has been mutilated. Yet I stress care is taken and trees do regain an acceptable and pleasing shape after a couple of years and with subsequent trimming.

The existing standards have not in the past been made public, and this has probably been the cause of many misconceptions. The consultants have recommended that action be taken to provide a mechanism for public agreement and notification of standards. I know that my colleague the Minister for Environment and Planning has a particular interest in this question, and we will be pursuing the matter.

I had discussions with the Chairman and General Manager of the Trust on these questions this morning. The General Manager has indicated that as an interim measure the Trust will be taking steps to advise interested environmental groups of the nature of the present standards in this complex area. ETSA is currently assessing the report to determine what actions should be taken internally to implement its recommendations. Last Saturday ETSA advertised for foresters and horticulturists to join its distribution and customer services division. This was on one of the report's recommendations.

As I informed the House on a previous occasion, ETSA has in the past received assistance through the Botanic Gardens advisory officer and has a number of staff who have particular expertise in this area. However, I think that the appointment of qualified foresters and horticulturists demonstrates that the Trust is determined to develop its own professional expertise in this area. The professional staff to which I referred will be involved in such activities as developing and monitoring better methods of trimming, training of field staff, assessment of environmental and heritage factors associated with line clearing, and the development of alternative control methods.

CEP GRANTS

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Will the Deputy Premier say whether it is the practice of the South Australian consultative committee which assesses applications for Community Employment Programme grants to consult relevant State and Federal Government departments regarding the merits of these applications? If so, was the Department of Tourism consulted by the committee regarding the

Storemen and Packers Union's application for the redevelopment of its caravan park at Policeman's Point and, if not, why not?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I am not in a position to advise the honourable member whether or not the consultative committee checks with departments. It is the secretariat's and the consultative committee's responsibility to assess the programmes as they are put forward by the sponsors. The project concerning the Storemen and Packers Union, about which the honourable member has been carrying on for four or five months, is one of the better projects that the sponsors put forward over a long period. It has been totally—

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Better than the Lady Nelson Park?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I will deal with the Lady Nelson Park in a moment if the honourable member wants me to.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Yes, do.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Well, I will; I will deal with that as well. However, the project itself will provide for low wage earners the opportunity to have a holiday at very low prices. I do not know how the honourable member can even consider condemning that sort of situation. It is not only for Storemen and Packers Union members to use: any person in the low wage category can apply and if there are any vacancies can go ahead and use this facility. I think that the project was an extraordinarily good idea for the Storemen and Packers Union to put forward. There is nothing in the guidelines or the Constitution or anything morally to stop a union from putting forward a proposition of this nature. All sorts of community groups are putting forward sponsorships—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Is someone opposite saying that I put them up to it? That is a load of rubbish. I do not put anyone up for sponsoring. I have kept out of that completely. It may be the activity of the Liberal Party to put people up for things, but it certainly is not the activity of the Labor Party. I have deliberately kept myself out of talking to sponsors because I am not going to be accused of playing favourites in this area. There is an opportunity for people who are under a low wage concept to have a holiday in a decent caravan park at respectable prices and at prices they can afford.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: If the honourable member will be quiet she will hear the complete answer. I will get to the other point in a moment. In fact, the honourable member asked one question, but I am prepared to be liberal today and answer two. It will save her getting up again tomorrow and asking another question.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: No it won't.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: It will. It will save the honourable member time on the Mount Gambier matter. Having said that, I place on record that I think any project that assists the disadvantaged, the under-average wage people in the community, is a worthwhile project. In regard to the Storemen and Packers and the concept of sponsorship at Policeman's Point, that is a damn good project. I want further to congratulate the consultative committee for recommending such a project so that people can get the use of it.

Mr BECKER: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker, and seek your guidance and ruling. The Auditor-General's Report was tabled in the House today and insufficient copies were made available to members. What is the policy in relation to the tabling of reports?

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. I can understand, however, that the honourable member is unhappy if he has not received a copy and I will set things in motion to remedy the situation.

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

TRANSPLANTATION AND ANATOMY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Tourism): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The purpose of this short Bill is to facilitate the continuing operation of the Lions Eye Bank of S.A. Honourable members will recall that South Australia's transplantation and anatomy laws were rewritten during 1983. Part III of the new legislation, which recently came into force, provides for the authorised removal of tissue from the body of a deceased person, for the purpose of transplantation to the body of a living person, or for other therapeutic, medical or scientific purposes. Section 24 of the Act envisages that a medical practitioner will carry out the removal of the tissue. (In fact, research on the point has shown that since the old Anatomy Act of 1954, persons other than medical practitioners have been forbidden from removing eyes or any other tissue.)

It has recently been brought to the Government's attention that the provisions of new section 24 cause practical difficulties for the effective operation of the Lions Eye Bank of S.A. As honourable members may be aware, we have in South Australia an eye bank which is at the forefront of eye banking at an international level. Financed by the Lions Save Sight Foundation and housed at Flinders Medical Centre, the Lions Eye Bank under the medical direction of Professor Douglas Coster, has achieved an enviable reputation.

Its main functions are to collect, store and distribute eyes for corneal grafting; to undertake research into corneal grafting; and, to increase community awareness about organ donation and corneal grafting. Since it began in December 1982, the Eye Bank has collected 164 pairs of eyes, providing material for 121 sight restoring corneal grafts.

The majority of eyes (108 pairs) have come from Coroner's cases at the City Mortuary, with the remainder coming from metropolitan hospitals. The practice which the Eye Bank has followed, and which has proved to be most effective, is to have the excision of eyes undertaken by a specially trained technician. Great care is taken to ensure that consent is obtained for the tissue removal. The excision needs to be done in such a manner that the best possible cosmetic and aesthetic result is achieved, and the specially trained technician takes particular account of that aspect. The person currently performing this task is both a nurse and a science graduate.

The persons involved in conducting the Lions Eye Bank are most anxious that the success of the corneal grafting programme not be jeopardised and that present practices be allowed to continue. As I have indicated earlier, the provisions of section 24 of the Act restate requirements

which have existed for some 30 years. However, their inclusion in the new legislation has highlighted them as an obstacle to the work of the Eye Bank.

The Government is anxious to facilitate the continuation of the excellent work of the Eye Bank. Accordingly, an amendment is proposed to broaden the provisions of section 24, to allow a medical practitioner or an authorised person to carry out the removal of tissue for the purpose of corneal transplantation. Honourable members will note that it is only in relation to removal of tissue for corneal transplantation that it is proposed to allow a departure from the general requirement of medical practitioner removal of tissue. In addition, to ensure that there is adequate control over the choice of persons who may be appointed as authorised persons, the appointment is to be made by the Director-General of Medical Services or his delegate.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 24 of the principal Act. Subsection (1) of that subsection is struck out and a new subsection substituted, providing as follows: An authority given under the Part is sufficient authority for the removal of tissue from the body of a specified deceased person. The tissue must be used for the purpose of transplantation to the body of a living person or for other therapeutic, medical or scientific purposes. The tissue must be removed by (a) a medical practitioner (not being one referred to in subsection (2) or, in the case to which section 21 applies, the designated officer for the hospital) or (b) where the tissue is to be removed for the purpose of corneal transplantation—an authorised person or a medical practitioner entitled under paragraph (a) to carry out the removal. New subsection (4) is inserted for the purpose of defining 'authorised person'—a person other than a medical practitioner, appointed by the Director-General of Medical Services or his delegate to be an authorised person for the purposes of the section.

Mr EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 30 August. Page 686.)

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): Before responding to the Budget presented by the Treasurer, I wish to pay a tribute to the Under Treasurer, who will be retiring in November. Mr Ron Barnes has loyally served successive South Australian Governments for more than 40 years and his standing amongst Treasury officials becomes readily apparent during Premiers Conferences. Whilst I wish Mr Barnes well in retirement, I am pleased that he will not be severing all association with public service, and I look forward to the contribution he will continue to make to the Electricity Trust, the Pipelines Authority and the South Australian Oil and Gas Corporation.

This Government, and this Premier in particular, want to ensure that 1986 is truly a year to remember. Not only will we be celebrating South Australia's Jubilee in 1986, but it will be the year of the \$1 billion tax grab. That will be the result if the Premier is given the opportunity to go on increasing State tax collections in the next two Budgets at the same rate he has in his first two Budgets.

This Budget estimates total tax collections at \$766.8 million in 1984-85. That means a 39.7 per cent increase in just two years—three times the rate of inflation—and a projected growth in tax collections in real terms of 27.1 per cent since July 1983. If the same growth rate is maintained for the next two Budgets, the 1986 appropriations will propose tax collections of \$1 071 million—just over \$1 billion. This is

the stark and distinct possibility now facing South Australian taxpayers under this Premier. Yet, two years ago, almost to this very day, in this House, this Premier criticised the former Government because tax collections had exceeded \$500 million for the first time.

And less than two years ago, in his election policy speech, this Premier promised no tax increases under a Labor Government before 1986, the year in which, at the present rate of growth, he would take more than \$1 000 million from us in State taxation. What this Budget exposes is the political version of the Fine Cotton hoax. The Premier, who made his run for office promising no tax increases, will finish as the greatest tax collector in our history. And the people he has duped, the taxpayers of South Australia, will be continuing to count their losses for a long time. Let the House just consider some of the other milestones in this Budget.

It means that total State tax collections are doubling in just six years, between 1979 and 1985, and the greatest areas of growth affect those South Australians least able to afford the higher prices which this Premier's higher taxes are generating. Taxation collected from cigarette sales will double in two years. Motorists, and wine, beer and spirit drinkers fare a little better. It has taken three years to double the tax take from them through petroleum business franchise fees and liquor licences. The tax on electricity consumers is almost doubling in three years. By the end of this financial year, stamp duty collections will have doubled in four years, and water and sewerage rate receipts will be doubled within six years.

This is the end result of Government revenue raising roaring ahead at way above inflation—three times the rate of CPI under this Premier. The former Government cannot be blamed. The four Budgets introduced by the former Government increased tax collections by 42.7 per cent or 5.7 per cent below the inflation rate for the period—a period in which Government budgeting was made extremely difficult because of unstable and unpredictable movements in costs, particularly wages. It has taken this Premier just two Budgets to raise tax collections in the same percentage terms. Yet, this Premier says in these Budget papers that his taxation growth is 'modest and responsible'. When he says that, we know why he has not called a Budget summit this year: his credibility will not withstand any scrutiny, even the slightest public scrutiny.

In June, the Premier was arguing with my Deputy Leader about whether South Australia was the fourth or fifth highest taxed State per capita. At present, we are in clear fourth position, and during this financial year we could rise above Western Australia as the State with the third highest taxes per capita. Only two years ago, we were the lowest, under a Liberal Government.

By the end of this financial year, State taxation in South Australia will be the equivalent of \$10.95 a week for every man, woman and child—or \$569.40 annually. In addition, some 138 separate charges have been increased by this Premier, who promised in his election policy not to use charges as a form of back-door taxation. Record taxes and charges are the bottom line of this Budget—the bottom line which this Premier wanted to hide during his orgy of orchestrated pre-Budget announcements.

These announcements were as unsuccessful as they were calculated in their attempt to hide the great tax hoax. Some of the announcements were deceptions in themselves, as I will prove in a moment. But first, let me record that the Budget speech of the Premier nails him once and for all to the cross of deliberate deceit and dissembling on the reasons for this massive increase in State taxes and charges. It exposes yet again the fact that the Premier won office without any semblance of an honest economic strategy.

I take the House back first to the period of the former Government and its record of reducing taxes to the lowest per capita in Australia. Published figures prove that record. ABS figures show that for the 1981-82 financial year per capita State taxation in South Australia was an annual \$355.01—the lowest of any State. Despite that record, the Leader of the Opposition, as the Premier then was, made constant allegations of high taxation, in his typically untruthful way. Let me remind the House of some of his words. In a press statement on 22 October 1981, he said:

It's now quite clear that increased State charges and taxes are fuelling Adelaide's higher inflation rate.

In his much vaunted Economic Plan, stage 1 (I might add we never got to see stage 2 and I can understand why) released in May 1982, the Premier alleged of the former Government that 'it is in fact a high tax Government'—the words of the Premier (then Leader of the Opposition).

In a press statement on 25 August 1982—just over two years ago—the billion dollar taxer, as the Premier wants to become in two years from now, complained that, 'For the first time, the Government will receive more than half a billion dollars in State taxes.' Again, in a press statement on 20 September 1982, we heard him say, 'Premier Tonkin has been a high tax Premier.' In his Opposition report the following month, he commented that 'it is very difficult indeed for Mr Tonkin to sustain the claim that his is a low tax Government'. And he was at it again earlier this year.

In a statement on 27 February, after I had exposed some of the failings with FID—South Australia's first new tax in a decade—the Premier said:

The former Liberal Government in which Mr Olsen was a Minister, increased taxes by 69 per cent during its three-year term.

That statement was typical of the Premier's junior grade mathematical ability. The facts are that it was a sheer, shabby untruth, because the figure was 42.7 per cent, and well the Premier knows that. As I have already pointed out, that was 5.7 per cent below the rate of inflation for the period.

But the Premier's deceptions when he was in Opposition did not end with the revenue side of the Budget. Not only did he constantly allege that the former Government was taxing too much, implying that it should have raised less revenue, but he also repeatedly called for more spending, and no use of capital funds to support the day-to-day outlays of Government departments. On the one hand, the Premier encouraged people to demand more Government services, especially in education, health, and community welfare. On the other, he also suggested more services could be provided at no extra cost to taxpayers. It was no economic strategy. It was as simple as it was irresponsible. It was blatant vote buying by a man who had never run a business and who does not know how to run a Government. It was treating the hard earned cash of South Australians like Monopoly money.

But the Premier has been caught cheating. He is a tax cheat and the dice are now loaded against him, because the facts speak for themselves. One fact—an unassailable fact—is that the former Government was a low tax Government. Unlike this Premier, it honoured its election promises. It cut taxes. It also cut its outgoings—responsibly, without affecting essential services or sacking public servants—to fund those tax cuts.

During a second term of Liberal Government, that strategy would have continued. That is why it has been nonsense for the Premier to claim—as he has constantly tried to do—that he was left with a recurrent deficit of \$109 million. Treasury figures made available to the former Government just before the last election give no support whatsoever to the allegation, and since I presented those figures to this

House on 16 December 1982, the Premier has never challenged them, because he cannot: they are documents supplied by the Under Treasurer (Mr Barnes).

I remind the Premier that those last Treasury figures made available to the former Government showed that a continuation of Liberal Government would have resulted in a deficit of just over \$13 million at the end of the 1982-83 financial year. That includes the full cost of our modest election promises, because we refused to run that election as if it were an auction. This estimate is based on hard facts and official Treasury figures.

It is also interesting to note that at the time of the last election, the former Premier, whose integrity this Premier constantly attempts to impugn, estimated that the election of a Labor Government would cost a family of five an extra \$9.49 per week. This was on the basis of departmental costings including Treasury costings of the ALP election promises. In fact, the former Premier was rather charitable to his successor because, on the basis of the Estimates now presented in this Budget, the increase in State taxation since 1983 is the equivalent of an extra \$15.25 per week for a family of five.

It is in this context that this Premier's attempts to justify his tax increases must be seen. As the main basis of that justification, he has used a five page memorandum signed by the Under Treasurer which, on its author's own admission, contained rough figuring and was based on possibilities, assumptions, projections, forecasts and variables between \$30 million and \$55 million. It was the sort of document which Governments regularly receive on the progress of Budget Estimates. It was not the sort of document on which a financial strategy for a three year term of Government should be set in concrete, as the Premier has done.

Variations from one year to the next can significantly change original projections. For example, the Under Treasurer's minute did not anticipate the \$36 million windfall last financial year from stamp duty receipts—a windfall equivalent to more than half the record consolidated deficit which this Premier has run up. Indeed, the Under Treasurer's paper which the Premier continues to quote as a testament to Liberal Government mismanagement can now be seen as much more of a warning about Labor Government free spending.

The Premier knows his attempts to excuse his tax increases have not worked. They are in fact so discredited that he has now completely shifted the ground for attempting to argue the justification for a litany of broken election promises. While, from 1981 until recently, as I have just demonstrated by quoting his own words, the Premier argued that the former Liberal Government taxed too much, he is now saying in this Budget that it did not tax enough. The Premier made this statement in his Budget speech:

Over the past few years, the revenue base of the State has been depressed. This was due not only to the economic down-turn, but also to the policies of the former Government which undermined the financial base of the State without proper regard to the need to support the services which the community requires.

That statement is true only in so far as the financial base of this State does not have the capacity to fund the high spending policies of a Labor Government. It is, in fact, just one more pathetic and baseless attempt by the Premier to justify his broken promises. It exhibits all the brightness of a blackout.

The Premier has tried to have it all ways—blaming the former Government variously for not spending enough, spending more than the revenue base would support, taxing too much, and now not taxing enough. We have had more of the same in the lead up to and presentation of this Budget—of the Premier again squirming and turning, looking for any excuse for breaking election promises repeatedly

made and faithfully accepted by the electors, looking for any opportunity to hide the magnitude of his tax grab. For example, the Premier tried to hide the extent of the windfall in receipts from stamp duties generated by increased housing activity and motor vehicle sales.

On 18 April, he told this House in presenting the Supplementary Estimates that stamp duties were likely to bring in about \$20 million more than the original Budget Estimates. However, when he gave that estimate, the Premier was aware that, for the first nine months of the last financial year, \$126.6 million or 96 per cent of the original Budget Estimate of \$132 million had already been collected. To that stage, stamp duty revenue had been coming in at an average rate of \$14 million a month. However, the Premier then estimated that, for the remaining three months of the year, receipts would amount only to another \$25.4 million, or an average of \$8.5 million a month. That would have been a 40 per cent drop in monthly receipts for the last quarter, despite the Premier's continuing assurances about the boom in housing activity. The Premier has not yet explained the reasons for that major discrepancy.

In a statement on 16 July, I challenged him to do so, estimating that total stamp duty receipts for 1983-84 had exceeded Budget Estimates by \$36.2 million, or 27.4 per cent. There had never before been such an overrun in stamp duties. The previous largest was \$9.9 million in 1975-76, during the last housing boom. However, the Premier continued to attempt to conceal the truth.

In response to my statement, he was quoted in the *Advertiser* on 17 July as saying that the increase in stamp duty revenue would be about \$30 million. In fact, this Budget reveals that it was \$36.27 million. So, while on 16 July I was able to estimate the overrun to within 0.19 of 1 per cent of the actual amount, the estimate that the Premier gave on the same day was out by almost 17 per cent. And the figure he had given to Parliament on 18 April is now revealed as an underestimation of 44 per cent. It has been proved time and time again that the Premier has no capacity in the field of mathematics.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: That is not an isolated case. I am glad that the Premier uses that distinction. Let me use one or two other examples of the mathematical—

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Genius!

Mr OLSEN: No, genius is quite the wrong word, because a genius can usually get it right, and unfairly this Premier has not been able to do so—

The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: You tell the taxpayers of South Australia that. The greatest tax slug on South Australians in the history of the State has been provided by your Government.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: I do not really have to say much more to the people of South Australia. They recognise it, because it is coming out of their hip pockets. They understand who is taking them to the cleaners.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: I will talk about unemployment figures in a moment. I will put in the proper perspective this Premier's claim that he has turned around the great unemployment problem in South Australia.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: That is right. For the third month in a row we have had a down-turn, so what does he do? He has swapped over to seasonally adjusted figures. When the figures start getting a little difficult, the Premier starts using seasonally adjusted figures in order to get a different unemployment/employment ratio. Let me, however, be charitable to the Premier and say that he is no orphan in his Cabinet when it comes to fiddling the figures. I will demonstrate

that. On 22 June, the Minister of Mines and Energy, as Acting Minister of Water Resources, announced higher water and sewerage rates and, in doing so, suggested that the 'average increase per household' was only 13 per cent. In his announcement, the Minister quoted an average base rate for the last financial year of \$116.80, which gave an allowance of 259.6 kilolitres of water. The average base rate that he used for this financial year, however, was \$132, which gives an allowance of 249 kilolitres—10.6 kilolitres or 4.1 per cent less than in 1983-84. We really do not know why a different base was used until we reach the bottom line.

In quoting these average base rates, or different base rates to suit their argument, not only did the Minister fail to give the reasons for the anticipated reduction in consumption, but he also ignored the fact that 60 per cent of consumers pay additional rates for water used in excess of the allowance. Last financial year, the average total bill payable was \$165.30. This was \$48.50 in addition to the base rate to buy 107.7 kilolitres on top of the allowance, giving a total consumption of 367.3 kilolitres for the average household. To buy the same amount of water this financial year will cost \$194.70, an increase of 17.8 per cent for the average household—not the 13 per cent suggested publicly by the Minister. They were caught out. Again, their lack of mathematics was shown up. The Government tried once again to dupe the public of South Australia, but it did not get away with it.

This Government has now increased the price of water by 43.2 per cent since it came to office—from 37 cents to 53 cents per kilolitre. While the Premier consistently attacked the former Government for rises in water rates, these increases were much less than we are now experiencing at a time when inflation was rising at about twice the present rate and when wage movements, in particular, were most unpredictable. The water rate increase was announced immediately after the last Premiers' Conference. To further minimise the public reaction, the Premier sought to end speculation about any further significant tax or charge increases in the Budget. The Premier was very expansive after the Canberra Premiers' Conference; maybe the rare air there got to him.

In a statement reported in the *Advertiser* on 22 June and repeated in that newspaper the following day, the Premier said State taxes would not rise in the Budget. The range of taxes in the Budget is not great. There are 10 separate categories, one of which is motor vehicle taxation. Both the Commonwealth Grants Commission and the Australian Bureau of Statistics classify driver's licence fees and motor vehicle registrations as taxes for the purposes of calculating revenue raising by the States. The Premier knows this, and when he was Opposition Leader he always referred to them as State taxes and used them as a basis for calculating per capita taxation movements at various times.

It was only last week that the Premier spoke about wearing sackcloth and ashes. He asked how often he has to apologise for breaking his promises of November 1982. It is not only the promises that he made in November 1982 that have been broken. As recently as 22 June this year he was promising not to increase taxes, but taxes were increased in the Budget. So much for the plaintive pleas to the public of South Australia! Credibility is established on performance, but the credibility of the Premier based on his own performance is certainly wearing away. In the Budget speech, the Premier described the various taxes to which I have referred as being taxes but now they have become Clayton's taxes—the taxes which are not taxes when you are a Premier and about which you have to answer questions regarding putting them up—by 25 per cent for drivers' licences and 10 per cent for motor registrations. These are the seventh and eighth tax rises imposed by this Government.

Not content with attempting to mislead the public about these tax rises, after the Premiers Conference the Premier sought to soften this blow by announcing, the day before his Budget, what he called the first stage of a package of major road safety reforms to be funded in part by higher taxes on motorists. I am pleased that this package includes a zero blood alcohol level for novice drivers. Of course, that was Liberal Party policy, announced last March. I am pleased that the Government has picked up part of our policy initiative.

Let me also say to the Premier that in relation to the reduction in the overall speed limit from 110 km/h to 100 km/h he will not get the support of the Opposition. I give a commitment that, if this Government is able to get this measure through this Parliament, we will in Government return the speed limit to 110 km/h. One of the Premier's other so-called major reforms—

The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: The Premier is a little sensitive about this issue, as well he should be. One of the Premier's other so-called major reforms—

Mr Ashenden: But 10 km/h is nothing.

Mr OLSEN: It is largely cosmetic; it is nothing more than that.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Well, why are you condemning it?

Mr OLSEN: It has been widely condemned and we will condemn it. We will also indicate to the people of South Australia what we will do.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: It is another revenue raising measure.

Mr OLSEN: Yes, another revenue raising measure. The Premier's pre-Budget sell also included announcements about cuts in senior Public Service employment, tourism and capital works. Let me deal with each in turn because they contained more deliberate deceptions by the Premier—the chap who wants to be squeaky clean, forthright and honest with the people of South Australia. A report in the *Advertiser* on 28 August quoted the Premier as calling the Public Service cuts a 'no soft options initiative' and as saying that actual cuts would be made. This simply is not true. The public sector wage bill will not be reduced. The same amount of money will be spent on more positions.

When it is analysed (and the facts did not become apparent until the Opposition questioned the Premier in Parliament), all this decision amounts to is a token reshuffle of a small number of positions at senior levels of the Public Service. It is not a tough decision. It does not tackle the core of the problem—the rising size and cost of Government. The report tabled today by the Premier clearly indicates the significant rise in Public Service numbers in South Australia. They show that the Public Service has been increased by just under 3 000 people. Two days before the presentation of the Budget, the Premier announced what he said was a hefty 32.9 per cent increase in the tourism budget. However, when the Budget papers became available, and it was possible to compare like with like, it could be seen that recurrent spending by the Department this financial year would not be increasing by 32.9 per cent. The estimated increase in the Budget is 24.4 per cent. That is just a further deception to the people of South Australia. The Premier admits that it is right. He held a press conference.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Let us get on to that. Let me move on to that phase next. What the Premier's statement sought to emphasise in particular was spending on advertising promotion.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Let us look at the facts behind this grandiose announcement that the Premier made. Again, an analysis

of the Budget shows that the suggestions of a hefty increase are more illusory than real. The fact is that the actual increase in spending estimated in the Budget for advertising and promotion is 13 per cent, and much of that will be needed to cover the increases of 20 per cent in advertising media buying costs. So, it is some increase for the tourism budget that the Premier talks about! What the Premier did not explain in his pre-Budget announcement about tourism was that spending on town tourist offices will be cut in real terms, while allocations for regional associations barely match the inflation rate.

I recognise that tourism is important. The former Government significantly upgraded the Department and its spending, and I am pleased that the present Government has endorsed and followed our strategy. However, that is no justification for the fairy floss announcements made by the Premier which exaggerate the impact of Budget allocations. In his pre-Budget announcement about capital works spending, the Premier said that the increase in capital spending by Government departments and Budget supported agencies is around 16.3 per cent. That is not a figure that can be confirmed by reference to the Budget papers, because the detail simply is not in those papers. What the Budget papers do show is that capital spending directly through the Budget is up by \$25.3 million, or 6.5 per cent.

Housing remains the centre piece of the Premier's capital works spending allocations. The former Government boosted the Housing Trust's building programme to record levels, and the present Government has continued that trend. At the same time, the former Government demonstrated a concern in regard to limiting housing costs, but the present Government is ignoring that. The former Government used all means at its disposal to reduce housing costs by granting concessions on stamp duty for first home buyers, by removing the imposition of land tax on the principal place of residence, and by ensuring that building societies held down interest rates to the maximum extent possible. We also amended the Real Property Act to make it easier to obtain strata titles and to allow them to apply to buildings of any age. However, it can be demonstrated quite easily that the present Government is doing nothing to limit spiralling building costs. Figures published recently by the Real Estate Institute show that in Adelaide home prices leapt by 25 per cent last financial year—the highest rise of any capital city. This confirmed a trend world wide—

The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: What you are doing is pumping it up and pushing the low income earners further away from the dream of owning their own home, as I will demonstrate. This confirmed a worldwide trend revealed in figures published earlier this year in the March edition of the publication *The Building Economist*. I suggest that the Premier should obtain a copy of that publication and read it, as it might give him a few home truths. The figures given showed that building and construction costs in Adelaide were the most expensive of any capital city. They were put at more than 4 per cent above those applying in Sydney. This compares unfavourably with the figures for September 1982 when Adelaide had the second to lowest building figures in Australia and when the costs were 5 per cent cheaper than those in Sydney.

The reasons for the escalation in the price of major building and construction work include higher site allowances demanded by building unions which have circumvented the wages accord and increased workers compensation premiums. A major factor in forcing up home building prices has been the failure of the Government to make serviced building allotments available in metropolitan Adelaide. Another factor is the ruthless determination of the union movement, supported by the Government, to impose compulsory unionism

on the building industry, and particularly in regard to sub-contractors. I have previously provided the House with figures which show that between May last year and the time of the latest design and construct tender call by the Housing Trust the contracted building cost for three types of homes had risen by, respectively, 33.3 per cent, 26 per cent and 25.5 per cent. For the edification of the Minister of Housing and Construction, who has great difficulty getting anything straight—

Mr Ashenden: Unless a script is written for him.

Mr OLSEN: I noticed that on page 2 he ran into trouble when answering a Dorothy Dix question asked by the member for Hartley. For the benefit of the Minister of Housing and Construction, who so far has shown a complete inability to understand the reasons for the increases to which I referred, I emphasise that they relate only to building costs and do not include the cost of land. They were provided by a builder involved in the design and construct programme, so they are accurate figures. Those cost increases make it extremely unlikely that this financial year the Government will be able to meet the target in its capital works programme of 3 100 Housing Trust units from the funds allocated. The amount of the State's Loan funds proposed for spending on housing this financial year is the amount actually spent in 1983-84 as well as \$8.1 million from last year's Budget provision which was not spent. This means an increase of 5.5 per cent on actual spending last financial year. Therefore, it is not an increase in real terms at a time when building costs are rising at a much faster rate than the consumer price index.

Although housing funds from Commonwealth sources have increased by \$2.9 million, the total funding for housing from both State and Commonwealth sources will increase by only \$11.1 million this financial year to \$227.7 million—again allowing no real increase. I have referred to these facts because it is important that the Premier's pre-Budget announcements be seen in their full perspective, especially when so obviously they seek to debase the Budget presentation process by revealing carefully selected facts which cannot be checked against the full Budget lines—in other words, deceiving the media in South Australia and, in turn, trying to get a headline or two.

The Premier's attempts to sell this Budget have amounted to an attempt of media manipulation. I suppose that after the Premiers Conference he got the headline that he wanted on page 1, namely, '“No tax rises” says Bannon'. We know how accurate that headline was; we know how much meaning and sincerity there was behind that promise, as there has been behind all the promises by the Premier on taxes and charges. There are other examples which I could give and which touch on decisions in the Budget, particularly in regard to announcements and reannouncements of pay-roll tax exemptions and the setting up of the Small Business Corporation.

Let me run over this. It is interesting to get into perspective the performance of this Premier. He first announced the latest pay-roll tax exemptions on 2 February this year, and there were further announcements about the same decision on 20 March and 1 August. So he pumped that announcement up three times.

The decision to establish the Small Business Corporation (and it is interesting that he does not deny the fact) was first announced on 13 September last year, announced again on 2 December, reannounced with an identical statement on 2 February this year, and then announced for a fourth time on 12 March. Obviously, the Premier has been honouring so few election promises that when he does do something which he promised he has to keep telling the people about it so that at least they will believe he has delivered something from his policy speech.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: It's the Dunstan theory.

Mr OLSEN: The Dunstan theory, is it? Repetition! I will now deal in broad terms with some of the major items in this Budget. I refer, first, to the deficit. The outcome for the year just ended was an overall deficit of \$1.6 million, according to the Premier's figuring. We have already established what his capacity is in grade 1 mathematics. But these figures were manipulated by the intake of additional funds into the Budget from statutory authorities. The original estimate of funds to be taken into the Budget from statutory authorities was \$127.5 million, but for the 11 months to May this year only \$25 million of this amount had been transferred.

Note that up to May only \$25 million had been transferred or invested. During June there was a further inflow of \$109 million, resulting in an actual investment of funds from statutory authorities of \$134 million—\$6.5 million above the original estimate. By exceeding the estimated intake of funds from statutory authorities, the Premier has used the cash management facilities of the State Government Financing Authority to offset departmental over-spending. I suppose that it is the same as—

The Hon. Michael Wilson: That's dishonest.

Mr OLSEN: It is. It is a continual deception in which this Premier participates. I suppose it is the same as using Bankcard to supplement any short-fall in the monthly household budget: it has to be paid for some time. The Premier has used the Financing Authority to shore it up. But in this case, the extra investment of \$6.5 million made during June by statutory authorities had the effect of reducing the deficit for the year from \$8.1 million to \$1.6 million. That is an interesting set of figures to draw out. As a result, additional State Government debts beyond Budget estimates have been created. The provision in this Budget for interest on the public sector debt is \$225 million—or \$3.20 per week for every man, woman and child in South Australia.

I now turn to the transfer of capital funds. As I have already mentioned, the Premier, as Opposition Leader, constantly criticised the former Government when it transferred capital funds to support recurrent spending. Of course, he never at any time proposed alternatives to that practice, such as massive tax increases or sackings of public servants. Implicit in all his statements before the election was a commitment that as Premier he would stamp out this practice immediately. The reality, however, has once again failed to match the rhetoric. In the first three Budgets introduced by the former Government there was a net transfer of capital funds to recurrent expenditure of \$83.5 million. In the 1982-83 Budget, a further transfer of \$42 million was proposed.

In relation to talking about the 1982 Tonkin Budget, it must be kept in mind that for seven-twelfths of that financial year we—the Liberals—did not control the cheque book. We were not writing the cheques: the Labor Administration was writing those cheques.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Like they were going out of fashion.

Mr OLSEN: Indeed! It is interesting to note that the overspending occurred in that seven-twelfths of that year—the period during which this Government controlled the Treasury benches, as well Government members know. Its members know which departments overspent. The Minister of Health could not contain himself. Having been out for three years, he got in there and really let fly.

The Hon. H. Allison: They scrapped the Budget Review Committee, too.

Mr OLSEN: There is no end to it. In the article in the *Advertiser* it was at least acknowledged that we have the best mechanism for Budget control in South Australia. The net effect of that was that it saved taxes on South Australians. That was the bottom line. We got out of their hip pocket.

The Premier had responsibility for the Treasury for almost two thirds of that financial year but, rather than reduce capital transfers as he implied he would, he increased them in 1982-83 by \$9.9 million on that Budget estimate. He added another \$9.9 million to the \$42 million that we allocated. Last financial year, there were further transfers of \$28.1 million, and \$25 million is proposed this financial year. This amounts to \$63 million of capital fund transfers to support recurrent spending for which this Premier must take direct responsibility. In his Budget speech, the Premier refers to his Government's policy on this matter as a commitment 'to progressively reduce the use of capital funds for recurrent activities'. That is a far different commitment to the one that he implied before the last election.

As to overspending by Government departments, the Premier's statement about net overspending amounting to only \$7.9 million masks the real outcome. Once again, we see this cover up. In fact, total overspending for reasons other than wage and salary increases amounted to just over \$38 million in 1983-84.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Indeed. Obviously, the Minister of Health had not got the message in the first year in Government and repeated gross financial mismanagement in the second term.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: He was on a crusade.

Mr OLSEN: To tax people to the limit.

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: I do not mind a degree. I can understand the Government's concern that it has no confidence behind it all. But at least on this side of the House there are quite competent people in all the respective seats who have the capacity to make a contribution to a major debate such as this. I can understand the Premier's concern—not only his back bench but also his front bench would not have the capacity to contribute.

The Premier believes that underspending by some departments excuses overspending by others. I do not accept that. Total overspending by departments since this Government came to office, for reasons which the Premier has been unable to justify, amounts to well over \$50 million. No business or household budget can operate on that basis.

I now turn to State taxation. The Budget estimates real growth in tax collections this financial year of about 10.5 per cent. Such growth gave the Premier an opportunity to consider relief in a number of important areas which he has not taken. Following the imposition of the Federal sales tax on wine, I asked the Premier to reduce liquor licence fees by half of 1 per cent. This was because the Federal tax will automatically generate increased liquor licence fees for the State based on current levels of liquor licence receipts, and even allowing for some downturn in wine sales because of the sales tax, I have estimated the windfall for the State Government at about \$800 000 to \$1 million.

The Premier has given an estimate of \$100 000 but, if he accepts that, what he is actually predicting is a very significant downturn in wine sales during the next two years. Of course, the figure is purposely trotted out to give an under-estimation. Liquor licences have become a bonanza for the Premier. Total collections went up 20.1 per cent last financial year, and they are estimated to increase by another 36.6 per cent this year. I wonder what the publicans throughout the State think about that. On this basis, the Premier should be following the example set by the Victorian Premier, of giving some relief to the wine industry from the Federal sales tax. The Premier owes that to South Australia, following the statement he made on 2 March 1983—on the eve of the Federal election. Giving major reasons why South Australians should vote for Mr Hawke, the Premier said:

The Federal Labor Party has given a categorical assurance that it will not introduce any wine tax or excise. The Fraser Government, in contrast, refuses to give such an assurance and is committed to broadening Australia's tax base with the imposition of a sales tax. A wine tax would hit South Australia hard.

The only true part of that statement is its reference to the impact of a sales tax on South Australia, and we are now finding that out because Mr Hawke has broken his promise. In these circumstances, only a selfish Premier would ignore an obligation to consider some form of relief, particularly when, in that category, there will be a 36.6 per cent increase in the income derived by this Government.

I call on the Premier to think again about my proposal for a slight reduction in liquor licence fees to give some compensation to South Australia for this massive breach of faith on the part of the Hawke Labor Government. Another boom area of receipts is land tax. Collections went up 18.1 per cent last financial year, and it is predicted they will increase by 17.1 per cent this financial year. The former Government abolished land tax on the principal place of residence, but even this was not good enough for this Premier. He complained in his last Budget speech as Opposition Leader about increasing collections from land tax as a result of moderate growth in property values. More recently, there has been a rapid escalation in property values. I have produced detailed figures which show that this financial year many small businesses in particular are facing soaring land tax bills because of higher property valuations and the fact that there has been no review of the marginal land tax rates since 1977.

The increases I have identified so far are up to 86 per cent. Past State Governments have been prepared to review rates of land tax to reflect movements in property values. It is time this Government faced up to its responsibility. The Premier has also refused to consider any relief from the imposition of financial institutions duty.

While the three other Labor States which impose this tax have granted exemptions to local government, there is no similar provision foreshadowed in this Budget for South Australia. Such relief to local government would cost about \$400 000 in a full year at a time when receipts from FID are running well above the original estimates given by the Premier when he introduced this new tax. Here we have yet another example of deliberate misrepresentation to the Parliament.

The Premier told this House on 27 October last year when FID was introduced that it was anticipated the revenue to be raised in a full year from this source would be \$22 million. But this financial year—the first full 12 months of application of this tax—receipts are put at \$28.5 million, which represents a growth in real terms on the original estimate of more than 20 per cent.

And most of this burden will fall on ordinary South Australians, because it remains beyond doubt, despite the Premier's denials, that many larger financial transactions are being sent out of South Australia to avoid the FID net, and well he knows it. The Premier has tried to argue that the increases in driver's licence and motor registration fees are not higher taxes because the receipts generated are only applied for the benefit of road users. What is happening, in fact, is that this Government is putting much more of its taxes on motorists into general revenue.

Receipts from motor vehicle registrations and driver's licences go up 10.7 per cent this financial year. The full year effect of last year's increase in the petrol tax will result in a growth in collections from this tax over the two years of 68.6 per cent, but the proportion of receipts from driver's licence fees, motor registrations and the petrol tax being transferred to the Highways Fund for roadworks is declining. In the four Budgets introduced by the former Government,

an average of 46.1 per cent of all receipts from these sources was transferred to the Highways Fund.

Last financial year the proportion transferred was 40.3 per cent. This year it is estimated to be 39 per cent. The Government is diverting \$15 million collected in fuel tax into general revenue instead of the Highways Fund and then argues that it needs to raise driver's licence fees and motor registrations to help build new roads. What a nonsense that is—further deception and duping of the public of South Australia.

I have dealt at some length with the revenue side of this Budget because this is what the Premier has deliberately tried to play down and to misrepresent in introducing this Budget. I have exposed many fallacies and factual inaccuracies in his arguments. In the end analysis, what this Budget does achieve is to highlight the clear differences between the approaches of the present Government and my Party to the management of the State's finances.

During its term of office so far, this Government has permitted over-spending of more than \$50 million by Government departments which should have been avoided. This Government has also increased the size of the public sector pay-roll, when a Liberal Government would have gone on reducing it. As I mentioned, the figures tabled in the document today by the Premier indicate the massive increase in Public Service numbers.

I estimate this financial year the savings which a Liberal Government would be making in salaries to be about \$78 million. That figure is based on the difference between the level of public sector employment now and what it would have been had a Liberal Government been re-elected in 1982. With increasing public sector employment and allowing significant departmental overspending, this Government has ignored the opportunity to make savings of well over \$100 million. Instead, the taxes have been tolled. The rates of seven taxes have been increased, and one new tax has been introduced. I estimate the full year cost of these increases at just over \$90 million in 1984-85.

There was no need for those increases. Had they been avoided, the Government could still have allowed for a small increase in recurrent spending in real terms this financial year, based on its Budget figures. Had these taxes not been increased and recurrent spending reduced by an equivalent amount in 1984-85, growth in recurrent spending of about 6.2 per cent could still have been achieved this financial year. That would have been an increase of about 1 per cent in real terms, funded in the main through higher receipts from the existing tax base generated by the economic upturn. Instead, recurrent spending is going up by about 5.3 per cent in real terms this financial year.

I believe the high taxing, high spending strategy which the Premier has adopted to be particularly inappropriate to South Australia's needs in the present economic circumstances. It is a strategy based and dependent on continued economic recovery to sustain increasing levels of tax receipts, yet this Budget does little to help the non-government sector which creates most of the jobs and pays all the Government's bills. It is also a strategy which has expanded the revenue-generating requirements of the public sector at a time when the Commonwealth is considering changes to the tax-sharing arrangements for future years.

This means that in the next few years South Australia may have to become relatively more dependent on its own tax base than it has been in the past. That tax base is, I believe, already over-extended as a result of the policies of this Government. Those policies are going to magnify the impact of any reduction in South Australia's share of the tax-sharing grant. This financial year, that grant is estimated to provide 38.4 per cent of total recurrent receipts—the largest single component of those receipts. Any reduction

at all will require further significant increases in State taxation to support the level of public sector activity which this Government has built up and proposes to expand even further.

There can be no other way, because while royalties from resource development are going to increase significantly, they will not be sufficient to completely offset the impact of fall in our tax-sharing grant. As an illustration, a reduction of just 1.5 per cent in the tax-sharing grant South Australia is getting this financial year would almost wipe out the benefit to the Budget from the estimated 129 per cent increase in royalties this financial year.

There are other reasons to seriously question the economic policies of this Government. I refer, for example, to the most recent economic survey of the South Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry for the June quarter. This survey suggests that the greatest short-term gains for South Australia from the economic upturn have already been obtained. Yet in terms of jobs we are no better off than we were two years ago, and that is clearly demonstrated by the figures tabled today. South Australia's percentage of total employed people in Australia remains below the levels of the four years up to and including 1982. Unemployment has just increased for the third month in a row.

Despite the Premier's attempts to fudge the latest figures by arguing about seasonally adjusted trends, he has not reduced unemployment to the extent promised before the last election, and serious problems remain within specific sectors of the potential work force. For example, the percentage of our unemployed aged between 15 and 19 was 29 per cent in August this year—well above the national rate of 23.6 per cent and 2.5 per cent higher than it was one year ago. The proportion of our unemployed aged over 45 years was 6.5 per cent in May this year—well over double the figure two years ago.

Our job vacancy trends are also less encouraging than are those elsewhere. Between February and May this year, the estimated number of job vacancies in South Australia decreased from 3 400 to 2 500. On the May figures, South Australia has a rate of six vacancies per 1 000 jobs, compared with the national average of seven.

Retail sales, another important economic barometer, are also slipping. In June this year, we had 8.7 per cent of the national total, compared with 9.1 per cent a year earlier. This represented a reduction in real terms of more than \$15.5 million in sales. As Opposition Leader, the Premier often quoted with glee figures to show that Western Australia's population was expanding at a rate faster than was ours. At the end of 1982, Western Australia's population was 16 900 in excess of ours. During 1983, the gap widened to 26 700 persons. It is against this background that I quote this statement in the Chamber's survey:

The June quarter produced a satisfying modest improvement in the South Australian economy, but a substantial improvement still remains elusive.

I stress the word 'elusive', and ask the House to consider why it is that the sector of our economy that employs 75 per cent of all South Australians believes that the conditions necessary to sustain the recovery and provide long-term employment growth have not been established.

This is particularly the view of small business, which has the greatest capacity to increase employment quickly, yet the least capacity to absorb the imposts of this Government. The reality is that Government influences have become a major inhibitor of growth. Apart from low demand and high labour costs, this survey by the Chamber identified much more frequent mention of Government effects, including competition from Government authorities, as expansion constraints.

Because the Chamber says these Government originated constraints represent a relatively new and growing expansion constraint, future surveys are to seek further information about them. I do not believe that they will be difficult to identify. They will include record rises in State Government taxes and charges; growth in State public sector employment and strict limits on the allocation of Government tenders to the private sector, especially in public works and maintenance; escalating workers compensation premiums and other on costs generated by a number of factors, including the spread of compulsory unionism.

While economic recovery during the past 18 months has been due mainly to the wage pause, the ending of the drought and the international economic up-turn, these are factors largely beyond the control of any State Government. They have allowed South Australia to follow trends which are occurring throughout the Australian economy, but they have not produced the extent of activity or growth necessary to improve our economic position relative to the other States. And, in considering constraints to future growth, it can be seen that factors uniquely within the control of the State Government (particularly the three I have just mentioned—workers compensation, taxes and charges, and competition with the private sector) are going to have greater influence.

The present Government has no answer to these vital issues. The only answer in this Budget is to increase taxes and increase the size of government. This Government has plodded along, satisfied with recovery from the most recent recession at the same pace as the rest of Australia, ignoring that this will not be enough to save us from the next recession because of the continuing narrowness of South Australia's economic base.

'Bland' has been a common description of this Budget. It provides tired responses to dynamic circumstances. The Liberals have other ideas, and a record to prove that we can implement them. We will reduce Government interference in economic affairs. A fully developed, fully costed practical programme will be announced before the next election. Small business, in particular, needs deregulation, lower taxes and freedom from public sector competition, but these essentials are ignored in the Budget. Indeed, the *Government Gazette* of last Thursday nominates that on 1 October the fees for registration of business names will increase between 25 per cent and 60 per cent for the registration of business houses and the like in this State.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: What is the actual fee?

Mr OLSEN: The fees range from 25 per cent to 60 per cent and they average 36 per cent, and if the Minister does his sums he will understand that.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: What is the number of dollars?

Mr OLSEN: If the Minister has a look at the income figures for the Minister of Corporate Affairs and the cost of administering that Department, he will recognise that the Government is making a \$4 million profit and is still putting up the fees. The Government is taking the small business people to the cleaners. It is ripping it out of the small business people, making a profit on the registration of business names and the like—that is what it is doing.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: But what is the figure?

Mr OLSEN: One is \$50, and the Minister well knows it is \$50.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Come on!

Mr OLSEN: Obviously the Minister does not understand it. He does not even check the *Government Gazette* these days; so regularly are increases gazetted that Government members do not bother to read them. The fact is that the Government is socking out of the small business sector, the sector that has the capacity to create jobs and the least capacity to pay the increased fees, a profit of \$4 million.

So much for the want to create job opportunities for young South Australians.

Already, I have made major policy announcements on workers compensation, planning and industrial relations to demonstrate our commitment to helping business to grow, but what has this Government done? It has taken direct action to increase business costs by legislating to ensure that workers compensation premiums rise. And its response to the increasing rigidities of our industrial relations and wage setting systems is to give blind support to the ACTU's job protection claims and to propose occupational safety, health and welfare legislation which will be a further erosion of the rights of employers—further pace-setting legislation for this State that will impede the creation of job opportunities.

A Liberal Government also will be able to bring more resource development on stream more quickly, as it demonstrated between 1979 and 1982. Apparently the Premier has just discovered the benefits of resource development. He warned in his Economic Plan, stage 1, of the obvious dangers, as he called them, of placing too much emphasis on resource development. At various times he called Roxby Downs a mirage in the desert and pie in the sky. Now, the Roxby Downs development is one basis for the Premier's raising the possibility of tax cuts in years to come, although other uranium mined at Honeymoon and Beverley remains dangerous. Any promise that the Premier gives on taxes should be taken with a pinch of salt, as not too many of them materialise.

This is just one more example of this Government's complete failure to develop a credible and coherent economic strategy. Resource development is not by any means the only component, but it must be a significant component of any strategy to extend South Australia's present narrow economic base. Only a Liberal Government can implement such a strategy effectively, with vision and determination. Our record in Government, and the failures of this Government with mine closures and declining mineral exploration, prove that.

Another vital issue which this Government just is not addressing is the opportunity for South Australia to take advantage of rapidly expanding trade in the Asia-Pacific region. Business in South Australia must be encouraged to become more outward looking and more competitive, in order that jobs can be created and real living standards of all South Australians can be raised. But all this Government has done is increase the burdens and barriers which impede large, medium and small business. Business has already told the Government that this is the result of the Budget.

The next Liberal Government will reduce the burdens and the barriers. Government taxes and charges are increasingly eroding individual incentives and the ability of people to buy private sector goods and services. They are adding to business costs and increasing Government competition with the private sector. The extent of this Premier's tax grab has put the need for smaller government and tax cuts at the top of the agenda for the next election—at the top of the Notice Paper for the next Parliament. There must be tax cuts sooner rather than later, but they can be achieved responsibly through smaller government.

I believe that, if electors had known on 6 November 1982 that a vote for this Premier would result in the tax bill which this Budget presents them with, members opposite would still be on this side of the House. This Budget exposes the full extent of the Premier's dishonesty, deceit and dissembling. He is now on a course to become the billion dollar taxer in our Jubilee Year. But it will not be a Labor Government which presents the 1986 Budget. There can be no respite if the Premier wins another term of office.

The Australian Labor Party State Convention has already decided that. One of the economic resolutions passed at the most recent conference states:

Labor recognises that the present balance between the public and private sectors of the mixed economy does not provide an effective basis for economic recovery to restore full employment. It will therefore be necessary to significantly increase the scope and role of public equity and social ownership.

What this means is that any future Labor Government is committed to higher taxes; bigger government; and more Government interference. As the alternative, the next Liberal Government will reduce the tax burden on South Australians; reduce the size of government by rationalising resources and redefining priorities so that it establishes the conditions under which there can be better opportunities and long-term security for all South Australians; and reduce interference with the non-government sector of the economy which creates the community's wealth in the first place. We must understand that we must create the wealth before we have the capacity or ability to redistribute it.

In attempting to justify the tax burdens of this Budget, the Premier has continued to argue about the past, while ignoring the future. He has dealt in fiction and fantasy, but the fact is that the former Government managed an economic decline far better than this Government is managing economic up-turn. And it is another fact—an inevitable fact—that, if this Premier and this Party are allowed to pursue their policies, South Australians will face a billion dollar tax bill in 1986.

That is why it will not be a Labor Government that presents the 1986 Budget. It will be a Liberal Government with a vision for the future of South Australia and a practical strategy to make that vision a reality over the next 20 years. The only vision this government has is higher taxes and bigger government. A Liberal Government will bring an end to this tax madness, because there is a better way and a fairer way; it is the Liberal way.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I want to deal first with the latest handout from the Government, a recent innovation, a document termed 'Employment Aspects of the 1984-85 Budget'. This is new to us but we have had time to briefly peruse it, and if ever there was an indictment of the present Administration it is this document. It goes on at some length to describe what is happening in the employment system, quoting figures most advantageous to the Government. It indicates that there has been an increase of 3 000 people on the pay-roll in public sector employment from when it came to Government; 1 000 of them are full time. It makes a curious statement (certainly curious in logic) to justify the increase in the following terms:

Given the fragile nature of the recovery in the labour market, the Government believes that the maintenance of public sector employment is necessary to ensure that economic activity is sustained. Public employees, of course, also act as consumers of goods and services within the wider economic community. A significant reduction in public employment would therefore have a direct effect on private sector activity.

Following that argument to its logical conclusion, everyone would be on the public pay-roll. However, it is the people, via their rates and taxes, who are supporting that work force, and their spending power is proportionately diminished. To suggest by putting more people on the public pay-roll—

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Following your argument to its logical conclusion, you would have no Public Service.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am not saying that at all. I am saying that we keep it to a minimum.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Your argument follows in either direction.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: No, it does not. The public will pay a level of taxes to support a level of services which it believes and which the Government believes is justified. To pursue the argument, that by putting more people on the public pay-roll there are more consumers using more goods and that that is doing something about unemployment, is patently stupid. If we followed that to its logical conclusion, there would be a declining number of people in the community in active production, making goods, providing services and selling them, and everyone would be working for the Government. In contra-distinction to that statement the Premier acknowledges that:

It is recognised that some offset to the positive impact on employment of Government expenditure will occur as a result of Federal and State revenue raising to finance that expenditure.

The only way that extra people can be financed on the public pay-roll is by raising the level of taxes and charges which the community bears, thus reducing its spending power.

Despite all the figures quoted in the employment document the Government cannot get around two basic facts which indicate that its employment record has been disastrous. More people are out of work in South Australia at the moment than on the day that the Bannon Labor Government was elected to office. In November 1982, 54 200 people were unemployed; at the present time in South Australia 58 700 people who were in employment in 1982 are unemployed. In 1982 there were 560 500 and at present there are 558 600 employed in South Australia. There are fewer people in work now than when the Bannon Labor Government was elected.

These are the people who, in Opposition, day in and day out deplored the employment situation in this State which at that time was stable, and indicated to the public that they would do something about it. In fact, they have presided over a decline in employment in South Australia, in spite of the fact that the unemployment figures have been propped up by the enormous expenditure of Government funds on job creation schemes. The Premier went into the public arena last week and talked about \$93 million having been spent in South Australia on job creation schemes; that is taxpayers' funds, and that is reducing the ability of the community to demand and pay for goods and services. That spending power has been reduced in the community at large, it has reduced the markets for people who produce something to sell, because it has reduced the spending power of the community. That has been to create about 7 000 temporary jobs.

The Hon. H. Allison: Unemployment has risen to 9.7 per cent.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes. There are 7 000 temporary jobs, so those unemployment figures are padded by that number. Despite that padding and the enormous expenditure of \$93 million in South Australia alone on temporary jobs (because that is what they are), the unemployment situation has deteriorated very considerably under this Administration. Members opposite cannot get around that, no matter how many documents the Government likes to churn out to try to justify its Budget. We received this one today—

Mr Evans interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Of course. We need to add another 7 000 to that number of unemployed, and we see what a disastrous position prevails in this State as a result of the economic theories of the present Administration. All the Government has done is pad the unemployment figures by putting 3 000 people on the public pay-roll and 7 000 people into temporary employment, and we are still worse off. What is that from a Government whose one cry to the State was 'We will do something about employment'?

There are 27 per cent, no less, of young people between 18 and 20 unemployed. What an indictment of a Government that professed to be worried about unemployment to justify a level of taxation to do something about this. That figure of 27 per cent is acknowledged in this statement:

The position of the longer term unemployed is also of considerable concern. The average duration of unemployment actually rose in 1983-84...

That is said in its own document put out to support the Budget papers. The document goes on to talk about the \$5.7 million that the State Government has found from its own resources, but of course all of that \$93 million comes from the taxpayers. That reduces our spending power and the ability of people to sell goods, because that money has been taken out of the community. The Government says that it has put aside \$5.7 million of State funds to help with job creation, but in fact it has spent only \$2 million. That is buried away in the other Budget papers. The Government voted \$5.7 million and the same amount this year, but it had \$3.7 million left over from last year.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: So I suppose they will say that expenditure this year will be up 60 per cent on last year.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: That is the impression; that is the way in which it is written in today's hand-out. The Government is saying that it voted \$5.7 million out of State funds last year on job creation schemes but it spent only \$2 million. It voted \$5.7 million again this year, saying that it is making an enormous effort to create jobs with its own taxpayers' funds. However, despite the enormous infusion of funds from the Federal Government, the State Government spent only \$2 million of it. The Government therefore has \$3.7 million in reserve from last year, so it is merely spending \$2 million a year, although it keeps on saying that it is spending \$5.7 million a year of State funds on unemployment. That is a completely misleading and false statement.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: With road funds it underspent last year's allocation by \$5 million and on this year's Budget the Government can now boast an increase.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, and now claim that it has increased the allocation. The Government said that it would spend \$5.7 million of State funds on unemployment last year and this year but in fact it spent only \$2 million. It had \$3.7 million left over, yet it is saying that it will spend another \$5.7 million this year.

I must admit that I think John Stone's comments in relation to this enormous infusion of funds into temporary jobs waiting for something to turn up is something about which we ought to be worried. The Premier was boasting loud and long about the \$93 million that has been used in South Australia. That is an enormous amount of money, but all we have is higher unemployment than when the present Government came to office, fewer people in employment and an increased number of young people—27 per cent between the ages of 18 and 20—out of work. I am sorry that the Minister is leaving the Chamber, because I want to turn now to something with which he was involved some time ago.

The Government has had an enormous fillip in its Budget revenues by the addition of \$30 million mainly from the hydrocarbons, the oil development at Point Bonython. I went up there last week and I noticed that suddenly the Stony Point development has become a bipartisan effort. It was one of the initiatives of the producers and the Liberal Party between 1979 and 1982, but suddenly we have all become matey about it. The Premier has taken it to his bosom. He went up there and has his name on a plaque; they opened the thing last week—for the third time! The background to the concept of developing the liquid hydrocarbons of the Cooper Basin was mooted in 1970 (if I

remember correctly, that was when former Premier Dunstan came to power, so it goes back a long way), when oil was discovered in the Tirrawarra field. However, owing to the remote location of fields, their relatively small size and distance from each other, development beyond the marketing of dry gas was uneconomic.

Circumstances altered with the discovery of more oil and gas fields. In early 1980 Santos, on behalf of the 11 producers, announced the decision to proceed with the liquids project. This was during the life of the Liberal Government. Throughout 1981, events occurred in rapid succession. A site for the liquids terminal was selected, a route for the liquids pipeline chosen, environmental impact studies completed and approved by Government and an indenture agreement with the South Australian Parliament drawn up and ratified by Parliament. There was an agreement with the Liberal Government actually, but it was ratified by Parliament. These procedures were finalised in the 12 months. The final formality, that of establishing the terms of agreement among the 11 participating companies, was completed on 31 December 1981.

Then the producers go on to talk about a bipartisan approach, but at that time the Labor Party said we were going too fast. Of course, the Premier last week did not think that we had gone too fast: he rubbed his hands with glee about the fact that \$30 million would flow into the South Australian Treasury. However, he still felt it imperative to inflict a record tax slug on the public of South Australia. He was rubbing his hands together because, now that oil was flowing, so were revenues into the State Budget. This is what the Hon. Don Hopgood said during the debate after I had presented the indenture arrangements to Parliament. I am sorry that Dr Hopgood has just left the Chamber.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: What was the date?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: This was 8 December 1981. I was well aware of the fact that if the project was to get off the ground the arrangements with international banks which were to finance the project had to be completed by the end of the year. I had made that clear, but all the Labor Party did was whinge and whine about the fact that we were going too fast. We were trying to get this enormous \$1.5 billion project off the ground, not particularly for our benefit, but for the benefit of the taxpayers of this State, a project that would create employment and generate revenue to keep a tab on our tax slug commitments. However, all that members of the Labor Party could say in debate was that we were going too fast and that we should have hung around longer and allowed more time so that the public could complain longer. During the debate on 8 December 1981, the Hon. D.J. Hopgood stated:

It is not my desire to overly delay the House in this matter. I want to direct my remarks to several specific matters, and if members peruse the transcript carefully, they will note that these matters were raised fairly frequently by the witnesses who came before the committee.

He then goes on to deal with two matters—one concerning the speed with which the project was negotiated and settled and the other about an environmental matter. Dr Hopgood wanted to put in a dissenting report, but was prevented from doing so, because, of course, as is the case with select committees, the Government had a majority of members. In regard to his motion, this is what Dr Hopgood wanted to write into the report. He said:

I think it is important, though, that the House should hear what it says. It is as follows:

A common feature of the evidence was the complaint that witnesses had had too little time in which to study the Bill and prepare material for presentation. The Committee draws the House's attention to the first schedule of the Bill and clause 7 of the indenture. The first schedule indicates that the document was signed on 26 November. Clause 7 states:

7. If the Stony Point (Liquids Project) Ratification Bill, 1981, does not come into operation as an Act on or before 31 December 1981, or such later date as the parties to this indenture may agree in writing, in the same terms as those now contained in the Stony Point (Liquids Project) Ratification Bill, 1981, or in such other terms as the parties hereto otherwise may agree in writing, this indenture shall lapse on and with effect from that date...

He continued:

At the time of signing of the indenture it was common knowledge that the Parliament was to sit until 10 December, that is, clause 7 was agreed to in the knowledge that Parliament had six sitting days in which to process the legislation. The life of a Select Committee should ideally be determined by the quantity of evidence placed before it and the complexity of the matters addressed. In this instance we found a good deal of public interest and concern. The Committee is not unsympathetic to the company's desire for early Parliamentary approval, particularly in order that financial arrangements be completed but on balance it accepts the argument that more time should have been made available for Parliamentary consideration.

So, the Hon. Don Hopgood did not want the Government to pass the indenture in December 1981. He, and I presume the present Minister of Mines and Energy (who was also on the Select Committee), complained that the Liberal Government was going too fast, that we had completed the negotiations and put the matter to Parliament too quickly. However, the former Government went to no end of trouble. The member for Eyre (Graham Gunn) was a member of that Select Committee. To suit the convenience of the people at Whyalla we organised a sitting of the Select Committee at Whyalla, and we stayed until we had heard from all the witnesses. No-one was denied the opportunity of appearing before that Select Committee. However, the Labor Party wanted two bob each way; it wanted the Liberal Party to get on with the job and get the project up and running, but it also wanted to delay it.

Here we are now with the big bipartisan approach. What a lot of hoo-hah! There was the Premier up there rubbing his hands together with glee as he unveiled a plaque to commemorate the first LPG ship from Japan, while the biggest contract ever written was negotiated by the former Liberal Government. So much for the Labor Government's sudden interest in resource development! Also, we know that the Labor Party sought to defeat the Roxby Downs indenture Bill. Suddenly reference is made in the Budget to the fact that maybe in due course some royalties will flow to the State's coffers from that enormous mining development and that we may see some tax relief. What absolute hypocrisy from a Government that did its utmost to slow up and delay those multi billion dollar developments.

The tragedy of it all is that not only did members of the Labor Party complain about the speed with which we were seeking to negotiate and complete those negotiations for the benefit of everyone in South Australia but also they slammed the door shut on other developments of the same magnitude in total. I shall not further take up the time of the House on this matter. I simply point out that the Government's new-found interest in resource development points out the absolute hypocrisy of its stance over the years. Secondly, I make the point that the election of the Labor Government put resource development back not only three years (the life of the Labor Government) but probably at least five years and maybe more, because of some of the other multi million dollar projects on which the door was slammed shut due to the Labor Party's not knowing where to jump on the uranium issue.

Some of those projects will be very hard to revive. Certainly, those involving uranium enrichment will be very hard to revive in the next few years, according to discussions I have had with people with whom we had close contact in the United Kingdom. Certainly, in the short term it will be very hard to resuscitate that billion dollar project. That is

one of the tragedies of the accession of the Labor Government.

I want to refer to some other matters in the Budget. Of course, the Premier's complete hoodwinking of the public is now legion. Let us refresh our memories about what he had to say when in Opposition. This is what the present Premier said about life under the Liberals:

Charges that have been increased include electricity, water and sewerage levies, hospital charges, and bus, tram and train fares. These 'backdoor' taxes hit ordinary families hardest. I have called for this freeze because thousands of South Australian families cannot make ends meet with the rising home loan repayments and the extra costs involved with new health insurance arrangements from 1 September. People cannot cope with more increases in State charges as well.

I would say that now the situation is miles worse, as it has been exacerbated greatly during the past 18 months while the Labor Government has been in office. I hear complaints that the ability of the average family member to pay has diminished enormously under this Government. The end result is, as I pointed out earlier in my remarks, that we now have more people out of work than when the Government was elected. What a record! I read now from a press statement of Mr Bannon dated 27 August 1981 calling for a 12 months freeze:

Since the commencement of the 1980-81 financial year, almost 100 separate charges have been increased. These include electricity tariffs, water and sewerage rates, bus and train fares, harbor charges, dwelling rents and many others. Charges for State services now are at record levels.

Well we know that State charges have increased at twice the rate under Labor than they did under the Liberal Administration. The Premier made the following statement in 'South Australia's Economic Future—Stage I', published on 27 May 1982:

We will not allow State charges—like transport fares, electricity and hospital charges—to be used as a form of backdoor taxation.

In his election policy speech on 25 October 1982 the Premier said:

We will not increase taxes or introduce any new taxes.

He repeated the statement about no backdoor taxation. What is the Government's record? It threw those promises to the wind very early in the piece. The Government keeps perpetrating this myth that it inherited a deficit. Unfortunately, some members of the media have swallowed that line. Members opposite did not inherit a deficit. They were in control of that Budget—a balanced Budget had been put to Parliament. They controlled that Budget for seven months of the financial year. The Government did not have anything like a Budget Review Committee or any mechanism at all for overseeing departmental expenditure. There was an enormous blow-out, and members opposite claimed that they inherited a deficit from the Liberals. They inherited a balanced Budget from the Liberals, but they have perpetrated this myth which, unfortunately, they have managed to sell in one or two quarters.

This is what happened to taxes under Bannon: in 1983-84 five taxes were increased when he stated that none would be; financial institutions duty was introduced when he stated that no new tax would be introduced; and estimates of State taxation up to this Budget indicated that during the past financial year State tax collections increased from \$549.1 million to \$663.5 million—an increase of 21 per cent. That was an increase in tax take during the 12 months. The Premier has not disputed this. Average ETSA accounts increased by 26 per cent; average water bills went up by 18.4 per cent—way ahead of inflation; and bus fares for an average family went up, before the recent increases, by 36.5 per cent. Since November 1982, 128 State charges have increased and more have increased since then—one charge

every five days has increased under this Administration. One State charge goes up every five days!

Mr Becker: Working days?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: That is every five days. This is just a start. We know that water rates have gone up again; and we know that STA fares have gone up again by 16 per cent, making an increase of 54 per cent, no less, since this Government came to office. This is a Premier who said that he would not use bus fares or electricity and water charges as a form of back-door taxation. Fares have gone up 54 per cent. What a record! All of this is in what I believe to be a declining economic situation.

I also want to mention briefly the inability of this Premier to carry a fight when the interests of the State need a strong advocate to put a point of view. Let us sit down and have a pow-wow, he says. Let us have a committee; let us talk about it. What has he done about this wine tax? What did he do about the railway line to Darwin, except to say that there will be a committee? One knows darned well that, once the Federal Government has made a decision and set up a committee, one could sit down and write the report oneself.

The Labor Party said that it would build the Alice Springs to Darwin railway, linking South Australia to Darwin—it was a clear election promise. They got in and wiped it. They said they would not tax superannuation—they got in and taxed it. They said they would not impose a wine tax—they got in and imposed that too. But, my point is, what has the Premier done to look after the interests of this State? What fight has he shown? At least Premier Dunstan would have had the gumption to criticise his Canberra colleagues. Is the position of the Premier of South Australia so weak within the Labor Party? Is he so frightened? Does he have to watch his back all the time?

We know that the Premier is not the traditional product of the trade union movement and that therefore his strength within the Party may be questionable. Premier Dunstan was not a product of the union movement, but at least he was able to get the numbers to have some strength within the Party, so that at least on occasions he could take on the Federal Government. Of course, he had no problem in regard to the Liberal Government, and that is traditional. But I remember occasions when he took on the Labor Government in Canberra. What does this Premier do? Let us sit down and have a pow-wow, he says; let us quietly acquiesce in setting up a committee to have a look at it! We all know that, once a decision is made, even if a committee is set up, that is the end of the shooting match. What happened with the Darwin to Alice Springs railway has happened time and time again. It has happened in regard to the wine tax, which is disastrous for South Australia.

I do not know whether this has dawned on members opposite, because the wine growing areas are held by Liberal members, so it is not so close to home for them, I suppose. But this Government that says it is doing so much to ease unemployment (when in fact it is doing absolutely nothing and its record shows that it presided over deterioration of employment) should know that the wine tax is expected to have a devastating effect on South Australia, which produces 60 per cent of the nation's wine. Surely, that would be enough to get the Premier off his backside and banging on the Prime Minister's door. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics estimates the impact of a 10 per cent sales tax on wine is a slump in sales of 4.3 per cent initially and 13.5 per cent in the long term.

Professor K. W. Clements of the University of Western Australia estimates that 4 000 jobs will be lost in the wine and ancillary industries in South Australia and 45 000 nationally, and here is a Government that says it is doing something about unemployment in the home of the wine

industry. What do we have—a bit of a weak squawk from the Premier that 'We will see what the committee comes up with', as happened in regard to the Alice Springs railway. The battle is over unless he gets over there and really gets stuck into his Federal colleagues. However, as I said, I do not think that he has enough strength in the Labor movement. I think that he is a follower, not a leader, in that movement.

Where has the Premier been in the uranium debate—following the leader. At least Prime Minister Hawke has tried to talk some sense into the councils of the Labor Party, and in regard to some of the resolutions that I will be debating tomorrow I will quote the Hon. P.A. Walsh, Minister for Resources and Energy. At least they have tried. What has the Premier of this State done? He has done nothing. He has sat back, let events roll on and not taken a lead for fear that someone in the Party might upset someone else. What a weak leadership when the interests of the State are in jeopardy!

Returning to the wine tax for a moment, it is estimated that the tax will lead to a production drop of 24 million litres in production in this State. This is the equivalent of 2.5 million cases of wine or two cases of wine for every South Australian per year. The estimated reduction in grape intake from South Australian growers will be about 39 000 tonnes annually, a drop of 16 per cent based on the latest figures for material used in wine production. Payment to growers is expected to decline by about \$9 million annually in the long term. I can speak from first hand experience—the people on the receiving end of any taxes of this nature or any downturn in the industry are the grapegrowers. They are the people who cop it: they are the people who are vulnerable.

It is all very well to talk about the tax on beer. Grain growers have other outlets for their products. What do grapegrowers do with their product? They cannot sell it abroad for food. Grapes are either turned into wine or they rot on the vines. Grapegrowers have no other outlet for their production, so to say that because there is a tax on beer there should be a tax on wine is a fallacious argument. I know that very powerful lobby groups argue in that way. But the fact is that the people who cop it are the people on the end of the line, and they are the grapegrowers. They are the people whom I and the other members who represent grapegrowing areas are here to represent. What will we do with those people? It is hard enough to keep the rising generation on the land now. Will they work longer hours, prune in the middle of winter and stay there when their returns diminish?

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

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON (Torrens): I would like to begin by paying a tribute to the Under Treasurer, Mr Ron Barnes, who is to retire in November. I consider it an absolute privilege to have worked with Mr Barnes when I was a Minister in the former Government. He is a very great public servant and probably one of the finest public servants of his type in Australia. He was a very good Under Treasurer. He used to fight very hard for the Treasury and that did not mean that Ministers always agreed with him. However, his attention to duty and his idea of what was correct in government were impeccable.

On one or two occasions the Under Treasurer, or the Treasury itself, led by him, wished me, as the then Minister of Transport, to take action that I did not think was warranted. Mr Barnes always put his case well. It was extremely well documented and no-one could be blamed for accepting his advice, because I do not believe that any other public servant in Australia has ever had so much respect.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: I forgot to mention it, but I want to be associated with those comments.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: The Deputy Leader has supported those comments and he would know more than most members in this House the abilities of Mr Ron Barnes, because the Deputy Leader is a former Chairman of the Budget Review Committee, which showed the dedication of the then Government to tight fiscal control of the moneys of this State. That is something that is seriously lacking in the present Government.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: I want to endorse those comments about Mr Barnes entirely.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: The Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader have dealt in some detail with the current Budget and I wish to make a few remarks about the Premier and his Budget strategy. As far as the Premier's Budget speech is concerned, I wish to confine my remarks to the fact that once again the Premier has blamed the former Government for his own financial problems—financial problems of his own making. I want to point out to the House what the Premier did to try to correct his so-called financial problems.

For the past two years this Premier has blamed the former Government for his budgetary problems. So, we have a Premier who came into office with so-called financial problems, and what does he do? How does he correct them? He puts another 1 000 people on the pay-roll: that is how he corrects what he considers to be financial problems, despite the fact that the Under Treasurer, Mr Barnes, about whom we have just been talking, provided a document to the Liberal Government at the time of the last election which showed that there would be a Budget deficit in 1982-83 of only \$13.1 million. Despite having a document signed by a very respected public servant, the Premier has continually blamed the former Government for his own mismanagement.

One might say, 'Well, is this figure of 1 000 extra public servants right? Where do we get those figures from? Are we just plucking them out of the air? Are they figures that were dreamed up by the Opposition?' The figures come from the document that the Premier tabled today 'Employment aspects of the 1984-85 Budget'—the new approach of the Premier. Let me read the figures. Table 3.1 on page 7 of that document gives the number of employees in the State public sector. It is stated that in June 1982, 96 259 persons were employed in the State public sector; in June 1984, 99 080 persons were employed in the State public sector. That is a difference of some 2 700 employees. One might say then, of course, that some of those might be part time, so let us look at the full time equivalents.

Mr Klunder: Have you looked at the full time equivalents?

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: In June 1982 there were 89 444 full time equivalents, and I mention this for the member for Newland. In 1984 there were 90 459.5 full time equivalents. That is a difference of nearly 1 000 extra people on the Public Service pay-roll, which is this Premier's solution for curing the financial problems of this State. Another 1 000 public servants is equivalent to about \$20 million in wages. Indeed, that is about the same amount that the Premier originally predicted he would receive from his new financial institutions duty. That is budgeting, if one likes. There is a self-made financial problem because of irresponsible promises made before an election. There is that problem, so what does the Government do? It adds another 1 000 people to the pay-roll and increases costs by at least \$20 million in that area—

Mr Mayes: You would have cut down on school assistants and teachers aides.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: —and then, of course, hikes taxes and charges to the enormous rate that has

occurred over the past two years (and the answer to the member for Unley's question is 'No'). What an extraordinary Budget strategy that is. We are using the figures contained in the Premier's own document today. The education Budget shows an increase in real terms this year for the Education Department. In fact, on my calculations it shows an increase of approximately 13.7 per cent.

If I remember correctly, last year the increase was about 4 per cent in real terms, but this year it is about 13.7 per cent. It is extremely difficult to get the exact increase in real terms from that figure because, if one allows 5 per cent for inflation (which is the predicted rate), we are back to 8.7 per cent, but we are told that this year for the first time a proportion of the round sum allowance has been included in the departmental estimates. I am not aware of the percentage that has been allocated from the round sum allowance to the departmental estimates, but I estimate it to be some 3 per cent.

So, on my calculations we see an increase in real terms of about 5 per cent in the Education Department budget. I do not criticise that at all, but I do say at this stage, to put the Minister on notice, that in the Estimates Committee I will require far more detail than is present in this document. However, if we compare education expenditure as a percentage of the total State expenditure, we find that that percentage is once again reduced on what it was last year. In fact, the highest percentage of the State Budget ever allocated to education was under the stewardship of my colleague the member for Mount Gambier when he was Minister. The percentage then was of the order of 31.5 per cent: let us look at the figures for this year.

Mr Becker: Did anybody ever say anything about that?

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: The present Minister, when in Opposition, made much play about this percentage. I have been on record in this place as saying that percentages can be manipulated and interpreted in different ways but, of course, we must use the standards as set down by the Minister when he was in Opposition, and I have done that. I have used the same criteria that he used when in Opposition.

First, taking a comparison of the Education Department only in terms of payments authorised by Appropriation Acts, we find that for 1983-84 there was an expenditure of \$507 446 000 for the Education Department compared with an amount this year of \$577 million. If we then take the appropriation for the two years, we find for last year \$1 740 037 000 and for this year \$2 208 940 000. That is a comparison of 29.16 per cent last year and 26.12 per cent this year, showing a reduction of almost 3 per cent. That is a very significant reduction in a total State Budget.

If we then, as the Minister did when in Opposition, compare total education expenditure (including technical and further education and miscellaneous) with total State recurrent payments (including payments authorised by special Acts), we find that last year the total education expenditure was \$632 408 000 and \$725 286 000 this year, compared to a total State expenditure of \$2 085 471 000 last year and \$2 573 840 000 this year, or 30.32 per cent last year compared to 28.18 per cent this year—once again, over 2 per cent.

Whichever criteria one uses, it is over 2 per cent. We are now facing a situation where education spending as a proportion of the total State expenditure is reducing, also taking into account that the Minister has retained the same number of teachers on the pay-roll as in previous years.

Mr Klunder: Do you object to that?

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: No, I hope that I would be able to do the same thing, but it is a significant fact when there is a reduction in expenditure as a percentage of total budgetary outlay. As my friend from Mount Gambier says, it is a declining slice of the cake, especially when

compared to his record of 31.5 per cent—nearly a third of the total State expenditure. However, we will deal with the education budget in more detail in the Estimates Committee.

I want to point out again that this year we have had a marked reduction in the school building and redevelopment programme—a reduction of some 22 per cent in real terms over last year. The member for Unley or his colleagues could well say that we have declining student enrolments so there is probably not as much need as there was previously to build as many new schools. However, I suggest that, if he were to say that to residents in the vastly expanding suburbs to the south or north-east, they may well disagree with him. Nevertheless, there is some logic in that argument, but there is no logic in cutting the funds for school redevelopment. I do not think that any members in this House would not have schools in their electorates badly needing redeveloping.

The irony of the situation is that it is this very part of the education budget that instantly stimulates employment. Why has the Government, after last year reducing the capital allocation for school building and redevelopment by 17 per cent, this year reduced it by 22 per cent in real terms? I mention that and will be taking the matter further in the Estimates Committee.

However, I turn now to the recurrent budget for technical and further education, showing an increase of 16 per cent. If one takes off the allocation for round sum allowance and inflation it is probably an increase of 8 per cent in real terms. Where is that money going? At no stage since I have been shadow Minister have I had so many complaints out in the field from students of TAFE colleges, members of the councils and lecturers about the allocation in the TAFE budget for each particular college. At no stage have I found so much unrest in the community about TAFE budget allocations.

One needs to look at the Premier's speech introducing the Budget for some clue as to where the money for TAFE is going. I might say that there are only two very brief references to education, one dealing with the new Children's Services Office (which one would expect to be included) and the other concerning TAFE. The Premier referred at page 8 to the allocation for technical and further education as including 'the cost of commissioning new facilities at Elizabeth and Adelaide Colleges' and 'an increased level of financial contributions to the South Australian Institute of Technology for TAFE courses.' There lies the answer to the question that I posed: where is that extra money going? It is of course going for the commissioning of the new Adelaide College, a very worthwhile project and, to a lesser extent, the Elizabeth College.

The commissioning costs for TAFE colleges are quite enormous. The Commonwealth provides most of the capital, although not all of it, for the building and major items of equipment, but the State Government is responsible for all recurrent expenditure and for minor furniture and works connected with the college. The commissioning of a large college like the Adelaide College is a major undertaking, and I suggest that that is where most of the money is going.

The other point I wish to reiterate as far as TAFE is concerned is this: I mentioned in the House only two weeks ago that when the Commonwealth Budget was brought down \$39 million extra was added for the whole of Australia—an extra \$39 million for TAFE, of which South Australia gained only \$1 million.

Mr Baker: What happened to the Minister of Education?

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I suspect, and I said at the time and it has not been denied by the Minister, that that was because of lack of State effort in technical and further education, because the Commonwealth requires (and it is in the Budget papers if one wants to look at it) State

effort to match the Commonwealth input. That is the reason why this State received only \$1 million. Talk about standing up for South Australia! The Deputy Leader mentioned the Alice Springs railway. What about technical and further education? How can the Minister sit here and accept \$1 million extra from \$39 million when one takes into consideration the unrest in the community about technical and further education.

I mentioned before that there was tremendous unrest among college councils. The member for Mitcham, the member for Semaphore, the member for Mount Gambier and the member for Hanson are members of councils, and we all know (those of us who have anything to do with TAFE) that there are problems. Only today I received the following information that the adult literacy courses in TAFE were being cut, in fact, being decimated. I understand that at the Elizabeth College adult literacy is to be reduced by 50 per cent next year and by an additional 20 per cent the year after. I also believe that there are to be reductions at Kensington.

As I mentioned in the House two weeks ago, I understand that programmes for the physically and mentally disabled are to be cut, and I postulated the reason then that unfortunately this was because most of the staff were part-time and it is much easier for a college to put off part-time staff than to try to remove permanent staff and place them in other colleges. I am told that at Regency Park four tutors are to be dismissed in the field of adult literacy. The tragedy is that, because of what I have outlined about TAFE funding, the Department is sending out memos to the colleges saying, 'This is your budget allocation for 1985, and you are going to have to cut back.' The same thing is occurring in advanced education and I will deal with that in the grievance debate.

The colleges are faced with a dilemma: how do we cut back on expenditure? They are cutting back in the areas where there are part-time lecturers, and this is in the areas of the physically and mentally disabled and in the adult literacy section. I point out that 50 000 South Australians are classed as being illiterate and in need of assistance.

The Hon. H. Allison: What about leisure time?

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Leisure time is another type of activity that is being cut back, as I am reminded by the member for Mount Gambier. This is not good enough, because the cut-backs are taken in the areas of greatest need. The member for Semaphore may be aware of some of these things because of the college of which he is a council member.

Mr Peterson: Port Adelaide.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Yes. It is extremely serious. The Minister agreed with me on how important the field of special education was, and in that context he was referring to speech pathology. I will refer to that later, because it is an advanced education matter. In the TAFE sector these cut-backs are occurring in the areas of greatest need. I could go on about TAFE because I have had the privilege of visiting several TAFE institutions recently. One occasion was with my colleague the member for Hanson when we visited the TAFE College of Music in the city. That institution is in a deplorable situation: it looks as though it will collapse. It has cracks in the walls and the condition of the building is unbelievable. I have also visited the present TAFE college at Port Pirie, and it is just as well that it has been replaced, because I do not think that it would stand much longer.

I have visited other TAFE colleges in the country where converted schools and various areas are being used, and they are all badly in need of refurbishing. I know that I am talking about capital funds but that \$1 million from the Commonwealth includes capital: it is capital and recurrent, involving the total allocation for TAFE. As I said, the Commonwealth mainly funds in the field of capital, anyway.

We cannot emphasise too much the problems that are occurring in TAFE. The Minister himself said last year that for too long TAFE had been the poor relation; it seems to me that this year it is an even poorer relation.

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

LIBRARIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Second reading debate resumed.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): Before us we have two sets of documents: one is the document presented by the Premier last Thursday week, which contained some fact and a lot of rhetorical comment; the other is the Auditor-General's Report which was tabled today. That report is a factual statement of events as they have unfolded and as they have been audited, and gives the lie to a number of statements contained within the Premier's rhetorical document. Statements made by the Premier in an endeavour to sell his Budget to the public contained rounded out figures which, quite obviously, do not stand up when compared with the detail contained within the Auditor-General's Report. In bringing matters to the attention of the public and the members of this House, why cannot the Premier be factual and present detail in the proper perspective? I refer to the position in respect to housing. Over a period of time since being in Opposition, members on this side of the House have lauded that action taken by both the State and Federal Governments in actively supporting the housing industry as the basis for getting the economy up and running.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: It hasn't—

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Oh, but it has. The Deputy Premier has not been listening. He has been too easily sidetracked by the rhetoric which is coming from his own side when he should have been listening to comments that have been forthcoming from members on this side of the House. The economy of Australia has improved as a direct result of the initiative taken by the Housing Industry Association's federal body. That initiative was presented to the Federal Government in March-April of 1983 and was acknowledged by the Prime Minister at the national conference of the Housing Industry Association held in Adelaide earlier this year as being the initiative of the Housing Industry Association that had provided a lot of the groundwork which had allowed the Government at the national Accord to indicate its preparedness to accept the value to the economy of a major housing involvement. Twelve months ago in this place a statement was clearly made that it was a laudable response by the present State Government to have committed the whole of its Loan funds to housing. They have repeated that performance, but the point that I was about to make before the Deputy Premier assisted me in drawing attention to statements that we had made on housing was that the document presented by the Premier talks once again of 3 100 homes having been built in 1983-1984—either built or built and/or purchased to make up that total increase in stock of 3 100 houses.

In the Auditor-General's Report that was made available to us today we find at page 389 that the number of houses completed in 1983-84 was 2 311 and that there was the purchase of a number of other units, but that did not bring the number up to 3 100, which the Premier has continued to use in seeking to hoodwink the people of South Australia.

Referring again to the Auditor-General's Report at page 389, one finds that during the year 776 dwellings were purchased at a cost of \$37.1 million, while 296 dwellings were still to be completed under existing agreements. The report goes on to indicate that to supplement the building programme the purchase of private dwellings continued. Settlements were completed during the year for 578 houses at a cost of \$28.5 million. The 578 houses, along with the 2 311 houses that were completed within the Trust's dwelling arrangements, give a total of fewer than 2 900 houses—200 units fewer than the figure about which the Government has been talking publicly.

We also find—and I will come to the particular detail in a minute—that the statement has been made in these documents that a further 3 100 houses will be added to stock in 1984-85. After reading the statement that there will be an increase by that number, one finds that the actual funds allotted in South Australia to housing in 1984-85 in real terms is less than the amount allotted in 1983-84. Of the recognised escalation in costs associated with housing, some of it brought about by an increase in the land component, some of it by an increase in specifications required of Housing Trust (design and construct houses), some of it by an increase in costs of component parts (there have been sizable increases there), but a large amount of the increase results from the cost of labour, which has risen markedly in the housing industry because of a dearth of expert labour.

So, one has what amounts to a sellers market rather than a buyers market and the cost in the actual physical completion of houses has increased as a result of that changed circumstance. While some 12 months ago it was possible to have a contract written for the building of a home to completion within 11 to 13 weeks, I am advised now that it is not possible today to get a building of any proportions contracted in less than 22 weeks and that in actual fact, because of the weather conditions that have prevailed for the past seven to nine weeks, the period beyond the 22 to 26 weeks has eased out the top and quite a number of developments are not being completed under 28 or 29 weeks. The cost of the funds associated with the building programme extended over a period of 28 to 29 weeks as opposed to 11 to 12 weeks is markedly different.

Those additional costs of financing the projects are also added to the cost of the finished product. The figures which were presented to the House by the Premier indicate that there was underspending of the allotment for housing in this State in 1983-84 of \$8.1 million.

If one looks at the part of the document headed 'Support for Housing Programmes' one sees statistical material appearing at page 47 of the financial statement of the Premier and Treasurer. As this material pertains to the points I want to make, I seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

SUPPORT FOR HOUSING PROGRAMMES

	1983-84 \$ million Actual	1984-85 \$ million Proposed
Commonwealth:		
Commonwealth-State		
Housing		
Agreement	62.3	73.2
Other	8.0	—
	73.2	

State:				
Consolidated				
Account	154.4		146.4	
Balances				
Advances to Housing				
Account	—8.1	146.3	8.1	154.5
TOTAL		216.6		227.7

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: In that material we find that \$216.6 million was available but not actually spent in 1983-84. It was intended to spend \$154.4 million from the State Consolidated Account but, as previously indicated, there was an under-expenditure of \$8.1 million. That \$8.1 million has been directly added to the value of building for 1984-85, but that is barely over and above the amount available in 1983-84. In other words, the Government has withdrawn other funding. So, although there is a total of \$227.7 million available in 1984-85, some of that addition is associated with an increase in funds made available from the Commonwealth, which provided \$62.3 million in 1983-84 and is providing \$73.2 million this year.

The Government has reinvested or left within the housing budget the \$8.1 million which was underspent in 1983-84 and we find that there is a total of \$227.7 million—a mere \$11.1 million greater than the amount available in 1983-84. This is at a time when there has been an escalation in costs and also when the amount of money expended last year only brought forward in the vicinity of 2 900 units as opposed to 3 100 about which the Government is crowing. We find an increase of a little over 5 per cent in total funds available for housing projects; this will certainly not provide the increased number of houses that the Government has promoted to the people of this State. I do not want in any way to downgrade the need for additional housing units for the people of this State at a time when 32 000 people are looking for Housing Trust accommodation and 63 per cent of all people living in Housing Trust accommodation are in receipt of some form of rent relief.

Every member of this House through his or her electoral office is aware of the number of requests or applications being made to them to assist both in permanent Housing Trust accommodation and, more specifically, in emergency housing. We want to maximise as much as we can but, if we agree that we want to maximise, it is also extremely important that the Government be truthful with the people of this State as to what it is doing with the funds available to it and about what those funds are capable of purchasing. The funds that the Government has made available for 1984-85 are incapable of fulfilling the building programme which has been promoted by the Government as 3 100 units.

I appreciate that, because of the extended period of time in building many of these homes, accentuated by the adverse weather conditions and made more difficult by a reduction in the number of artisans available for the building process, and recognising the competition which exists within the building industry for the number of artisans available, the end result must be more expensive housing. The Government must take some of the blame for the increase in housing costs, because it introduced and totally supported the attack on the original cottage-type subcontracting businesses which have served the housing industry well for many years but which are now being placed in some jeopardy in relation to the eventual existence of subcontracting businesses by forcing unionism and increased costs for housing labour.

In a normal buyer-seller relationship in the normal subcontracting field, which is a traditional part of the housing industry, a lower price is always available by virtue of the amount that an individual wants for his labour than that which has been forced upon him by some arbitrary decision made by a union organisation. That is being seriously

reflected in the costs associated with housing in South Australia at the moment, amounting to an increase of some thousands of dollars in the cost per unit. These figures were spelt out by the Leader during the Address in Reply debate. I referred to those figures during the same debate when apples were compared with apples in relation to the same type of home on two building projects some 15 months apart. The value of the same units were many thousands of dollars different.

Against that background, I say that the figures which have been given to the House by the Premier, and which have been debunked by the information that is available in the Auditor-General's Report, clearly indicate where the Government seeks to pull the wool over the eyes of the South Australian public. The Government is not being particularly successful in covering its tracks in relation to the massive taxation increase that it has put upon the South Australian public. Last week I had the good fortune to spend some time at the Royal Adelaide Show and to be associated with a stall that was presented there by members of the Party that I represent. The large number of people who came forward and signed the petition against increased taxation in South Australia was revealing. More revealing was the locality from which many of those spontaneous signatures were received. People came forward from areas which are not normally directly associated with the Liberal Party. In fact, without any goading at all by members on the stand, people were moving up to the petition forms, appending their signatures and telling those in proximity why they wanted to associate themselves with the petition: they were sick and tired of the constant fiddle in their pockets by the present State Government.

Many of them referred to the debacle of the FID tax. A number of them referred to the cost of transport, the cost of housing rentals and the increase in costs associated with the use of their motor vehicles, and many of them laughed quite derisively at the supposed benefit that was to apply in the forthcoming Federal Government handout of decreased taxation. They knew that it was, as has been so aptly stated, 'Hawke gives and Bannon takes away.'

Mr Trainer interjecting:

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: The honourable member may well acknowledge the providence of what I am telling him. It is a fact that the people of South Australia have not accepted the hoodwink and are reacting quite strongly to the activities of this high tax Government.

I would like to mention very briefly some of the detail contained in the statements relative to local government. The local government allocation will provide for eight new libraries and the maintenance of subsidies to existing libraries in real terms. That is a direct quote from the Premier's statement, and I hope it is achieved, because there is a bipartisan commitment in this House to the need to provide every opportunity for educational benefit, which derives from a number of sources but which certainly derives from access to adequate library services.

In addition to the educational advantage that can derive from the texts and better class of document available, the recreational or leisure reading available through the library system is also of benefit to the community. The fact that reading makes people more knowledgeable and incites them I suggest—

Mr Trainer interjecting:

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: The honourable member does not believe that to be the case.

Mr Trainer: I am not necessarily querying that. It is just that reading does not necessarily make someone wise: it can make them more knowledgeable.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: If the honourable member wishes to hold his horses for a minute, I would extend that

to say that the fact that they read indicates that they are more likely to pick up knowledge on a variety of issues and they are more likely to understand better the circumstances of the environment in which they live from a political and social point of view. I think that the honourable member now indicates that he accepts that as being a fact. Many people read and do not know afterwards what they have read. Many people do not retain what they read. However, a very strong view is held (and I think that the honourable member would hold it with me) that, if people make reading a discipline they follow, it is more likely that they will be better citizens or more knowledgeable people as a direct result.

It is in that context that I say that there is this bipartisan attitude to libraries in South Australia, and I genuinely believe that the advantages of the satellite technology which will soon be available not only to our education system and our general business system but also through our library system, is likely to further advance the benefits which accrue to people who read or people who seek knowledge by participation in library activities. Therefore, this extended sum of money—and I trust that it does turn out to be in real terms as the Premier has claimed—will be distinctly beneficial to the people in this State.

It is certainly a policy which members on this side would want to see extended not out of proportion to the total cut-up of the cake but at least to maintain its present position. The proposal of eight new libraries this year is an improvement on last year, when I think from memory that three were proposed definitely with a possibility of extending to five. When we come to the Estimates Committee we will be able to look at that point in more detail, but it shows a commitment that is acceptable to members on both sides of the House.

The other significant funding that has been made available in local government relates to funds for the newly formed Local Government Advisory Committee. During the passage of the Bill associated with the rewrite of the Local Government Act it was clearly understood that a number of new initiatives would be possible as a result of the existence of that new Advisory Commission, and that the Government was requested from this side of the House to make the best possible use of this new initiative in the best interests of local government.

One of the areas that will be clearly opened up will be that directly associated with boundaries and boundary alterations. I hope that with the hindsight, which is now possible, of the recent Gawler exercise and the very unfortunate debacle that is associated with the black banning of services to those people in the area of Munno Para who are to be transferred to Gawler in May of next year, the same mistakes will not be made again. Certainly, the people who are suffering as a result of this black ban are not at all in accord with the activities of the staff at Munno Para, who they believe are holding them to ransom. The ban goes far beyond the collection of the garbage; it involves, also, access to the mobile library and to a signature on a necessary document or documents associated with housing or with subdivision. Therefore, it extends the cost factor associated with those subdivisions or new houses.

It has resulted in the withdrawal of the community bus, which is used extensively by a number of aged persons in that community for their weekly shopping, their visits to the medico or for those other important activities in the town of Gawler. That some of the aged people have had to walk up to 1½ kilometres to catch a train and then the same distance back afterwards because of this attitude being expressed by staff is something that does the staff of Munno Para council no credit.

I trust that the bans that were removed this morning will remain removed; in other words, they are now off and it is back to normal. I am quite certain that there will be positive consultation between the Munno Para council, the Department of Local Government and the new Gawler area, so that the best interests of all people are served. The Advisory Commission, for which we are providing additional funds, may well play a part. It will certainly be called on to play a significant part in other local government activities across South Australia.

We also find that there is to be a 37 per cent increase in the funds made available for effluent drainage projects. While making the point that the 37 per cent increase is to be made available, I point out that there was a significant under-run of the use of these funds during 1983-84; so there really has not been a major lift in the sum available for effluent drainage. It is just a matter of the accumulation of the funds that were appropriated in 1983-84, plus a normal funding for 1984-85.

I have sought to point out to the House that the housing issue is vital to the community. It requires that the Government be honest in its revelations and not seek cheap political gain by making claims that cannot be substantiated by fact.

I have been able to demonstrate that the documents that were presented by the Premier last Thursday week do not bear a relationship to the facts that are clearly set out in the Auditor-General's Report as presented this afternoon. Whilst time does not permit an examination of all the documentation and figures that are directly associated therewith, members can be assured that those factual details are there to be seen in the Auditor-General's Report. People outside this place who are interested in those factors should look at the facts rather than at the promotion of the Government.

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

Mr BAKER (Mitcham): I take up the point that the member for Torrens addressed in his speech to the House. He raised the question of moneys being made available to TAFE colleges, and I made some reference to the funding situation in a speech some weeks ago. We recently had a meeting at the Panorama Community College in which the financial situation was put before the council. The difficulties that are involved with managing a budget which has decreased by some \$94 000 in a total of \$500 000 are, as anyone would imagine, quite horrific. There is no increase in the funds available. Indeed, there is a real decrease approaching the order of 20 per cent. I am pleased that the Minister is in the House tonight. I am sure that he is well aware of the concerns being expressed by TAFE colleges and the South Australian College of Advanced Education campuses on the issue of funding.

The member for Torrens today raised a question about speech pathology and spoke on it again tonight. A number of people have come to me about the funding situation. Although they have heard that there is to be an increased allocation to TAFE, they have suddenly found that there will be a significant diminution in the funds available. It appears to be affecting the TAFE colleges slightly more than the CAEs, but both are in particularly bad circumstances. It is useful to relate to this House the options that are available to colleges in these circumstances.

To take the example of Panorama, the programmes run from streams 1 to 6. Some of the programmes are pre-ordained. In other words, they are required to be run: the courses have to be provided. There is a significant component of prevocational training, which is one of the most expensive although, in my view, one of the most effective forms of

training available. One can run through the vocational and semi-vocational courses and find that no room exists to change those courses, unless those involved wish to take a course off their books.

It is untenable to take off some courses because, as people would appreciate, with streaming students start at year 1 and have to go through to year 5. If we suddenly cut a course at year 3, the students or apprentices will not have the full benefit of training, and their ability to then be able to continue to get the diploma or trade certificate has been reduced; in fact, it is just not available. So, we have a block of courses in the TAFE colleges which must be provided with all resources of the colleges.

However, the end of the stream is stream 6, which covers a number of the interest courses. These are very useful to people who are not in the workforce and to older members of the community. When speaking of people not being in the workforce, I am referring to married women with children and commitments, unemployed people and those who work on a part-time basis. The Minister is well aware of the range of courses provided.

This means that at Panorama, which I presume is typical of all TAFE colleges, with this sort of reduction being imposed, there must be a loss of almost all of the stream 6 courses. The commitments of all the other streams will mean that most of the available resources will have to fit into those areas. At the stream 6 level the part time tutor and part time lecturer is the most obvious area available for cutting because there are no full time employees in those areas.

The council briefly discussed the matter this week. I do not necessarily want to single out the Panorama College; I am only using that as an example. However, the difficulties that it faces in providing the range of education that it has provided in the past are quite significant. The college does not have the option to reduce other courses to enable it to maintain the range of courses that it has traditionally provided. It must reduce at the bottom end of the scale, and it may well be that Matriculation courses have to be dropped. I have put the following Question on Notice to the Minister which I hope he will eventually answer:

Is the Minister aware of the estimated \$94 000 shortfall in funds necessary to maintain existing programmes at Panorama Community College during 1984-85 and, if so, what direction will he provide as to the courses which have to be discontinued and lecturers to be sacked?

That is an indication of the feeling that exist in colleges at present. Whilst colleges can manage with perhaps some loss of income in real terms, the decreases that have been laid down are totally untenable. It means that the colleges will revert to providing vocational type training. No other sources are available to provide these courses. If the college council said, 'We will run such and such a course but dispense with Matriculation,' I could understand that the Minister would suddenly lay down some guidelines to replace the Matriculation courses.

So, there will be a fairly sensitive time ahead in relation to how the colleges will manage. We have had speech pathologists in the SACAE's and I have had approaches from other campuses on the same issue where guidelines are being laid down. I believe in running budgets as tightly, effectively and as efficiently as possible. The challenge for management is how one manages with the funds available. I know of no body which can effectively cater for a 20 per cent plus decrease in real terms of the available budget. If the Minister wants to close the colleges, he should state quite categorically that that is his intention.

If the Minister does not want to close colleges he should categorically state which areas he believes are non essential. If he does not believe that people can go back to these colleges to matriculate or to take on other courses then it

is up to him to show some guidance in this matter. I think that it is totally disgraceful for the Minister to provide colleges with an unmanageable budget. It is a disgrace for him to expect people who are totally dedicated to the delivery of educational services to cope with such a situation. I have a great deal of respect for the way in which the Panorama college is run. There is a good relationship with its council and staff, and it runs smoothly. It is well and economically managed, never spending more money than is absolutely necessary to make the college work.

I believe that the Minister has to tell people why the budget is to be cut by well over 20 per cent in real terms. He should also outline the guidelines he expects them to follow. The matter can then be debated and perhaps the Minister can use his influence (which seems to be fairly inadequate in Canberra) to elicit more funds from the Commonwealth Government to maintain those courses he believes are essential for people who would have previously gone to TAFE colleges. I have mentioned this matter because it is something that we have considered recently and is a problem that is very real. One sees in the Budget a 16 per cent increase in available moneys. This is why the colleges cannot understand why their budgets are being slashed to ribbons.

I turn now to taxation. Members opposite may recall that taxation is one of my favourite topics when I am addressing this House. I will quickly review the performance of this Government, hopefully without reiterating a lot of the remarks made by the Leader in his excellent speech to this House on this matter. It is interesting to note the receipt lines in the Budget and the way in which the amounts have increased. I have before me last year's Budget, which shows that in 1982-83 land tax receipts totalled \$23.7 million, yet in the forthcoming year it is expected they will total \$32.8 million, an increase of almost one-third in the space of two years.

For the edification of members opposite who believe that one can continually tax without impact, I point out that even a tax such as land tax can have a detrimental effect on the business community and, in particular, on small business. It is well recognised that taxation of all forms costs jobs. In some cases the taxation measures that have to be implemented are necessary to sustain jobs within the public sector. These are necessary jobs that provide essential services. However, at some point in the taxation framework we will reach a situation where the more the taxation the greater the loss of jobs. There is, in fact, a break-even point in this series where one finds that the net benefits of taxation equal the net cost of jobs lost. I cannot come up with a figure on what is the most appropriate form of taxation, but we certainly know that we need essential services, services that cannot be provided by the private sector: these are emergency services such as police, the fire brigade and so on.

There is even an argument for public sector education and health delivery. The approximate 30 per cent increase in land tax is money that is being taken away from the small business sector, and is related to the increase in land values. Increases of 100 per cent and 500 per cent have been cited. I know of a case where there was an increase in land tax of about 1 500 per cent some 18 months ago purely because the person involved had increased the value of his property by doing it up; there was also an increase in value because of the location. It is disgraceful. Fortunately, this is an isolated incident.

There are many examples where land tax imposts are becoming very difficult to bear. For the edification of members opposite, I point out that the principle is that during times of boom or strong real estate demand there is a substantial increase in property values. When the heat goes

off the market, those values flatten out. We know that the Government, to sustain its programmes, must continue to tax. This means that, when activity becomes relatively static, to sustain the Government's ever-increasing demands for tax revenue, taxation rates have to increase.

If taxation remains at the same level and if land values do not increase then the revenue does not increase. We know that Governments require ever-increasing amounts of revenue—at least this Labor Government does. So, we are taxing people in good times and in bad times. We are placing on them imposts that reflect the property value itself, the asset backing of the entrepreneur and, I believe, this reduces the ability of many people in small business to perform.

I noticed in the Budget that revenue from gambling has been quite propitious. In 1982-83 the estimated contribution to the Hospitals Fund from lotteries, TAB and other racing was \$25 million. In 1984-85 the amount is estimated to be \$40 million. As the member for Torrens would know, being a former Minister of Recreation and Sport, the health of the racing, trotting and dog codes is very dependent on the sum that can be provided from stake money.

The Liberal Government provided a new formula under which the clubs could operate. The formula has not been updated by this Government, but the revenue base has been updated. The industries that provide so much income to our State Budget and the hospitals are not sharing in the benefit. It should be of concern to the Government that it is estimated that there will be a \$9 million increase to the Hospitals Fund from this source during 1984-85. The increase for the forthcoming year is of the order of 27 per cent—one of the highest increases of all the Budget items in percentage terms. One cannot kill the golden goose! If South Australia wants to remain viable in the three codes more money has to be put back into the industry so that Government revenue and the industry, which is a very large employer, prosper.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: It is about the fourth largest.

Mr BAKER: Yes, it is about the fourth largest industry in this State. That windfall of the Government should have been matched by some revenue going back into the industries involved. Had the Minister of Recreation and Sport read the *Botra News* and some of the other articles that have been put forward by people in the horse racing and other codes he would have understood that they want to be able to bring up their standards to those that apply interstate. However, while the Government continues to tax in the way that it does they will be unable to do so. That industry has the potential to come up to the standards applying in the Eastern States, but while its capacity to do so is continually reduced its ability to contribute to Government revenue is reduced. The penny-pinching that occurs and the creaming off from the industry of profits will only harm the industry itself. It will never realise its full potential while the Government continues to use it as a means of boosting its hospital budget, in the way it has done in the past two years.

Much has been said about the increase in registration and drivers' licence fees. Receipts for 1982-83 totalled \$58.6 million. The budgeted receipt for this year is \$66.4 million. It is estimated that the increase for the coming year will be about 11 per cent. Admittedly, between 1982-83 and 1983-84 the rise was fairly marginal. However, this is another very large impost, of the order of 11 per cent. It is twice the rate of inflation. It must be paid by the motorist and will have the effect of suppressing activity. In this document on the State economy I find it quite fascinating that the Premier has made great play about the uplift in the economy and has attempted to take some kudos for it. However, he

has done very little to help the economy; in fact he has done much to retard it.

The financial institutions duty is a classic case. The Premier said that in a full year we would collect \$18 million in financial institutions duty. After a full year of receipts, it is now estimated that the total will be something like \$28.5 million. I wonder what the Premier will do to repay some of the money that has been ripped off South Australians? The Premier's ability to estimate and to grasp the essential ingredients of economic management continues to astound me. The original estimate was for \$18 million, and allowing \$1 million for the inflation factor, the total amount represents a real increase of some 58 per cent. With stamp duties, again this year there will be an increase of 11 per cent. In 1982-83 receipts totalled \$118 million, while for 1984-85 receipts are estimated at \$187 million—that is another windfall for the Government. Who will receive the benefit? Certainly it will not be home owners.

I have spent some time in this House previously discussing this matter of the little people being hurt by this Government. However, it will not adjust the rate of stamp duty applicable; it will not make it easier for people to purchase their own home. The Government is placing imposts on people who can least afford them. An increase in gas prices has occurred; business franchise fees have increased by 20 per cent; and fees associated with liquor licences are estimated to amount to \$31 million for 1984-85, as against \$18.9 million for 1982-83—that is a large increase to be paid by the public of South Australia. In connection with tobacco there has been a 31 per cent increase in 1984-85.

One interesting matter that I wish to mention briefly concerns waterworks and sewerage. In 1983-84 estimated receipts totalled \$177 million; we had a particularly good year of rain, and revenue fell short by \$3.4 million. I do not know whether the Minister has estimated that there will be a similar season this year or on what he bases the \$197.2 million, yet we have a 14 per cent increase in revenue from water and sewerage payments. As the House is aware, that is a direct impost on home owners. As my Leader has pointed out, this increase has been brought about by a continual increase in the cost of water under the 'user pays' principle. It is estimated that 60 per cent of home owners pay excess water, and by the time the Government's term is finished next year if the rate of increase is maintained everyone in South Australia will be paying excess water rates.

This comes against the background of one of the best years of rain, and this year the need for pumping may be reduced on average. Perhaps the demand for water will decrease. If the 'user pays' principle holds there should be no real increase in the revenue collected under the waterworks line. Again, the Government has budgeted for a 14 per cent increase in the amount. Irrespective of water saving or any attempt made by people to conserve water, the Budget strategy is that we will have to continue to increase the impost on South Australian users. At some stage the public is going to rebel. People will say that they have done everything possible to reduce their usage of water to a bare minimum, yet they are still faced with excess water bills. It will not be long before people will refuse to pay for the water they receive, particularly if the position continues as it has over the last year. Not only do people use less water, which means that their water bill should go down, but the water quality in South Australia in 1983-84 and continuing into this this year is the worst in living memory.

We are paying for a very indifferent service at present. If the Minister wants to increase the cost of water he is entitled to do so, but let us see that payment matches quality of service. If I were not a member of Parliament and if I continued to feel strongly enough about the issue I would

probably start a campaign encouraging everyone not to pay their water bills in the southern suburbs where the water quality is an absolute and utter disgrace. Filth comes through the pipes, yet the Minister will be getting \$197.2 million from the South Australian community for the indifferent service that he is providing. Obviously, if it was a private sector concern, the people of South Australia would be looking to another provider of the service in return for the \$197.2 million payment. It is time that the Government became accountable. One of the greatest disappointments of this Budget is that the Government had the ability to create some space.

The Government had some ability to be able to provide for a real reduction in the recurrent deficit. It had an opportunity to place South Australia on a sounder footing after the problems caused by the bush fires and floods of last year. It has not taken that opportunity; it has still acted with largesse. It has continued to tax at rates such as 17 per cent, 27 per cent, 11 per cent, 58 per cent, 20 per cent, 37 per cent, 31 per cent and 14 per cent increases. This is the nature of the increase in the taxation revenue that the Government will reap from the public at a time when the inflation rate will be of the order of 5 per cent or 6 per cent. It cannot continue. There will be a revolt. South Australians will say 'no longer' and this Government is in danger of being on the end of that revolt.

Mr BECKER: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention, to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

The SPEAKER: I call the honourable member for Goyder.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): Thank you, Mr Speaker. What a rip-off this Budget is! We heard from the Premier in earlier days that under his Administration there would be no tax increases; charges would not be a form of back-door taxation. Yet here again we see that he has ignored his promises and could not care less what he has said in the past. It is a disgrace that this present Government and the Premier have allowed this to occur. It is all very well for the Premier to try to justify certain things, but why did he make the promises in the first place? It is the principle of the whole matter. He was determined to get into Government at any cost. He could not care less if he became a hypocrite.

He wanted to be on the Government benches, so he said, 'We will promise the people of South Australia the world, then we can take it all back and we will find excuses.' He was fortunate enough, I suppose so far as he and his Government were concerned, to have the natural disasters as a good excuse for part of the tax increases. What a Budget! If one analyses the figures one sees that, if the Premier keeps on taxing at the current rate, we will hit the \$1 billion figure in the next two Budgets.

Let us consider some of the details. There has been a 39.7 per cent increase in tax collection in just two years—three times the rate of inflation. That is a projected growth in tax collection in real terms of 27.1 per cent since July 1983 so, using those figures, if the same growth rate is maintained for the next two Budgets the 1986 Appropriation Bill will produce tax collections of \$1.071 billion, or just over \$1 billion. That will be some gift to the electors of South Australia in our sesquicentenary year—some gift!

My word, I hope that the people will realise that this Government has gone back on virtually every promise it made in the area of taxation and State charges. But, let us consider the alternative situation. Two years ago in this House the Premier criticised the former Government because tax collections had exceeded \$500 million for the first time.

Less than two years ago during an election policy speech the Premier said that there would be no tax increases under a Labor Government before 1986, a year in which at the

present rate of growth he will take more than \$1 000 million from us in State taxation. This Budget exposes the political version of the Fine Cotton hoax. The Premier who made his run for office promising no tax increases will finish up as the greatest tax collector in our history. I believe that the Government will be thrown out of office at the next election because of its hypocrisy.

Unfortunately, we see in this Budget that the rural sector—the country sector—has been virtually ignored. What is new about that? We have been virtually ignored since the present Government came to power, anyway. Is there any real relief for our roads? No. There is some small increase, but we should remember that in the last session of Parliament there was a 12.5 per cent decrease in the Highways Fund, and that affects country roads. The increase for roads in this Budget is really just a cover-up. I just wish the Premier would travel on some of our country roads a little more often to see the state they are in.

We have heard quite a bit about education. Certainly, TAFE education in country areas again has received a significant set back. I have said much about that in the past in relation to the Yorke Peninsula College of TAFE and how it has been treated. This lack of funding will not help it at all. Likewise, I have examples in my district, and other examples have been mentioned by other members, of the unsatisfactory situation in relation to teacher-aides in country schools. It appears that this Budget does not address that problem.

I would like to know what steps might be taken in the Budget in relation to the provision of reticulated water in the so-called uneconomic areas. Of course, the answer is very easy—no step forward will be taken. As people plead for water the Minister will continue to say, 'Unfortunately it is uneconomic and we cannot supply it.' I wish the Government would grapple with the real problem and help production in this State so that it can get back on an even footing with the other States. However, it is much easier for the Government to shut its eyes and ignore reality. After all, the Government will not lose any votes in the rural areas. It is concerned only with the marginal seats that it wants to win. People in the country can go and get lost for all the Government cares. It is a very tragic situation.

I will have more to say about water later in the session, but I refer to the new policy in relation to water hydrants and metered water hydrants. The Minister will have to reconsider this area because local councils appreciate that it will add thousands of dollars to their costs. It will be a real impost to them. It is things of this type that we do not see in the Budget. I could deal with many aspects of the Budget and I will highlight another, that is, motor vehicle taxation. Let us be quite honest—it is taxation. Both the Commonwealth Grants Commission and the Australian Bureau of Statistics classify driver's licence fees and motor vehicle registration as taxes for the purpose of calculating revenue raising by the States.

We now see that the Premier has increased driver's licence fees by 25 per cent and motor vehicle registration fees by 10 per cent. So much for his promise that there would be no increases in taxes during his term of office! In fact, I believe they are the seventh and eighth taxes to have increased. Of course, we could also consider the approximately 130 taxes and charges which the Premier said that he would not use as a form of back-door taxation but which have been increased under this Labor Government. I suppose one tax that went up recently that might be of some advantage to rural people is the fine for people who take timber from roadsides, which was increased from \$200 to \$1 000.

Certainly it has a positive advantage when one thinks that we need to protect the remaining vegetation, but I

wonder how many people are aware that that was a 400 per cent increase. Also, in relation to roads—

Mr Plunkett: When did that go up previously?

Mr MEIER: I fail to see what relevance that has to this particular debate. The other factor in connection with roads is that the Premier announced a package of so-called safety measures. The one for which I will give him full credit is the policy to have a zero blood alcohol level for P-plate or L-plate drivers. Fine! The Liberal Party announced that back in March, so it is good to see that the Government is trying to catch up with the Liberal Party in this connection. However, at the same time the Premier announced (and I am most interested that the Premier announced it—he would not let his Minister of Transport announce it—it appears that he perhaps has no confidence in the Minister of Transport, and that would not be surprising) the whole road package details.

I remember seeing him on television announcing it. I wonder what his Minister of Transport had to say about that. However, that is for the Premier and his Minister to work out among themselves. The Premier also announced that the speed limit would be decreased from 110 to 100 km/h.

Mr Becker: What do your constituents think about that?

Mr MEIER: My constituents are absolutely furious. The ones who have contacted me feel that they are being discriminated against more and more. The people who find that time is valuable, particularly those who have to work virtually from dawn to dusk and beyond, do not want to be forced into a situation where they are driving at a much slower speed at times when they could be driving faster with complete safety. I believe that a blanket 100 km/h limit in this State is not a positive feature. It will only lead to more people breaking the law. An education policy is needed for road users, rather than trying to tie people down with laws.

In fact, a person has said (and I am not able to quote that person's name) that laws are made for the utter obedience of fools and for the guidance of wise people, and I believe that this new proposal is treating people as fools. There are many roads on which there is a speed limit of 110 km/h today and on which I believe it is not safe to drive at more than 80 km/h; likewise, there are other roads on which we could be travelling at 115 and possibly even 120 km/h in complete safety. It is time that this Government woke up to the fact that it will not achieve anything by simply lowering the speed limit. It needs to look into it properly and, if it wants to regulate speed, it should consider various roads. I believe that it is completely within the realms of possibility to do this, particularly on our major highways and freeways.

Certainly, I hope that the people in the country will make their views known to the Government and that for once the Government might take some notice of the people in the country. There are other matters that are simply not addressed in the Budget and one of those concerns the provision of adequate public transport for people who are in the outer metropolitan area and who are not so close to the centre of Adelaide. I would like to bring particularly to members' attention the problem that people in the Virginia, Two Wells, Mallala and Balaklava areas are experiencing with their bus services. It dates back to earlier this year when the private company operating in that area decided to change the timetable. In fact, the timetable was such that they would start 20 minutes later than they would normally from Balaklava and, therefore, in each of the towns coming down they would pick up people later.

Unfortunately, that meant that people going to Adelaide in some cases were going to miss out on getting to work in time. I had the first contacts from two very distressed people

in Virginia, who were worried that they might lose their jobs and who asked me whether I could take it up with the bus company and any further. I was only too happy to do whatever I could as soon as possible. One letter was written to the Manager of Premier Roadlines and the other to the Minister of Transport, headed 'Urgent'. In that letter I detailed the various factors relating to the bus service that had been reported to me and as I saw them, and asked for urgent attention so that these people would not lose their jobs.

Thankfully, in each case the employees had very understanding employers. The employers said, 'We understand if you are going to be five or 10 minutes late for work because of your bus. I hope that you can work it out, though', and I must give credit to those employers. I also give credit to the people of Virginia and Two Wells who made their intentions very clear to the bus company, and also to the Minister to a greater or lesser extent. As a result of that correspondence I was pleased to receive a reply from Premier Roadlines, which said:

Thank you for your letter... regarding the Balaklava/Two Wells/Virginia bus service. Since implementing the new timetable it has been announced that the Stateliner service, presently servicing Balaklava of an evening (*en route* to Quorn), is to be rerouted. With this in mind we intend to operate the attached timetable... which I think will overcome the objections raised by your constituents.

To some extent, it did overcome many problems, and certainly the company must be thanked for that. At the same time I had sought from the Minister of Transport greater recognition of the problem existing for these outer metropolitan areas because, although we pay the same taxes and rates, we are not getting the subsidy that people in the metropolitan area get through their STA buses. The Government has to deal with the problem quickly to see that bus services into the new developing areas are put into operation where it is felt necessary and that, unfortunately, because of the system that we are using, subsidies will have to apply. The present subsidy figure for the metropolitan area is something like \$80 million per year. It is a lot of money, but if some people get it why should others be discriminated against?

More recently, I received another letter from a constituent, stating that the situation still was not as satisfactory as it could be. In simple terms, it dealt with the problem of school students, particularly, getting from the Virginia area to Adelaide. The route that they used was via an existing two-run service by the STA from Virginia to Salisbury railway station and then by train into Adelaide. Unfortunately, those students on the home journey have to wait around for some time, and parents naturally would like to see them home much earlier.

In that connection, I wrote to the Minister of Transport to further highlight this problem. I have only just received from the Minister an answer to the letter that I wrote. It states:

Dear Mr Meier,

I refer to your further letter of 22 August 1984 concerning public transport services between Virginia and Adelaide. It will always be difficult and extremely costly to provide commuter transport between Virginia and Adelaide if only for the matter of the service's having to traverse a considerable distance through vacant or sparsely populated land.

Your first suggestion of a mini-bus leaving the Virginia-Two Wells area at 7.30 a.m. and connecting with a train at Salisbury is the kind of service which a local community bus could provide, but the initiative for such a service should be at the local level if the local demand is to be best satisfied.

This is the principle behind the Government's support of community buses operated by local councils. You will appreciate that at this time the provision of extended bus services by the State Transport Authority is beyond the available funds. So, unless it can be shown that the extra revenue resulting from the extended services will cover the extra costs of the extension, it is regretted

that it does not seem prudent to further extend the services to the Virginia-Two Wells area. However, the local councils might be alerted to the possible use of community buses to fill these gaps and provide other useful services in the council areas.

Having received this letter only on 6 September, I have not had the opportunity to take up the matter with the local councils, but the thing that disturbs me is the statement I referred to in the letter, namely:

You will appreciate that at this time the provision of extended bus services by the State Transport Authority is beyond the available funds. So, unless it can be shown that the extra revenue resulting from the extended services will cover the extra costs of the extension, it is regretted that it does not seem prudent to further extend the services to the Virginia-Two Wells area.

I wonder whether the Government would like to do an analysis of every bus service operating in the metropolitan area currently to ascertain whether it is operating at a satisfactory revenue producing rate. If that is the case, why are we spending \$80 million in subsidising STA services? Of course, they will not meet the criteria in so many cases. Obviously they will not, and why should a town such as Virginia be discriminated against in this way?

The Hon. Ted Chapman: It's a bit like Kangaroo Island and the recovery costs proposed for the shipping services.

Mr MEIER: Exactly. That is another case where rural areas are ignored. The Government could not care less what is happening to them. The Government's answer is to tell people to go to the local council and see what it can do. I wish the Minister of Transport had seen to it that more money was put into areas where it could help disadvantaged people. Many of these people cannot get to Adelaide for a job, in some cases because of poor transport services. Let us remember that it is just the people who are looking for employment who cannot afford a motor vehicle and must rely on public transport. Many of them are living in this area simply because of their family background. They are being deprived in many ways because of it.

I feel certain that the local people will take this issue further. I pay full tribute to the local councillor of the Munno Para District Council, Councillor Frank Musolino, for his work in this area. He is endeavouring to do what he can to ensure that the resident's views are put together and to see what we can come up with as a package. I am very disappointed that the Minister seems to write it off with one stroke of the pen.

Another issue that does not seem to have been addressed in the Budget—an issue about which I spoke in this House on a prior occasion—is Marion Reef and the lack of adequate safety warning in that area. I raised this matter in a question some weeks ago and also took up the matter in writing with the Minister on 7 August this year. Part of that letter stated:

I write to you in relation to the Marion Reef buoy and the dangerous situation that has been established since the recent removal of this buoy from the Marion Reef. This matter was taken up with the Federal Minister of Transport, the Honourable Peter Morris, MHR, earlier this year (see enclosed correspondence).

In the Minister's reply it is stated that '... the South Australian Department of Marine and Harbours was aware of the proposal to withdraw the Marion Reef buoy and raised no objection'. My latest correspondence from the Edithburgh Progress Association has brought the following to my attention and I quote from their letter.

That letter highlights the fact that a yacht ran aground on the south-east corner of the eastern side of Troubridge Shoal, the occupants being unaware they were so close to the Marion Reef because of the lack of the beacon that the Federal authorities had taken away. Thankfully it was freed the following day, Monday 11 June at about 10.30 a.m.

However, the fact is that the existing light of the Troubridge Shoal is not clearly visible in certain weather conditions and undoubtedly contributed to the yacht running aground. One could say that this is a parochial issue occurring near Edithburgh and that it is just an unlucky situation, but after

speaking with a colleague in this House I can say that it seems that the Royal South Australian Yacht Squadron is also very concerned about the buoy being taken away and about its sailors. It was taken away only just before the winter period began, about May this year, and there has not been a real sailing season since. I am very worried about what might happen in the coming summer months.

I was disappointed when I asked a question concerning this matter in the House that the Minister said that he was unaware of the situation, yet a copy of the letter from the Progress Association which had been sent to the Federal Minister dated 17 May 1984 was sent to the State Minister. So, I wonder how the Minister is handling his Department when he said that he was not aware of the situation. Possibly the dangerous situation has existed because of a poorly handled department. However, the Minister of Marine has replied to the letter I have just read out. That reply, which I received last week, states:

I refer to the question you asked in the House on 7 August 1984, and to your letter of 8 August 1984, concerning the decision to remove the buoy from the Marion Reef. I arranged for the matter to be re-examined by officers of the Department of Marine and Harbors and the Department is still of the opinion that the area of the Marion Reef and Troubridge Shoals is sufficiently marked to enable safe navigation.

The Minister then deals with the various factors relating to the Commonwealth influence on the Marion site and the Troubridge Shoal area during last year, looks at the weather conditions and then states quite rightly that the buoy taken away was a Federal buoy relating to major shipping. The letter continues:

It is not possible to comment on the incident of the yacht running aground on 10 June 1984, without knowing the full facts...

The local progress association knows these waters well and is aware of the danger. It appreciates the tens of ships that have gone down in this area over the years. In fact, in this area one can see more than one anchor housed on the shore as a memorial not only to the lost ships but to the people who died when the ships went down. Yet, despite the fact that a yacht was grounded in the past few months—and we have not had a full sailing season—this Minister will not do anything about this safety hazard. That is very disturbing to all people who will use those waters in the coming summer season and I wonder how the Minister will explain it away should another grounding occur or, worse still, should a tragedy occur within the next six months or so.

This is a very serious situation and one that cannot be left as it is. The South Australian Royal Yacht Squadron is worried about the safety factor involved here and thinks that this matter must be further considered. I wonder how the Minister's reply, 'No, we think it is safe', is related to this Budget in which he has missed out on his share of the cake. He realises that he does not have the funds to do anything about this matter, anyway, and that he will have to take pot luck and hope that safety holds during the coming 12 months. This is a reflection on the Government and the Minister and the way in which he is handling his Department. I intend to press this matter further at another time.

This Budget has taken us a step closer to being the highest taxed State in the Commonwealth. I hope that the people of South Australia are waking up to this fact. I believe that they are, and that they will show this Government what they think of it at the next election. The only way in which this Government can govern is by stealing money from the common, hard-working people.

The Liberal Party has made its commitment in respect of taxation. People have seen how we operate. We will not overburden the little man with taxes. This Government is

not performing as it promised it would and has broken every promise it made about State taxation.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): It is very disappointing to see the number of members presently in the House.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Especially on the Government side.

Mr BECKER: As the member for Coles says, 'Especially on the Government side'. There are 47 members of this House and probably no more than about 12 are present. These are the only people who are interested in the details of the Budget and in making some contribution to the benefit of taxpayers of this State. Nobody on the Government side seems to care about this matter (there are only three or four Government members present in the House at the moment). They appear to accept the situation that Labor is a high taxation Government that will continue to tax people and spend the money that it gets, with no-one on the Labor side of this Chamber caring about accountability in respect of this matter.

I was worried this afternoon when the Auditor-General's Report was tabled and Opposition members (and back-bench members in general) were not given a copy of that report, because it is the crux of the back-up documents to the Government's Budget. The bad news regarding the various tax increases that the Government was about to make has already been announced—it was announced some weeks ago. The impact of those taxes was then glossed over by a series of announcements about all the goodies that would come from the Budget and the huge amount of money that would be allocated to recreation and sport (to which I do not object), and to other areas.

The principle of making such announcements at the time that the Budget is introduced has been broken. We now have the farcical situation of the Parliament debating the Budget when the Government made those announcements weeks ago. What is left: for members to look at the Budget and to consider whether it is good news, bad news or whatever? There is no doubt that this Budget is bad news for the taxpayers of South Australia, the unemployed, those on the poverty line or in dire circumstances, the aged, handicapped and the youth of our community. That is the tragedy of this Budget document. This Government has fallen into the same trap as have previous Governments of either not heeding the advice of Treasury or, if it has heeded Treasury advice, of not knowing that the advice was not well based.

For the fifth year in a row the State will transfer money from Loan Account to prop up Revenue Account. The Treasurer proposes to transfer \$25 million this financial year from capital funds to general revenue—the cash account. This means that in five years \$204 million has been taken out of Loan Account and put into general revenue. From now on the taxpayers of South Australia will continue to pay interest on that \$204 million. We are mortgaging the future of this State. We are creating a commitment and those now attending school, who hopefully will get jobs in the future, will have to pay for past poor financial management.

In 1980-81, \$37.2 million was transferred from Loan Account into Revenue Account; in 1981-82 it was a massive \$61.8 million; in 1982-83 it was \$51.9 million; in 1983-84 it was \$28.1 million; and now \$25 million—making a total of \$204 million worth of capital works that have been lost to the State to prop up the inefficient management of our resources. If one wants proof of the inefficiency of Government Administration, one has merely to read sections of the Auditor-General's Report. I compliment Mr Sheridan on his report. For the first time I am reasonably satisfied—and I will never be completely satisfied—with the presen-

tation of this document. In his report Mr Sheridan admits that there is a need for improvement. We have an Auditor-General who was prepared to put in this report his thoughts and an assessment of the situation. On page 1 of the report, under the heading 'Management of Resources', concerning the handling of \$2 500 million in 1983-84, the Auditor-General states:

Emphasis has been placed by successive Governments on the efficient and economic use of resources in recent years. That emphasis has given rise to an improvement in the management of public sector resources.

Despite that improvement, there is still a tendency in some areas to protect resources, rather than look to their reallocation to other areas of need. As a result, those resources remain locked into the Budget base, with additional funds being required for new or expanded programmes.

In this report reference is made to two management reviews which were both completed in January 1982. The Keeves review, and that part of it that relates to lecturing staff in Technical and Further Education (page 81), and the Lees Review of the management services function of the South Australian Public Service (page 8). Both reviews pointed to potential for resource savings. The extent to which those savings are to be realised has not been determined yet.

If that is not a fair sort of criticism of the Government and the Parliament, with its poor attendance of members in this Chamber this evening, I do not know what is. It has been spelt out by a greater authority than all of us—the Auditor-General. The Government must take heed of that warning and must act immediately in relation to this. The Auditor-General's Report continues:

Reference is made also in this report to the adequacy of some departmental reporting systems. I am concerned by the effect which delays in obtaining information from those systems can have on the monitoring and control of expenditures in those departments.

When I was Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee this was the type of comment that I believed in and supported, and I believed that we were deliberately being snowed in bringing about greater efficiency in the management of some Government departments. The Auditor-General's Report continues:

During the year I reported to the Treasurer my concern about the financial management of the Country Fire Services Board. That report suggested that consideration be given to the specification provided in the Country Fires Act for the appointment of Board members and the Director.

The Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee today tabled its report on the Country Fire Services. It states:

The PAC has concluded that the Country Fire Services Board has failed to exercise the powers of control and direction vested in it under the Country Fires Act. As a statutory authority the Board has wide powers to make and implement decisions with respect to the Country Fire Services.

The PAC further stated:

The PAC has concluded that the CFS Board must be restructured to provide a more effective vehicle for decision making. The current range of membership has not shown that it has the skills to provide decisive leadership, expert financial management or clear forward planning.

Many recommendations are contained in that report. The report does not say that the Board and the management of the CFS are incompetent. It was spelt out previously by the Auditor-General. The PAC had difficulty in dealing with this report—it took us two years. Tragically, the Ash Wednesday II fires occurred at the time when the Committee was in the South-East investigating operations of the Country Fire Service. I have nothing but admiration for the volunteers and the professional staff in the CFS when dealing with fires of the magnitude of the Ash Wednesday fires.

There is no excuse for incompetency at management level as far as the financial resources of the CFS are concerned. There is no doubt that Professor Schwerdtfeger should resign, that he should be made to resign by the Government, and that the Board should be restructured. I tried everything in

attempting to be friendly towards Professor Schwerdtfeger. But in my opinion there is no doubt that he as Chairman of the Board must accept responsibility for what has happened and for the invidious position in which the Director of the CFS has been placed, although he, too, deserves a considerable amount of criticism. I am also concerned about statements that were made by the Auditor-General at page 2 of his report:

The Government provides substantial assistance (in excess of \$500 million in 1983-84), to a wide range of organisations. I believe it would be prudent to examine closely the legislation under which those bodies operate to ensure that the necessary professional, business and financial management skills and the community interest requirements are not restricted by the legislation and are commensurate with the size and complexity of the organisation's operations.

In his statement the Treasurer said that financial assistance may have to be provided to the Woodville Spastic Centre—to mention only one organisation in one field. For many years the Woodville Spastic Centre has operated the Miss South Australia Quest. It is now known as the Miss Australia Quest—South Australian Division. It has raised \$600 000 to \$700 000—a huge amount of money to raise annually—and is a very aggressive fund raising operation. It is well run and well managed but extremely aggressive. But why is it that the Woodville Spastic Centre has been experiencing financial difficulties? Is it perhaps because of the programmes that it has undertaken in the occupational therapy units and in regard to activity therapy. Those sectors are financed by the Federal Government and I believe that it originally provided about 100 per cent funding, which has now been reduced to about 50 per cent funding in salaries. This is a problem that has occurred not only for the Woodville Spastic Centre but also for all other voluntary agencies dealing with the aged and disabled.

Over the past two years these charitable organisations have faced tremendous difficulties with fund raising, first, because of the recession in the economy, and secondly, because of the impact of the Ash Wednesday II fires at which time the people of South Australia and Australia came forward overnight and donated huge sums of money to the various lotteries and fund raising appeals that were organised. The impact on the organisations that were required to contribute part of their funds in concert with Government to assist the disadvantaged was tremendous. We hear all the time of other welfare agencies which are required to provide financial support for the disadvantaged but which cannot meet those commitments. I think that the Auditor-General is quite right. This applies not only to charitable, voluntary and welfare agencies but concerns all organisations which receive Government funding, and of course that includes statutory authorities as well.

In his report the Auditor-General goes on to deal with my favorite subject—value for money auditing. He gives a reasonable explanation of value for money auditing on page 4 and states what is occurring and what has happened. The Auditor-General again comments—as have previous Auditor-General's over many years—that the Audit Act has remained substantially unchanged for many years. It must be amended and updated to assist departments, management and the Auditor-General to carry out their functions. At page 7 in regard to Treasury and departmental finances, under the heading 'Financial Planning', the Auditor-General makes these pointed and excellent comments:

Financial plans and the monitoring of those plans against actual performance are a fundamental discipline in any efficient organisation. Ideally, the plans should extend beyond the boundaries of a financial year.

That is quite right. One cannot just draw up a Budget. It is a ridiculous situation when here on 11 September we are debating the State Budget for the financial year covering 1

July 1984 to 30 June 1985. There is no way in which this Parliament can amend the Budget or have any impact on it whatsoever, yet for administrative purposes the Government must have this document debated and passed by the Legislature. Already three months into the financial year we are now just considering the Budget. If we are to have any impact at all, it will relate only to the last nine months.

Why cannot State Governments—as does the Federal Government—bring down a Budget document in early January and give the Legislature and Parliamentary committees four or five months in which to examine all the documents, including the complicated programme performance documents: let us look at them all and have a complete and critical review so that by 1 July the legislation can be passed and the Budget commences. The Government can run the full 12 months without being interrupted in its programmes. All the programmes would be dealt with, debated and spelt out, at least five or six months before the Budget comes into force. That can be done. It is done in other countries with Budgets running into billions and billions of dollars.

For some unknown reason a State of 1.4 million inhabitants cannot do that or get its priorities in order. We cannot get ourselves organised, or is it just that we treat the whole thing with contempt? That is the tragedy of the situation. We should have a programme that is worked out for 12 months. At present we always have a situation in April, May or early June where Government departments spend up as much as they can to get rid of the money remaining because no-one wants a surplus at the end of the financial year. How ridiculous! We tried to resolve it when we were in Government.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: They do it because otherwise they expect to be cut back in the next year.

Mr BECKER: Yes, and that is not right. Governments should have the courage to give credit where there is efficiency and allow moneys to be carried forward. That is what the Auditor-General is saying when he states (page 7 of the report):

Financial plans and the monitoring of those plans against actual performance are a fundamental discipline in any efficient organisation. Ideally, the plans should extend beyond the boundaries of a financial year.

Again under the heading 'Financial Management' the Auditor-General states:

In 1983, the Government established a committee with broad terms of reference to examine Government financial management arrangements. Several reports have been handed to the Treasurer and the final report is expected by November 1984. The terms of reference relate to the Budget process and presentation, influences of the Budget on the State economy, financial legislation, raising and management of funds, pricing, statutory authorities and organisational matters.

It is one of these reports going on and on. I just hope that the Government will get down to carrying out its programme in this financial year. The Auditor-General further states:

The South Australian Government Financing Authority now adds a new dimension to the financing of capital works. The Authority has an asset base of almost \$1 000 million and available cash resources of \$347 million at June 1984. It provides a ready source of funds to support projects of economic benefit to the State. Three factors need to be watched carefully in using those funds for public purposes.

Here is the warning which the Government should heed:

- that the funds so used are channelled through the Consolidated Account, so that prior Parliamentary scrutiny of their intended use and effect on the State Budget can be made [accountable to Parliament];

- that those funds are not used as a device to expand the capital works programme in order to avoid difficult decisions with respect to project priorities;

- their use does not accelerate the growth of the net impact of debt servicing costs on the Consolidated Account and on taxation.

Those are three very pointed and timely warnings. It would be a very foolish Government that did not accept the advice of the Auditor-General. At page 8, we go to the management services review:

A report on the management services function of the South Australian Public Service (the Lees Report) was presented to the Public Service Board in January 1982. The report raised two main issues—

- that the management services function needed to be decentralised, with greater delegation to agencies, particularly with respect to staffing.

- that expenditure by the Government on the management services function appeared to be excessive in the absence of any performance measurement of the function.

The first matter has been addressed in the recent report of the committee that reviewed Public Service management.

Regarding the second matter, the Lees Report identified over 400 people employed in the area, with more than 65 per cent involved in personnel and administrative activities within the function. Less than 20 per cent were identified as involved in staff development, systems improvement and safety and occupational health.

That section continues, but again it is a very appropriate warning to the Government, and it is time that someone did something about this matter. The Auditor-General commented at page 8:

Development of the Treasury accounting system is an essential prerequisite to the effective operation of programme performance budgeting.

He talks further about that matter, but those issues have been raised time and time again at Public Accounts Committee level. The Auditor-General says, towards the bottom of page 9, that Public Service efficiency should improve as a result of the implementation of certain steps that have already been implemented under the Public Service Management Review, normally referred to as the Guerin Report. He points out the relationship that exists between a departmental head and the Minister which has not been addressed. He also deals with security of tenure of appointment and its effect on performance and the image of the public servant. Those two very vital points have been missed or not addressed by the Guerin Report.

Security of tenure is one matter, and the other is the relationship that exists between a departmental head and a Minister. In fact, 95 to 98 per cent of public servants have nothing to fear under security of tenure because of their performance and ability; their jobs are quite safe. Somewhere between 2 per cent and 5 per cent of non-performers who realise that they have security of tenure know that they cannot be dismissed and that nothing can happen to them. They float along and ride on the back of all the other good hard-working people in the Public Service. Something has to be done with that group. It is a hard number to assess, but it would save the Government hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of dollars if they could be weeded out. That issue must be addressed: Guerin and the Government would know that. If the Government is genuine about doing something for Public Service efficiency, that is the area it should address. As I said, 95 to 98 per cent of public servants have nothing to fear.

The Auditor-General points out some startling information on this occasion about matters that worry me considerably. At page 24 in the statement dealing with public debt and other indebtedness, he indicates that in June 1984 various statutory authorities in South Australia had debts of or owed \$1 218 million dollars. If we look at the size of the public debt, public debt interest bearing securities outstanding amounting to just over \$2 billion was down \$25 million from the previous year. These figures should concern every member of Parliament and every taxpayer in South Australia. Talk about mortgaging our future! Regarding other indebtedness, liability under Commonwealth agreements rose from

\$765.7 million to \$912.6 million, an increase in the past 12 months of \$146.9 million.

Liability on trust and other funds (moneys used by the Government—trust fund moneys) rose from \$96.7 million to \$566.4 million, an increase of \$469.7 million. The Government's public debt is \$3 489 million, or near enough to \$3.5 billion. The average interest rate on these amounts varies between 11.25 and 15.745 per cent. Thank you very much for the young people: their future does not look very good when we consider that they will have to pay the interest on the massive debts being built up by the current Government and past Governments.

Mr Evans: And the Federal Government, too.

Mr BECKER: As the member for Fisher says, the Federal Government would be building massive debts at a rate of knots, which is something no economy can withstand. The member for Fisher would know as well as I that the day of reckoning will come, as it has in other countries. We should learn from experience elsewhere just what occurs when the interest burden is so high. It is all very well for my Leader and others to predict that in South Australia we will be paying to the State Treasury \$1 000 million in direct taxation and that \$200 million and possibly \$300 million will go in interest and debt recovery. It is a huge debt that we are placing on future generations of this State.

I will present a few statistics for members, not because I like to do that but as a warning. It is statistical information which I think demonstrates the dangerous situation existing in the community. I refer to the Community Welfare Department, referred to on page 53 of the Auditor-General's Report—administration and community welfare services, residential care. The Auditor-General advises that in 1982 the average net cost per child for residential care was \$43 000; in 1983 it was \$42 000; and in 1984 it was \$42 000. Therefore, that figure (to look after a child in the Department's care) has remained constant at \$42 000 per year, or about \$840 per week.

We are quite alarmed when we hear that the St John's Boys Home at Brooklyn Park and several homes run by the Salvation Army are now experiencing financial difficulty. The Government will cut funds to the Community Welfare Department, and young people will be forced into a foster care situation or into Government homes. I feel for the young people because the foster care situation will fail. The Government will also fail to provide the appropriate loving care and accommodation that these people require. They cannot live in a normal natural family situation, and unfortunately they will be placed in a situation as they are now at St John's Boys Home at Brooklyn Park. They require loving care given by other providers, which money cannot buy and which the State cannot provide efficiently and effectively.

Page 54 of the Auditor-General's Report refers to difficulties in our youth training centres. The average cost of housing an offender at the South Australian Youth Training Centre in 1982 was \$48 000 per year; in 1983 it was \$57 000 per year, or just over \$1 000 per week; and in 1984, \$73 000 per year or \$1 403 per week per child. The cost of looking after an offender at the South Australian Youth Remand and Assessment Centre in 1982 was \$57 000; in 1983, \$73 000; and in 1984, it was \$104 000 or \$2 000 per week per offender.

There is something wrong with a situation where there is a capacity for 51 persons, but the average occupancy is 18. The staffing levels were not reduced. There was no way that the Department could reduce its administrative costs, so it is costing \$2 000 a week to look after offenders in the South Australian Youth and Remand Assessment Centre. It would have to be some type of record in the Commonwealth as far as the cost of this type of care is concerned. In regard

to the Lochiel Park Training Centre, in 1982 the cost was \$47 000 per offender, in 1983 the cost was \$69 000, and in 1984 it was \$67 000 or \$1 288.

The other matter on which I would like to spend a lot more time and to which I would refer members appears from page 256 onwards of the report on the Electricity Trust of South Australia relating to the effect of the impact of the Ash Wednesday fires. The Auditor-General draws attention to the Auditor's certificate and then spells out further on page 258, under 'Self Insurance' that the Electricity Trust's insurance premium has now gone from \$56 000 to \$5 million, but the Electricity Trust has shown a loss.

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

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I enter this debate because the earlier remarks of the previous speaker implied that the Government members were not at all interested in the Budget. I wish to give the lie to that statement, because I am particularly interested in the Budget, especially in so far as it affects my electorate. So far as I am concerned, for the record and because of the earlier remarks made by the previous speaker, I point out that there are now only six Opposition members in the House. Therefore, I feel that it is not quite right that members of the Opposition should be hurling criticisms at members of the Government for doing the same as they themselves are doing.

During the debate I wish to speak about the sport and recreation section of the Budget, and I refer specifically to the need for a community swimming pool in the western region. Unfortunately, during this year the Henley and Grange swimming pool had to close its doors. This is the second pool in the western region to be forced into this position; the other was the Olympic size swimming pool at Port Adelaide.

The Henley pool was in its fiftieth year of operation and was unique to South Australia. Its closure was because there were major cracks with resultant weakening along the concrete external pool wall, and there was deterioration of the reinforcing bars as a result of storm damage. The duck boards were in poor condition and resulted in a number of injuries, and the superstructure around the pool supporting the boards was of concern because of potential injury that could occur due to the failure of the timber structure. In addition, there was a corrosion of the valves, particularly in the plant filter valves and metal work.

An application for \$65 000 capital assistance programme grant was made to the Division of Recreation and Sport under the previous Administration in 1982. The application was not successful, and that made closure of the pool inevitable. Recently, the Henley and Grange council decided to allow the Henley and Grange Swimming Club to use the pool for competition, and I applaud that decision.

An examination of the swimming pools in the metropolitan area shows that they are not evenly dispersed. There are 14 public pools, two with limited public access at tertiary institutions, 46 school pools and 11 commercial pools. Discounting those facilities that have restricted or no access for community use, the remainder tend to be concentrated in the inner suburbs to the east of the city and in the northern and north-eastern suburbs. The area in which the community has poor access to adequate public swimming facilities includes the part of West Torrens and Woodville local government areas to the south of Port Road and to the north of West Beach Road, with an approximate population of 123 000.

The Metropolitan Regional Organisation Western, which includes the member councils of Glenelg, Henley and Grange, Hindmarsh, Port Adelaide, Thebarton, West Torrens and Woodville, has looked at the lack of swimming facilities in

the western region and has actively sought Government assistance to provide a swimming pool in the western area. Several councils have already pledged money to build the pool, but the task is financially beyond the reach of any local government organisation.

The Western Region of Councils referred the matter to a firm of consultants with a view to constructing a regional centre swimming pool with the following aims and objectives:

1. The centre should be self-supporting, and a high level of usage must be maintained.
2. Manage/control pool usage, so that the facilities are available for use by the general public at all times.
3. Provide for the inclusion of facilities for swimming and relaxation for all members of the family.
4. Encourage the community to use the facilities of their own accord (not necessarily relying on organised groups).
5. Promote the centre so that all ratepayers know what facilities are available and maintain the accessibility of facilities for the disabled.

The following objectives were adopted in establishing the criteria to match sponsored expenditure with perceived needs: to minimise management costs; to maximise opportunities for community activities; to maximise viability of the centre as a leasing proposition; and, finally, to maintain the adaptability of the facilities for a wide range of user groups.

Bearing in mind the recent closure of the region's only two public pool facilities, the following criteria were established: the availability of council or Government owned land of sufficient size to accommodate the facilities; the location needed to be central to the catchment area as identified by the Department of Recreation and Sport; and the location should be accessible to public transport, east, west, north, south and local government community bus services.

Two specific sites were ultimately identified: at Ray Street, Findon, and Toogood Avenue, Beverley. The Ray Street site satisfied all the criteria and, in addition, had the capacity for the development of other associated community and recreational facilities, together with sufficient space and access for car parking. In addition, I could not think of a better place for a community swimming pool: it happens to be in the very centre of my own electorate.

The Western Region of Councils is hoping that this pool will be a covered pool. In Victoria and New South Wales the covering of public pools, together with creative management, shows not only that enormous increases in attendance result but that significant changes in child to adult attendance ratios occur. This increase in adult attendance at pools results partly from controlled climate and temperature and partly from attractive activities. In any event, the need for equal consideration of all age groups and abilities in the design and provision of facilities is suggested.

In the western area, with good management and facilities, annual attendance figures could be expected of more than 300 000. With regard to the character and provision of existing facilities, the South Australian swimming pool study made the following observations:

The attractiveness of facilities to recreational swimmers, who form the largest sector of usage, is somewhat lacking. All of the public pools are rectangular in design, which has grown from traditional and strong influence of the competitive swimming sector. Where lanes and distances are all important. Such stereotyped design affords limited opportunity for expansion of usage where the greatest potential exists, that is, recreational swimming.

Relatively few users like to swim length after length of the pool and the activities which are most enjoyed—splashing, diving, jumping, bombing, floating, etc.—are mainly the very activities which most pools prohibit, mainly on the basis of safety. Very few of the pools have facilities that have been designed to 'have fun', thereby maximising the opportunity to increase usage.

The western councils believe that it is not difficult to design aquatic facilities which provide interest, excitement and fun as well as catering for the more serious organised programmes. There is no doubt that the intensive more formal use can more effectively cater to a greater number of users and hence yield greater returns. In the end the effectiveness and viability of the centre will depend on the quality and creativity of management. The plan for the centre includes both indoor and outdoor activities. It is suggested that facilities could be provided for local community groups and other local sporting groups, including volleyball.

The western region and the western swimming clubs are badly in need of swimming facilities. As I have mentioned earlier, the vast majority of swimming facilities in the Adelaide metropolitan area are in the eastern suburbs. Any boy or girl wishing to take on competitive swimming, who perhaps has aspirations to represent South Australia and possibly, eventually, Australia, has a great disability in being a resident of the western suburbs.

Unfortunately, in the present set of circumstances, so far as aquatic sports are concerned, we are creating two sorts of residents in the Adelaide metropolitan area: those who are rich enough and those who are fortunate enough to live in the eastern suburbs, or, alternatively, those who have parents who are prepared to make sufficient sacrifice to provide additional money and transport to take their children into the eastern suburbs, and those people who live in the western suburbs and who may have a particular sporting ability, but at this point in time are not able to utilise that ability. I might add that the times of the swimmers in the Henley and Grange Swimming Club, where they are currently using substandard accommodation, are better than the times of some of the swimmers who competed at the recent Olympic Games for some countries. The question, of course, as always, related to finance and the ability of the western suburbs to gather enough finance to build a facility that I have already mentioned.

I would indicate that I am totally in support of the western councils in their endeavour to build this very fine sporting complex. I believe that the children and indeed all people in the western suburbs deserve the sort of facilities that are available to other people in other areas. I understand that a deputation has been made to the Federal Minister for Sport, Recreation and Tourism (Mr Brown) to see what Commonwealth support is available and I would appeal to all Federal members in a bipartisan way to support this particular project.

I understand that representations have been previously made and will continue to be made to the Department of Recreation and Sport, and I hope that the South Australian Department is prepared to give full cognizance to the appeal that I am currently putting to the House. As I have indicated before, I am totally in support of this project and I would hope that it gets a sympathetic hearing from both the State and Commonwealth Governments.

I would like to briefly mention the merit of the submarine construction project in South Australia. There is no doubt about the need for this project to come to South Australia and I am sure that it would have the support of all politicians within South Australia. South Australian industry has long been dependent on manufacturing industry, the two main components being the car industry and the whitegoods industry. The motor vehicle industry is undergoing a rationalisation of production and this will continue for the next decade. This will materially affect South Australia more than any other State and it has already been evidenced by the whitegoods industry in particular, and its vulnerability to slight fluctuations in the performance of the economy.

Undertaking the building of a submarine in this State, therefore, will have a stabilising influence on South Aus-

tralia's manufacturing industry, and would do much to alleviate sectional unemployment in the Port Adelaide and western areas, with a possibility that it may draw down some of the unemployment in the Whyalla area. South Australia's share of the defence budget on a per capita basis is one of the lowest in Australia. There has been a concentration of the defence support mainly in New South Wales and Victoria and it would appear that on a per capita basis South Australia has a strong case for the establishment of a submarine base in our area. Major construction projects, such as a new submarine project which does not place heavy demands on natural resources, would do much to boost the economy of this State and compensate for its structural weaknesses.

The South Australian case is strong because it can be established that, of all the mainland States, the cost of production is the lowest in the Commonwealth. This is based on the fact that over the last decade South Australia's wage structure has been on average 5 per cent to 13 per cent lower than that of any other State. The man hours required to build the whole of a submarine varies between 1 000 000 and 1 500 000 man hours per submarine. Reduction in the man hour labour costs can have a major impact on the overall costing.

Industrial stability is far greater in this State than in any other State. For the last decade the level of instability in this State expressed in terms of man hours lost per employee has also been up to four times lower than that in equivalent trades elsewhere in Australia. In New South Wales experience has shown that not only does industrial instability in a dockyard seriously affect the economics of any shipbuilding programme but also it reflects on the quality of the management direction and control, which manifests itself in terms of quality of the product produced. At this stage of development of the proposed new submarine contract, the South Australian case is also strongly imbedded in the Eglo new engineering approach.

Eglo Engineering Pty Ltd is proposing to construct a purpose built site on the Port River as a green field site specifically geared to the construction of submarines. This company has recently completed a number of large petrochemical contracts where the size, complexity and level of the technical difficulties bear some comparison with the submarine hull construction. Its performance in the petrochemical area establishes with a high degree of confidence that this new engineering approach of treating the whole construction as an engineering enterprise rather than as shipbuilding will result in the product being produced at a lower cost, on time and to quality constraints.

Mr Speaker, I am naturally giving this project my total support. Many employees from General Motors-Holdens live in my constituency. Since I was elected to the House I have seen many of these people, quite often skilled tradesmen, unable to find employment following the wind-down of GMH Woodville. I hope that South Australia is able to procure the contract for the building of the submarine for the Australian Navy so that many of these people, whose valuable skills are now being lost to the South Australian manufacturing industry, may once again have a proper place in industry.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr TRAINER (Ascot Park): I would like to make a few remarks in defence of that noble and ancient institution the *Labor Herald*. I do this in response to some rather unkind remarks which came from the Leader of the Opposition a couple of weeks ago and which received the headline in the *Advertiser* of 30 August, 'Olsen accuses Government over ads in Labor newspaper'. Apparently the *Labor Herald* committed the heinous crime of attracting advertising from a wide section of the community, which included not only small business and big business but also one or two ads from Government departments.

The *Labor Herald* regularly seems to excite Liberal Party members opposite, and this certainly must say something about the quality of its publication. We often find members of the current Opposition (who are likely to be in Opposition for quite some time) a little bereft of anything to put into their contributions in this House. However, we know that there are two things that they can always turn back to when desperate: around June or July we can be sure that they will find plenty to comment on by way of remarks regarding what has transpired at the annual Labor Party Convention or the biennial national conference. For the rest of the year, if they are really stuck for something to say (and this happens quite often because they certainly seem to be bereft of ideas and policies and totally lacking in any sort of originality) they will turn to the *Labor Herald* and quote from it. They can quote from it very easily indeed, because it is a very accessible document—we do not hide documents of that nature as we believe it is part of our process of communication to the electorate at large and to the membership of the Party.

On the other hand, if one tries to get a copy of the Liberals' publication, with the exception of the Royal Show, that can be quite difficult. I understand that a publication called the *Southern Liberal* was distributed at the show—stuffed into show bags and jammed into people's hands as they walked past. However, that publication is not recorded as having been placed in the Parliamentary Library. Presumably the Liberal Party is too ashamed of it to have it registered as a document fit for reading by Parliamentarians. However, we have a much more open and democratic way of operating in the Labor Party. Our publication is readily available and is the only current publication produced with any continuity by a political organisation in South Australia.

The Leader of the Opposition was quoted in the *Advertiser* as saying it was in financial trouble. He quoted from a front page message in the July/August edition last year which said that the paper was in financial trouble. I point out that financial trouble is something that the *Labor Herald* has had ever since it was created. Financial difficulty is a perpetual condition that it has had for 87 years, a perpetual condition it shares with most specialist journals in our community. I refer to those journals which are not prepared to operate purely on a commercial basis, pandering to the lowest common denominator, but which instead target towards a specialist audience of perhaps 5 per cent, 10 per cent, or 20 per cent of the population. In the case of the *Labor Herald*, we ultimately aim at something more than 50 per cent of the population because that is the percentage of people who regularly support us in contrast to the number that supports our opponents.

The *Herald* in one sense is not officially a Labor Party publication, being the publication of the Workers Weekly Herald Pty Ltd. That is one point I take up with the Leader of the Opposition. I agree that there are strong links with the Labor Party. Board members are elected at the annual conference of the Australian Labor Party. The *Herald* also has a role as the official voice of the 126 000 members of the United Trades and Labor Council.

Through those dual roles with the Labor Party and the UTLC it provides a very special and easily identifiable target audience for certain advertisers. Quite a few people choose to advertise in the *Labor Herald* because of the target audience it reaches. A lot of the growth of advertising revenue that the *Labor Herald* has attracted recently derives from the work of Frank Murray, to whom the Labor Party and the *Herald* could not but give the highest praise. Frank Murray is not one of the full paid professionals around the place; he gives freely of his time to assist the *Labor Herald*, soliciting advertisements in the same way as a representative of any other journal would do.

Mr Murray has been told by Government officers that he has approached about advertising that any decisions on whether or not to take space in journals such as the *Herald*, or any other specialist journal, would be made solely on commercial considerations, and that any Government advertisement that has appeared has been placed by the Department on commercial considerations. As I will explain in a moment, there are not as many such advertisements as the Leader of the Opposition seems to think.

The status that the *Labor Herald* has had, in being a readily identifiable target audience for certain types of advertising, is a status it has had for years in a broken sort of line way back to 1897—further back than the afternoon tabloid which I hate to mention by name and which was established in 1923. The *Labor Herald* has changed from time to time. At different times it has been a daily publication, a weekly publication and, for as long as I can remember, a monthly publication.

The *Herald* has played a key role with particular issues over the years. It fought strongly for the establishment of Medibank in the 1970s. It fought for the establishment of the SGIC, yet it still has not attracted SGIC advertising, although one would think it fairly plain that the majority of persons who read the *Herald* would make almost exclusive use of the SGIC for their insurance purposes.

Nevertheless, it is worth analysing a couple of the largest issues in the new series that started in 1972. The November 1983 edition contained 32 pages. The February 1984 edition, the largest on record as far as I am aware, contained 44 pages, giving extensive coverage to the centenary of the United Trades and Labor Council. The November 1983 edition contained 45 separate advertisements from firms and organisations, none from the South Australian Government. That edition was one of the two largest editions of the *Herald*. It contained one advert from the Federal Government. The total non-government revenue of that edition was 92 per cent. The February 1984 edition contained advertisements from 57 separate advertisers, including two from the State Government and none from Canberra—a total non-government revenue of 96 per cent.

What is it that is really bothering the Liberals in this? Maybe it is the extent of the support that the *Herald* receives from small business, or perhaps they are even more upset about the support that the *Herald* gets from big business. For example, the *Herald* has been supported by advertisements from such firms as BHP, Santos, Mitsubishi, ICI, AMP, ACI, Frickers, and so forth. Or more likely perhaps it is just the fact that the *Herald* exists and that its existence is an ongoing reminder of the strength and durability of the Labor Government. Certainly, judging by the number of times that members opposite rely on the *Herald* to formulate their contributions, I suppose one could say that if it did not exist it would be an impediment in their speech.

I mentioned earlier that the Leader of the Opposition had jumped to a few conclusions about some advertisements. I want to refer in particular to the HOME advertisement that appeared in the October 1983 edition of the *Herald*, which was not paid for by the body whom he assumed was respon-

sible for it—the South Australian Government. That advertisement in fact was paid for by seven building unions. It was paid for not by the South Australian Government or by the Housing Trust, but by seven building unions. Another example of this same phenomenon; what the Leader of the Opposition did not seem to latch on to was that the accord advertisement in the August 1984 edition were not federally funded—it was paid for by a group of unions, including the PKIU and the Liquor Trades Union. I think it is about time that the members of the Opposition lifted their game a bit and concentrated on producing a few positive policies of their own instead of making up most of their Parliamentary contributions with such negative approaches as those which we saw recently from the Leader of the Opposition and which he continues to produce on an ongoing basis.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): No matter how much the member for Ascot Park tries to convince members on this side to the contrary, I think that was probably one of the worst contributions that he has ever made to the House. The paper to which the honourable member referred, the *Labor Herald*, deserves better support than that. In fact, I enjoy reading the *Labor Herald*. At least it is one of the very few publications that spells my name correctly. I want to refer again to the Auditor-General's Report. In the last paragraph on page 9 he states:

Audit Report

I am aware that some information contained in this Report duplicates information published in the Treasurer's statements and accounts. There is also considerable detail associated with some of the financial statements of agencies, particularly in the notes to and forming part of those statements. I intend to address these matters with respect to the next annual report. In doing so I would appreciate and be seeking comment from those who make use of the report.

I have already said that I think this is a superb Auditor-General's Report. I rang the Auditor-General this afternoon because I was a little worried that one of my favourite sections in the report was missing, that is, part VII. I have about 15 annual reports of the Auditor-General in my office that I have received in past years. Part VII deals with shortages and thefts of Government property, but this year the Auditor-General has not included that section in his report. He informed me that he believed that there is no obligation or requirement for him to provide that information and that perhaps such information might be misused. That is not the intention and never has been. I believe that, if we are to have total accountability to Parliament, it is essential that that information be included in the annual report as well.

Under the heading 'Shortages and Thefts' at page 498, the 1982-83 annual report indicated that the thefts and irregularities by Government employees totalled \$648 and that there was \$58 restitution. It indicated that other shortages, thefts of cash and irregularities totalled some \$2 923, and that \$379 in restitution was made. The important section is that dealing with thefts of Government property. The 1982-83 annual report of the Auditor-General states that losses amounted to some \$331 340 and that some \$8 461 was recovered. It gives information about which departments were affected and the amount of property that was stolen from various departments.

The worst, of course, has always been the Education Department. Fair enough, I am willing to accept that the Department is a huge operation with over 600 schools and spends several hundred million dollars. However, the equipment for those schools has been purchased with taxpayers' funds or moneys obtained from parents and students who raise money to purchase extra equipment. We want to know what action and security precautions are being taken by the

Department to prevent a repetition of this continuing theft of Government property. Whether it involves a bicycle such as that which was stolen from the STA a few years ago and which was never recovered, sophisticated computer equipment or a motor vehicle from another department, I believe that it should be reported to Parliament, as such information indicates that something is wrong with the management or the protection of Government and taxpayer's property.

I hope that the Auditor-General will take on board my suggestion that this section be included in future annual reports. I like the format of the Report that the Auditor-General has adopted. There are details, comments and additional statistical information that the House can discuss, but at least Public Accounts Committee members do have the opportunity to meet the Auditor-General generally a few weeks after the tabling of his Report and discuss the Report in more detail.

I want to draw the attention of the House to the report of the Electricity Trust, because this year the situation worries me. The Trust's report has always been the first report that I have received from a statutory authority each year, and this generally happens within weeks of the end of the financial year. This year however I have not received a copy, which indicates that some problems must be involved. Certainly, I was disappointed to read that the Trust had a turn around of about \$16 million. In other words, it went from a surplus in last the financial year of \$9 million to a \$7.7 million loss on overall operations.

There was a surplus of \$14.6 million on a straight out revenue and expense account, but then the statutory contribution to the State revenue of 5 per cent—that is 5 per cent on the overall income of the Trust—amounted to \$22.3 million. The Trust brought down an operating deficit of \$7.7 million. Other intangibles are added, including transfers from general reserves, and the final result was a loss of \$4 million for the financial year. That surely means that electricity charges, which have increased by about 26 per cent in the last two years, are likely to face another substantial increase within the next month or so.

The Hon. R.G. Payne: Do you want to bet on that?

Mr BECKER: Irrespective of how much the Trust has to increase the cost of electricity, it cannot be avoided. It will have to increase it. What worries me is the cost to pensioners, the aged and the infirm. I can only talk from my own personal experience, as is the case with all members, of my own electricity bills. How people on low fixed incomes can budget for the Trust's accounts is hard to believe because they involve unknown sums. One can try to estimate one's quarterly electricity bill, but that is extremely difficult to do. Some people can read their meters and monitor usage. Some aged people do this; we find that some are extremely cautious and are not getting adequate benefit from heating and the like.

I have been trying to devise some inexpensive system which would assist pensioners. There is a generous concession, and I give credit to the Government for that. We promised a concession, but the Government was elected and gave it. I am trying to work out something like a monthly account system, but that would be costly to maintain and monitor. It would mean a tremendous increase in the number of meter readers, a change in accounting procedures and so on.

The Hon. R.G. Payne: What about a tariff restructure?

Mr BECKER: Yes, I would agree to that. We need something, because many aged people need heating. We know that one of the biggest disabilities affecting the community is arthritis. We have had a cold, bitter and long winter. I am concerned when I either call on constituents or they come to see me that some of them have to retire early. They go to bed with their electric blankets on, because that

is the only kind of warmth that they can afford. They must be careful when using hot water and other forms of electric power. It seems a shame that a country with such wonderful resources cannot provide solar heating to the aged. We should be looking at alternative energy sources (using the sun) for these people so that they do not have to worry when their quarterly accounts arrive. I know that the Minister and the Trust are aware of this problem. I want the Minister to take this matter on board and find a solution. It is something that we cannot ignore.

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

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): During the adjournment debate I wish to refer to some needs in the District of Henley Beach concerning community welfare work. Problems in this area can be directly related to the results of the 1979 State election. During that campaign the Liberal Party in general and the local Liberal candidate in particular promised the South Australian voting public that if they voted for the Liberal Party then they would receive taxation cuts.

Mr Ingerson: Good on them!

Mr FERGUSON: The honourable member says 'Good on them!' I will explain in due course the damage that was done as a result of that election. We saw the election of a Liberal Government and in order to maintain its promises departmental services in many areas were cut back. This had a particular effect on the District of Henley Beach.

In 1981 a decision was made to close the Henley Beach branch office of the Department for Community Welfare. This was because of the Liberal Government's policy of reducing public services, and this policy affected the Department for Community Welfare particularly hard, forcing rationalisation such as the closure of the Henley Beach branch office. Unfortunately, there has never been a restoration of the situation in Henley Beach prior to 1981. There is, however, a continuing undercurrent in the area for the Department to either re-establish an office or to have at least a more visible presence in the area. This campaign has come in the main from the Henley and Grange City Council and other local service organisations. These people are quite rightly, in my opinion, seeking a restoration of the *status quo* prior to the reduction of services in the area by the former State Liberal Government.

Since the closure of the Community Welfare office in Henley Beach in 1981, the services to the area have been provided by the Thebarton District Office of the Department. The Thebarton office covers a large part of my district, and I have met with the officer in charge, Mr Graham Knill, to ascertain how his staff can work more directly in Henley and Grange. The Thebarton office has only 3.75 social workers and two senior staff to cover the corridor area from the city to the coast. This takes in all the area of Thebarton, Henley and Grange and parts of West Torrens local government area. Most of West Torrens is serviced by another branch office.

The taking on of this very large work load is one of the reasons why the Thebarton office is unable to provide a more visible presence in the Henley and Grange areas. In stating this I am in no way criticising Mr Knill or his staff because, from my experience, I have been most impressed with their work. They have shown concern and expertise in dealing with some very difficult cases and distressed individuals and families. My Parliamentary colleagues and I have received prompt and effective service with constituents. On several occasions I have met staff at community functions and meetings outside of office hours. I feel they have done a tremendous job in handling the problems of poverty and unemployment and meeting the needs of Indo-Chinese settlers.

It is alleged that the 1981 decision by the former Administration to close the branch office was due to a decrease in the number of clients using the office with an increase in the number of clients attending the Thebarton District Office. We have come through some very difficult times in the past 36 months. The number of people seeking community welfare services has increased. I find it very difficult to believe that the Henley Beach area would be any different from the rest of South Australia.

Certainly, since I have been in office, I have found a very great need to utilise the services of community welfare for people in my district. In addition, there is a need for the Department for Community Welfare to identify with the local service organisations, and the Thebarton staff are involved with a number of initiatives in contacting the Henley and Grange Women's Group, the family day care at Grange, the CYSS groups at Grange, the Henley Neighbourhood groups, the volunteer youth programme, and the HUG Community Organisation. However, I feel there is a need for the local population to identify closely with the Department for Community Welfare and a need for liaison with all groups by somebody who can be readily identified from the Department of Community Welfare. The need is definitely there.

The District of Henley Beach is fortunate to have a beautiful beach along the coastal area. I have spoken about this asset from time to time and I believe it is one of the best beaches of its type in the world. There is the ability which has not yet been fully realised to attract tourists to this area, and this potential has not been fully exploited or fully reached. There is a disadvantage, however, and that relates to the gathering of statistics by Government departments.

Because it is hemmed in by the sea, when looking at areas of 'most need' my electorate will always suffer, because inner city and nearby areas will always provide greater statistics of need because they are surrounded by larger areas of population.

Members interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: And I cannot see the reason why the Opposition would find this at all amusing. Therefore, in looking at the needs of my electorate, I am afraid that I will probably always find myself in a position of having to plead with various authorities to introduce services into my area. Unfortunately, we live in a world of statistics and grants, particularly Commonwealth Government grants, where determinations are made by decision makers who are not always in touch with the local scene. This makes it difficult for coastal areas like Henley Beach, where the problem cannot be seen in statistics because one side of the electorate is hemmed in by the sea.

I realise that in this instance I am talking not about a Commonwealth grant, but Commonwealth grants do apply in other areas, and it is my intention to mention those at another time. Unfortunately, I am advocating more staff in the Department for Community Welfare in my area, and I say 'unfortunately' because this means that I am seeking an extension to the Budget provisions for this Department. When one puts this into a political context—

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MEMBER'S REMARKS

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

Leave granted.

Mr BECKER: I am sorry to hold up the House at this time of the night, but the member for Henley Beach made a reflection on the Opposition's attitude towards the matter he has just raised in the House; that is, the closure of the office of the Department for Community Welfare.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I rise on a point of order. I understand that a personal explanation must relate to a matter involving the person who seeks leave to make the personal explanation and not necessarily the plural situation of the Opposition as a whole.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the Minister's point of order. In other words, the member for Hanson can explain the issue in so far as it bears on him but cannot deal with it in so far as it bears on a group.

Mr BECKER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I am a member of the Opposition, and the matter was raised on 22 August 1984 and appears on pages 484 and 485 of *Hansard*. I quoted a letter from the Minister of Community Welfare to the Henley and Grange council, which stated:

I understand that the 1981 decision to close the branch office—referring to the Henley Beach office of the Department for Community Welfare—

was also due to a decrease in the number of clients using the office together with an increase in the number of our clients from your area attending the Thebarton District Office... However, as well as providing normal District Office services, staff from Thebarton are involved in a number of local initiatives viz. Henley and Grange Women's Group, Family Day Care, Grange CYSS Group, Henley Neighbourhood Group and the Volunteer Youth Programme.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr FERGUSON: I rise on a point of order. I understand that in a point of order the honourable member does not have the right of reply. The only point of order is if I have reflected upon him personally, and I would suggest that the line of debate does not take that point of order.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not uphold the point of order taken by the member for Henley Beach. What I have upheld is the earlier point of order that the honourable member for Hanson must restrict himself to a personal explanation of the matter as it bears on him. He must not debate the issue.

Mr BECKER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I consider that it bears on me because the issue was raised by me and the point was straightened out on page 485 of *Hansard* relating to any implication that the member for Henley Beach has made on me as a member of the Opposition.

Motion carried.

At 10.25 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 12 September at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 11 September 1984

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

YOUTH AFFAIRS COUNCIL OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Mr OLSEN (on notice) asked the Minister of Labour: In relation to the Youth Affairs Council of South Australia:

- (a) what organisations comprise the Council;
- (b) on what dates were each of the bodies established;
- (c) what funding has been provided by the Government for the Council; and
- (d) what additional funding has been provided for the member groups?

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

- (a) The Youth Affairs Council of South Australia comprises the following forums:
 - the Youth Workers Network of South Australia
 - the South Australian Youth Forum
 - the Youth Organisation Forum of South Australia.
- (b) The above member forums were established in:
 - 1976
 - 1981
 - 1982
 respectively.
- (c) A grant of \$20 000 was made available to establish the Youth Affairs Council of South Australia in February 1983. In 1983-84 the Youth Affairs Council also received an operating grant of \$60 000 and a grant of \$15 000 to support planning for the International Youth Year. An allocation of \$66 000 has been provided in 1984-85 for the operating expenses of the Youth Affairs Council together with a grant of \$32 000 to support planning and development of activities for the International Youth Year. In addition funds to a limit of \$7 000 have been allocated to assist with meeting costs associated with hosting the National Youth Council of Australia in Adelaide in January 1985. The funds will be used to cover administrative costs and provide subsidies to enable young South Australians to attend.
- (d) The South Australian Youth Forum received a total of \$2 219 in the period December 1982 until May 1984.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HEALTH COMMISSION EMPLOYEES

4. **Mr GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism, representing the Minister of Health: How many persons are currently employed by the South Australian Health Commission, and has there been any increase during the past two years?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Numbers of persons employed by health units funded by the South Australian Health Commission fluctuate substantially, both because of seasonal factors (for example, the impact of intakes to nurse training schools) and the operation of random factors, such as the accumulated number of casual vacancies in any particular period among a relatively mobile workforce.

Numbers of persons employed at 30 June over the past two years were:

As at 30.6.82	19 857
As at 30.6.83	20 010
As at 30.6.84	19 963*

Average number of persons employed during 1982-83 was 19 884 and during 1983-84 was 19 975. There has not been a significant change in general levels of employment by South Australian Health Commission funded health units.

*Last available figure (subject to late notification of adjustments by health units).

WHITE AVENUE, LOCKLEYS

13. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Have traffic and pedestrian surveys been taken in White Avenue, Lockleys. If so, do the results support the need for a school crossing near Pierson Street and will the Minister establish such a school crossing and, if not, why not?

The Hon. R.K. ABOTT: A recent traffic and pedestrian survey in White Avenue, Lockleys, indicated that the number of pedestrians crossing this road is not sufficient to justify the installation of a school crossing at the present time.

COMMISSIONER OF CHARITABLE FUNDS

16. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism, representing the Minister of Health: Has there been a decline in moneys paid to the Commission of Charitable Funds by medical specialists granted the right of private practice at public hospitals over the past five years and, if so, why?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Yes. Prior to December 1980, private practice arrangements required net earnings in excess of 25 per cent of the salary of a Senior Medical Director (MO9) to be paid to the Commissioner of Charitable Funds.

In December 1980 new private practice arrangements in the form of schemes A and B were introduced. These arrangements formally provided for the employing authority to institutional bill on behalf of the specialists and to levy service and facility charges. Schemes A and B provide for these charges to be paid directly into appropriate hospital accounts.

ARCKARINGA BASIN

25. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy: Has a detailed assessment been undertaken of the coal mineralisation in the Arckaringa Basin, specifically that area under lease to Meekatharra Minerals Limited and, if so, what were the results?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: A detailed review and report of all exploration activity in the Arckaringa Basin region has been recently completed by officers of the Department of Mines and Energy. Their report indicates that there is considerable potential for the further discovery of substantial coal occurrences within the basin.

Coal occurrences in the area specifically under lease to Meekatharra Minerals Limited are continually being assessed by the lessee's geological and mining consultants. On 1 August 1984 the Future Energy Advisory Committee called for submissions on the supply of coal from four South Australian sources and invited Meekatharra Minerals Limited and other companies to submit detailed proposals. The

submissions will be assessed after the closing date of 19 November 1984.

LANDSCAPING

26. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: With respect to the article in the *Advertiser* of 11 July 1984 concerning landscaping of factories and supermarkets:

- (a) have any proposals been developed to encourage such plantings; and
- (b) in response to research in the United States, which has shown open space and bright lighting as the most effective deterrents against burglaries and assaults, has any study been undertaken on the impact of further greening initiatives on personal and business security?

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

- (a) Yes. A brochure entitled 'Planting Profit in Commercial Developments' has been prepared as part of the promotion of the Greening of Adelaide Project.
- (b) The lack of specific information on the type of research undertaken in the United States makes it difficult to comment on this question.

STA PASSENGERS

29. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What proportion of passengers during the last financial year travelled on STA buses and trains in the metropolitan area free of charge (using entitlement cards) and under concession arrangements?
2. How many passengers utilised the free Bee-line bus service?

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

1. The STA advises that, during 1983-84, 24 per cent of all passengers on State Transport Authority buses and trains travelled free, and a further 39 per cent travelled under concession arrangements.
2. No detailed counts of passengers on the Bee-line bus service have been done since February 1981, at which time it was estimated that there were approximately 50 000 boardings/week.

SATURDAY TRADING

30. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Labour: What practical assistance/support has been provided by the Minister to facilitate discussions between the retail employees unions and the relevant retail trader associations to negotiate mutually agreeable working conditions for Saturday afternoon trading?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: An offer has been made to consider implementing any proposal agreed by the parties on Saturday afternoon trading. No assistance has been sought at this stage by the retail employees unions or the retail trader associations to facilitate discussions on this matter.

ASBESTOS POISONING

37. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Has the Australian Teachers Federation identified those schools in South Australia in which there is potential for asbestos poisoning, how was the degree of risk assessed

and what action is being taken by the Minister on this matter?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: No. However, since the publication of the Australian Teachers Federation report a circular has been sent to all school principals setting out the known facts about the possible dangers to health from the inhalation of asbestos fibres and requesting that principals, who believe that there may be hazardous situation within their school, to contact their district building officer to arrange an inspection and assessment. The Australian Teachers Federation has not explained how the degree of risk was assessed.

Also, I am advised that the experience of the Department of Labour and of the Asbestos Advisory Committee shows that it is most unlikely that any person in a Government owned or occupied building is being subjected to levels of asbestos in excess of that determined as being acceptable by the National Medical and Health Research Council.

LISTENING DEVICES

44. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Emergency Services:

1. Has the Minister undertaken any investigation of electrical shops to identify items of equipment which could be used as covert listening devices and if so, what has been the result of the investigations?
2. Has the Minister approached the Federal Government concerning control of imported equipment which could be used as covert listening devices?

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

1. The Police Department has conducted inquiries at various electrical retail stores and has also reviewed publications relating to electronic equipment. As a result, a number of items of equipment which could be used as covert listening devices have been identified as being available for purchase by the public. One of the difficulties is that equipment of this nature has many legitimate purposes and is widely used in the community. The problem of controlling the availability and use of such equipment is a complex one which is not likely to be resolved without considerable research and deliberation. A further problem to be overcome is that covert listening devices can be easily constructed in Australia, at little cost, from components that are readily available within the country. At the present time, all State jurisdictions in Australia are examining ways of bringing about stricter controls over what are generally called 'bugging devices'.

2. The subject of listening devices in general is currently being considered in the forum of the Australian Police Ministers' Council at which the Federal Government is represented.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACCIDENTS

46. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: With respect to road traffic accidents over the past four years, what was the number and percentage age distribution of drivers deemed to have been partly or fully responsible for such accidents, who had alcohol in their blood, and how many exceeded .08?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The details are provided in the following tables:

1980

Age	No.	Responsible Per cent of Total Accidents for 1980	Total No.	Alcohol No. > 0.08 per cent
16-20	6 920	28.3	364	302
21-25	4 268	17.5	308	261
26-30	2 702	11.0	158	142
31-35	2 148	8.8	87	84
36-40	1 624	6.6	72	69
41-45	1 267	5.2	48	41
46-50	1 300	5.3	48	45
51-55	1 224	5.0	27	25
56-60	1 042	4.3	37	32
61-65	707	2.9	19	16
66-70	580	2.4	18	16
71-75	354	1.4	3	1
76-80	219	0.9	2	2
81-85	75	0.3	0	0
86+	24	0.1	0	0
Total	24 454	100	1 191	1 036

1983

Age	No.	Responsible Per cent of Total Accidents for 1980	Total No.	Alcohol No. > 0.08 per cent
16-20	6 236	25.0	585	531
21-25	4 582	18.3	458	426
26-30	2 874	11.5	233	226
31-35	2 318	9.3	157	152
36-40	1 845	7.4	99	94
41-45	1 427	5.7	81	77
46-50	1 156	4.6	65	64
51-55	1 119	4.5	62	61
56-60	1 107	4.4	58	57
61-65	814	3.3	30	30
66-70	604	2.4	18	17
71-75	492	2.0	16	16
76-80	271	1.1	7	7
81-85	101	0.4	5	5
86+	24	0.1	0	0
Total	24 970	100	1 874	1 763

1981

Age	No.	Responsible Per cent of Total Accidents for 1980	Total No.	Alcohol No. > 0.08 per cent
16-20	5 893	26.8	277	247
21-25	3 878	17.6	196	183
26-30	2 565	11.7	128	118
31-35	2 033	9.2	69	69
36-40	1 461	6.6	46	42
41-45	1 220	5.6	44	42
46-50	1 034	4.7	33	33
51-55	1 165	5.3	41	41
56-60	924	4.2	26	26
61-65	634	2.9	14	14
66-70	536	2.4	10	10
71-75	345	1.6	3	3
76-80	193	0.9	1	1
81-85	81	0.4	0	0
86+	26	0.1	1	1
Total	21 988	100	889	830

1982

Age	No.	Responsible Per cent of Total Accidents for 1980	Total No.	Alcohol No. > 0.08 per cent
16-20	3 538	29.2	440	414
21-25	2 296	18.9	310	299
26-30	1 353	11.1	199	195
31-35	1 047	8.6	123	119
36-40	749	6.2	87	84
41-45	592	4.9	56	55
46-50	518	4.3	40	37
51-55	535	4.4	45	44
56-60	468	3.8	36	35
61-65	324	2.7	25	25
66-70	291	2.4	11	11
71-75	210	1.7	15	14
76-80	128	1.1	1	6
81-85	70	0.6	6	1
86+	9	0.1	2	2
Total	12 128	100	1 396	1 341

Notes:

1. The statistical data supplied has been obtained from Highways Department records of reported accidents received from the Police Department.

2. Numbers shown are for persons whose ages were included on the police reports.

3. Figures for 'Responsible' for 1982 are lower than those for the other years because, unless a vehicle had to be towed away from the scene, property-damage—only accidents were not processed to computer. This was occasioned by the limited staff resources available to carry out this work at the time.

BRINKWORTH POLICE STATION

53. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Emergency Services:

1. What is the position as regards the permanency of the police station at Brinkworth and, if a decision has not been taken by the Government in respect of this matter, when will a decision be taken?

2. What arrangements will be made to ensure the continuation of patrol services of district roads in the area as well as services to the townships of Koolunga and Yacka if the decision is to close the station?

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

1. No decision has been made about the permanency or otherwise of the Brinkworth police station. A decision will be made following the completion and evaluation of a review of country policing currently being undertaken by the Commissioner of Police throughout the State.

2. Before any decision is taken to discontinue an existing police service anywhere in the State, regard is always had to the provision of alternative policing strategies for the particular district concerned, after consultation with local community groups. This will be the approach adopted in respect of Brinkworth if, in fact, the survey indicates that closure of that installation is warranted.

COOPER BASIN PRODUCERS

57. **Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy: What are the proven reserves

of gas up to the present time to satisfy the South Australian gas contracts with the Cooper Basin producers?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: A total of 2530PJ of sales gas is listed in the latest Cooper Basin producer's production schedule. Additional reserves amounting to 850PJ of gas are attested by the producers as being available in a recent submission to the Future Energy Action Committee.

AUSTRALIAN GAS LIGHT

58. **Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy: Who is conducting gas sharing negotiations with Australian Gas Light for the South Australian Government, how many meetings have been held since 1 January 1984 in these negotiations and what progress has been made?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The replies are as follows:

1. Representatives of the Natural Gas Steering Committee of the Future Energy Action Committee.
2. Five.
3. As the discussions are being held on a confidential basis, details cannot be disclosed at the present time.

COMPUTER EDUCATION

61. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. What resources are to be devoted towards computer education?
2. Is it Education Department policy to provide computer-user training for primary school students?

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

1. The Education Department maintains the Angle Park Computing Centre to provide support for schools computing. The Centre has a teaching staff of seven, two programmers and four clerical officers. In addition, there are four regionally based computing advisory teachers. The Centre has a 1984 professional development programme that consists of 65 inservice activities ranging in duration from half a day to 20 days.

The Centre also conducts activities in schools and in regional allocations; develops software for school use; provides consultant assistance to schools; and assists schools to establish computer facilities and to implement Education Department policy with regard to schools computing. The Commonwealth Schools Commission has allocated \$482 000 to the Education Department to implement the Computer Education Programme. Proposals for the use of these funds have been developed, approved by the State Advisory Committee of the CEP, and are awaiting approval from the Federal Minister for Education and Youth Affairs. When approval has been granted, details of the approved programme for South Australia will be published in the *Education Gazette*.

2. The answer to this question depends on the meaning of 'computer-user training'. The word 'training' implies some vocational bias. If this is so, then the answer is emphatically 'No'. Schools computing policy is currently being revised to emphasise computer literacy for all students and teachers. Computer literacy is taken to include the skills, attitudes and knowledge that an individual needs to have to confidently and competently use computers when it is appropriate to do so. Computing is not seen as a specific, separate object of study at the primary level, but rather as a tool that may be used across the curriculum. As the level of school based resources and teacher computer literacy are developed, the use of word processing and computer facilities that illustrate the problem solving techniques and the exploration of a

variety of teaching/learning activities to enhance communication skills, are being undertaken. Professional development activities for primary teachers emphasise the above processes.

In addition to the inservice professional development programme, the APCC conducts inservice activities for school staff, both at the APCC and in school locations. I have approached the Federal Minister for Education to have the Commonwealth Schools Commission include money for computers for primary schools in the allocation for the Computer Education Programme.

CEDUNA MEDICAL SERVICES

65. **Mr GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism, representing the Minister of Health: Does the South Australian Health Commission or any other department have any intention of providing salaried medical services at Ceduna or in the vicinity of Ceduna and, if so, why, on whose recommendations are they to be established in the area, and where will they be housed?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: It is not intended to give consideration to the introduction of a salaried medical service at Ceduna or in the vicinity of Ceduna. However, it is understood that the two current medical practices in Ceduna are for sale and clearly the owners have a financial interest in selling them. If there is any likelihood of the community being without medical services the South Australian Health Commission, the Ceduna Hospital and the district council will take whatever action is necessary to ensure that the residents are provided with the appropriate level of service.

I also advise that negotiations will shortly commence to enable an Aboriginal Community Health Service to be established in the Ceduna-Yalata area. When this is established it is envisaged that the Aboriginal community may employ a resident medical officer or other health professionals to work in the community based Aboriginal Health Service. The South Australian Health Commission will work with the Ceduna Hospital and district council to ensure a smooth transition.

HANSARD

68. **Mr INGERSON** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning:

1. What was the number of subscribers to *Hansard* during the 1980-81 session and the total sum collected from them?
2. What is the number of subscribers to *Hansard* for the current session and the sum collected from them?
3. What are the 'run on' costs for *Hansard* per session after the initial outlay has been made for reporting, proof reading, printing and free copies?
4. What is the total cost of printing *Hansard*?
5. How many copies of *Hansard* are printed?

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

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. (a) Number of subscribers, 1980-1 session | 356 |
| (b) Total sum collected, 1980-1 session | \$4 272 |
| 2. (a) Number of subscribers, 1984-5 session | 218 |
| (b) Total sum collected, 1984-5 session | \$29 430 |
| 3. 'Run on' costs, 1983-4 session | \$270 000 |
| 4. Total cost of printing <i>Hansard</i> , 1983-4 session | \$990 000 |
| 5. Number of copies of <i>Hansard</i> printed | 2 750 |

GOVERNMENT MOTOR VEHICLES

69. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: How many motor vehicles, by departments, were owned

by the Government (including semi-government authorities) as at 30 June of the years 1982 to 1984?

The Hon. R. K. ABBOTT: Statistics relating to Government vehicles are collated as at 28 February as all registrations expire on that date. The following list sets out the number of vehicles registered by Government departments and authorities as at 28 February 1982, 1983 and 1984:

Department/Authority	Government-Owned Vehicles as at 28 February			Department/Authority	Government-Owned Vehicles as at 28 February		
	1982	1983	1984		1982	1983	1984
Electricity Trust of S.A.				South Australian Health Commission (Mental Health Services)			
Vehicles	1 599	1 622	1 628	Vehicles	48	25	21
Cycles	3	4	4	Trailers	8	4	1
Trailers	614	622	614	Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science			
E & WS				Vehicles	37	37	34
Vehicles	2 305	2 402	2 314	Trailers	2	2	1
Cycles	1	1	1	Correctional Services			
Trailers	1 529	1 467	1 453	Vehicles	86	93	105
Marine And Harbors				Trailers	10	13	19
Vehicles	123	134	127	Community Welfare			
Trailers	86	86	88	Vehicles	288	278	292
Highways				Cycles	1	1	—
Vehicles	1 729	1 655	1 671	Trailers	21	25	28
Trailers	680	681	681	Auditor-General			
Lands				Vehicles	7	7	6
Vehicles	132	151	157	Treasury			
Cycles	—	—	1	Vehicles	6	6	5
Trailers	6	6	6	Local Government			
Mines and Energy				Vehicles	36	32	29
Vehicles	164	136	135	Trailers	1	—	—
Trailers	105	76	64	Transport (Government Motor Garage)			
Electoral				Vehicles	81	72	75
Vehicles	1	2	2	Cycles	47	44	48
Woods and Forests				Trailers	6	3	3
Vehicles	385	399	426	S.A. Health Commission (Health Ind. Serv.)			
Cycles	5	5	5	Vehicles	19	20	18
Trailers	70	74	77	Premiers			
Education				Vehicles	12	14	14
Vehicles	880	885	849	Trailers	1	1	1
Trailers	193	199	206	Lotteries Commission			
Agriculture				Vehicles	3	3	4
Vehicles	580	578	533	Lands (Valuer-General's Office)			
Cycles	22	23	24	Vehicles	2		1
Trailers	144	145	153	Environment and Planning (State Planning Authority)			
Police				Vehicles	7	14	16
Vehicles	804	874	816	Trailers	3	3	4
Cycles	212	241	212	S.A. Urban Land Trust			
Trailers	96	90	90	Vehicles	7	3	3
Public Buildings				Environment and Planning (Botanic Gardens Div.)			
Vehicles	619	599	474	Vehicles	30	26	26
Trailers	137	133	129	Trailers	5	6	7
South Australian Health Commission (Central Administration)				Environment and Planning (Admin. Div.)			
Vehicles	221	96	87	Vehicles	76	64	51
Cycles	2	2	2	Cycles	2	1	1
Trailers	39	17	13	Trailers	13	12	16
Services and Supply (Government Printing Division State Supply Division)				S.A. Health Commission (Domiciliary Care and Community Health)			
Vehicles	43	42	193	Vehicles	26	2	2
Trailers	1	1	1	Trailers	1	1	1
Tourism				S.A. Film Corporation			
Vehicles	10	10	13	Vehicles	7	4	5
Fisheries				Trailers	1	2	2
Vehicles	44	45	51	Art Gallery			
Cycles	1	1	1	Vehicles	6	5	5
Trailers	33	36	40	Trailers	1	1	1
Courts				Monarto Development Commission			
Vehicles	21	19	16	Vehicles	13	9	
Labour				Trailers	4	3	
Vehicles	94	82	84	Technical and Further Education			
Public Service Board				Vehicles	86	87	106
Vehicles	5	6	5	Cycles	3	4	4
Trade and Industry				Trailers	34	42	47
Vehicles	7	7	—	History Trust of S.A. (Birdwood Mill)			
(Eyre Peninsula) Regional Cultural Centre Trusts				Vehicles	2	3	2
Vehicles	7	5	5	West Beach Trust			
Arts				Vehicles	21	21	23
Vehicles	14	10	11	Cycles	2	2	2
Trailers	2	3	3	Trailers	7	7	7
				Senior Secondary Assessment Board of S.A. (Public Examinations Board)			

Department/Authority	Government-Owned Vehicles as at 28 February			Department/Authority	Government-Owned Vehicles as at 28 February		
	1982	1983	1984		1982	1983	1984
Vehicles	1	1	1	Vehicles	5	5	6
Marine and Harbors (No Fee Registrations)				Christies Beach Community Health Centre			
Vehicles	52	47	43	Vehicles	4	4	3
Trailers	77	81	72	S.A. Health Commission (Eastern Region)			
Alcohol and Drug Addicts Treatment Board				Vehicles	32		
Vehicles	15	14	15	Elliston Hospital Inc.			
Trailers	—	1	1	Vehicles	1	1	1
S.A. Meat Corporation				Flinders Medical Centre			
Vehicles	22	24	24	Vehicles	9	9	8
S.A. Housing Trust				Trailers	1	1	1
Vehicles	335	322	335	(S.A. Health Commission)			
Trailers	119	118	117	Glenside Hospital Inc.			
Adelaide Festival Centre Trust				Vehicles	34	37	30
Vehicles	8	7	7	Trailers		1	1
Trailers	—	—	1	Hillcrest Hospital Inc.			
S.A. Housing Trust (Emergency Housing)				Vehicles	62	65	72
Vehicles	1			Trailers	3	3	3
Pipeline Authority of S.A.				Ingle Farm Community Health Centre Inc.			
Vehicles	85	94	98	Vehicles	7	8	9
Cycles	1	1	—	Lameroo District Hospital Inc.			
Trailers	27	25	31	Vehicles	1	1	1
Public and Consumer Affairs				Lyell McEwin Hospital Inc.			
Vehicles	76	66	75	Vehicles	3	3	12
Trailers	13	14	17	Minlaton District Hospital Inc.			
Attorney General's				Vehicles	1	1	1
Vehicles	4	6	5	Modbury Hospital Inc.			
Environment and Planning (North Haven Trust)				Vehicles	4	4	4
Vehicles	6	8	6	Mt Gambier Hospital Inc.			
Cycles	1	1	1	Vehicles	2	1	1
Trailers	1	3	3	Trailers	1	1	1
S.A. Meat Corporation (Pt Lincoln Branch)				Murray Bridge Soldiers Memorial Hospital Inc.			
Vehicles	5	6	6	Vehicles	3	2	3
Trailers	2	2	2	Trailers	1	1	1
State Transport Authority				(S.A. Health Commission)			
Vehicles	1 172	1 125	1 215	Pt Adelaide Community Health Inc.			
Trailers	71	80	78	Vehicles	2	1	5
Environment and Planning (Wildlife Div.)				Pt Augusta Hospital Inc.			
Vehicles	165	170	179	Vehicles	2	7	7
Cycles	27	29	25	Trailers	1	1	1
Trailers	92	105	106	(Pt Lincoln Hospital Inc.)			
S.A. Teacher Housing Authority				Pt Lincoln Health and Hospital Service Inc.			
Trailers	13	7	6	Vehicles	4	6	9
State Clothing Corp.				Pt Pirie and District Hospital Inc.			
Vehicles	2	2	2	Vehicles	7	6	7
Corporate Affairs Commission				(S.A. Health Commission)			
Vehicles	5	3	3	Pt Lincoln Community Health Inc.			
Country Fire Services				Vehicles	1	2	2
Vehicles	22	21	21	(S.A. Health Commission)			
Trailers	10	10	12	Riverland Community Health Inc.			
Adelaide Womens Community Health Centre				Vehicles	2	6	4
Vehicles	2	2	3	Royal Adelaide Hospital Inc.			
Angaston District Hospital Inc.				Vehicles	20	56	56
Vehicles	1	1	1	Trailers	4	4	4
Aboriginal Health Organisation of S.A.				(S.A. Health Commission)			
Vehicles		38	50	Southern Domiciliary Care Service Inc.			
Trailers		—	2	Vehicles	34	40	39
Southern Fleurieu Health Service (South Coast District Hospital)				S.A. Health Commission, Strathmont Centre			
Vehicles		2	3	Vehicles	33		
Mt Gambier and Districts Extended Care Service				(S.A. Health Commission) Parks Community Health Centre Inc.	8	6	5
Vehicles		5	7	Queen Elizabeth Hospital Inc.			
Child Adolescent and Family Health Service				Vehicles	8	8	15
Vehicles		114	116	Trailers	1	1	1
Trailers		9	9	(S.A. Health Commission)			
(S.A. Health Commission)				Tumby Bay Community Health Inc.			
Barmera Hospital Inc.				Vehicles	1		1
Vehicles	1	1	3	Walleroo Hospital Inc.			
Central Northern Health Services Inc.				Vehicles	5	8	9
Vehicles	18	23	13	Whyalla Hospital Inc.			
Clovelly Park Community Health Centre				Vehicles	7	10	11

Department/Authority	Government-Owned Vehicles as at 28 February			Department/Authority	Government-Owned Vehicles as at 28 February		
	1982	1983	1984		1982	1983	1984
Trailers	1	1	1	Strathalbyn & District Soldiers Memorial Hospital Inc. Vehicles			1
(S.A. Health Commission) West Domiciliary Care Service Vehicles	17	38	51	TOTAL Vehicles	13 010	13 197	13 268
Jam Factory Workshops Inc. Vehicles		1	2	Cycles	330	360	331
Recreation and Sport Vehicles		8	11	Trailers	4 291	4 260	4 255
Trailers		3	3	Total Vehicles	17 631	17 817	17 854
Northern Regional Cultural Centre Trusts Vehicles		2	3				
Riverland Regional Cultural Centre Trusts Vehicles		2	2				
South-East Regional Cultural Centre Trusts Vehicles		2	3				
History Trust of S.A. (Schuberts Farm) Vehicles		2	2				
Trailers		1	1				
Kindergarten Union of S.A. Vehicles		33	43				
Parks Community Centre Vehicles		3	4				
Trailers		1	1				
Renmark and Paringa District Hospital Inc. Vehicles		1					
Cooper Pedy Hospital Inc. Vehicles		3	3				
Trailers		1	1				
Dental Health Services Vehicles		39	40				
Trailers		19	17				
Guardianship Board Vehicles		2	2				
Mental Health Review Tribunal Vehicles		1	2				
Morphett Vale Community Health Centre Vehicles		2	2				
Pinnaroo District Hospital Inc. Vehicles		1	2				
Trailers		1	1				
Meningie & Districts Memorial Hospital Inc. Vehicles		2	2				
Mannum District Hospital Inc. Vehicles		1	1				
Waikerie Hospital Inc. Vehicles		3	4				
Intellectually Disabled Services Council Inc. Vehicles		68	75				
Trailers		4	4				
State Development Vehicles			6				
Technology Park Adelaide Corp. Vehicles			2				
Tea Tree Gully Community Health Services Vehicles			3				
Bordertown Memorial Hospital Inc. Vehicles			3				
Eudunda Hospital Inc. Vehicles			1				
Mt Barker District Soldiers Memorial Hospital Inc. Vehicles			3				
Hutchinson Hospital Inc. Vehicles			1				
Kingston Soldiers Memorial Hospital Inc. Vehicles			1				
Cleve District Hospital Inc. Vehicles			1				

NURSES

78. Mr OSWALD (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism, representing the Minister of Health: In view of the fact that the Nurses Board has stipulated that all student nurses must receive 1 200 hours education over a three-year period which will result in classroom time being increased by 200 hours or 25 shifts per student over three years, will the Government provide staff to replace those students during this time away from service areas, and, if so:

- where will these staff come from;
- what level of experience will they have;
- what will be the additional costs in salaries to provide this replacement; and
- what number of extra staff will be required?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Staff will be needed to replace students during this additional 200 hours away from service areas. The replies to specific questions asked are as follows:

- the staff will come from those already in the system or recruited back into the system;
- the level of experience will depend upon the requirements of the particular training institution and where the 200 hours are placed in the three years of the training programme, but it is anticipated that the students will be replaced by a mixture of registered nurses and enrolled nurses.
- the additional costs in salaries to provide this replacement depending on the mix of registered and enrolled nurses will range between \$1.06m and \$1.2m over the three years; and
- the extra number of staff required will be approximately 70 over the three years.

79. Mr OSWALD (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism representing the Minister of Health: In view of the announcement by the Prime Minister on 24 August that the last intake of students into South Australian hospital based programmes would occur in 1990—

- what provision is being made to ensure that nursing staff levels will be maintained in hospitals;
- what increase in places for student nurses have been planned for in CAE's to make up the shortfall;
- into which colleges is it intended that the large numbers of student nurses in hospitals in South Australia at the moment be placed;
- is it proposed that the South Australian Institute of Technology establish a programme for student nurses; and
- has the State received written guarantees that the Commonwealth will fully fund college-based nursing training?

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

- The transition from hospital-based schools of nursing to colleges of advanced education is being planned in such a way that staff levels should be maintained in hospitals. The Health Commission is

presently considering the possibility of increasing student numbers during 1985 to take account of the needs for increased registered staff by 1988-1990.

- (b) The numbers of student nurse places in colleges of advanced education are still in the process of discussion with the Tertiary Education Authority of South Australia and details of numbers and the sites in which they will be educated is a matter for the detailed planning of the Tertiary Education Authority of South Australia, in consultation with the Health Commission.

(c) and (d).

In consideration of placement of student nurses in the higher education sector, the Tertiary Edu-

cation Authority of South Australia will be consulting both the South Australian Institute of Technology and the South Australian College of Advanced Education.

- (e) At this stage, the State has received no written guarantees that the Commonwealth will fully fund college-based nurse training. As indicated in the press release of the joint statement from the Minister for Health, Minister of Education and Youth Affairs, and Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, negotiations between the Commonwealth and States and Territories is to occur in relation to cost sharing arrangements and, as yet, these discussions have not occurred.