

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 24 September 1981

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

PETITION: HOUSE DEMOLITION

A petition signed by 208 residents of South Australia praying that the House stop any further demolition of residential buildings for the purpose of commercial expansion in residential and semi-residential areas of Adelaide and amend the City of Adelaide Development Control Act accordingly was presented by the Hon. J. D. Wright.

Petition received.

RIVERLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Riverland Community College and Mobile Workshop (Loxton).

Ordered that report be printed.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: INTEREST RATES

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

Leave granted.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am able to advise the House that copies are now available, although the machine outside is not working. An article in today's morning press concerning State Bank loans is inaccurate, irresponsible, and misleading, and has stimulated unnecessary fears about rising interest rates in the minds of State Bank customers and home loan applicants on the waiting list. I have obtained a report from the State Bank on this matter. Existing home owners with State Bank loans are not affected by these recent changes, and the changes to eligibility conditions for State Bank concessional home loans will not hurt the needy.

The changes to the State Bank's lending criteria are designed to give home purchase assistance particularly to those who would otherwise not be able to afford to buy a house. Couples with dependants are those in most need because of their added expenses and their reduced capacity to earn.

Nearly 90 per cent of all couples without children, who have applied to the State Bank, have second incomes. Because of the State Bank's practice of ignoring a wife's income if she is under 30 and has declared that she is working only until she has children, many such couples have been getting loans at high concession rates, even though their actual household incomes are not low. Indeed 20 per cent of State Bank loans have been going to couples with incomes of over \$300 a week.

In other States, house purchase assistance is confined only to couples with dependants. In South Australia the State Bank will still lend to a couple without dependants if their combined age is less than 52 years—a reduction from the 60 combined age which has applied in the past. However, these couples will have to pay at the rate of 2 per cent below market level until they do have children. The bank has also placed a specific value limit on a house which can be bought with a State Bank loan, costing up to

\$45 000. This has been discretionary in the past, but instances have been found where State Bank customers with low current incomes but access to additional capital have been able to use concessional finance to buy houses worth up to \$60 000. Again, it is considered these people can afford to do without Government assistance, while there are others more in need.

The Chairman of the State Bank has assured the Government today that all commitments and arrangements made with applicants prior to the change in eligibility conditions will be honoured. Therefore, no existing borrowers or applicants who had confirmed arrangements with the bank prior to change will be inconvenienced. As at June 1981, 31 320 home loans were current, totalling \$393 000 000. The weighted average interest rate was 6.9 per cent, which is well below the prevailing rates from the savings banks.

An honourable member: What are weighted average interest rates?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Taking into account the changes in interest rates as they come through. The annual interest subsidy for home purchases from the State Bank is currently \$18 000 000. The State Bank has been and is still approving 55 loans per week, and this financial year approximately \$85 000 000 will be lent. Even with this high level of lending, waiting lists are unacceptably high. The State Bank and the Government must ensure that the concessional loans made reach those most in need. There is no secret about the changes in eligibility conditions for concessional State Bank loans. The bank does not make public statements but has advertised prominently in the press, as it has done in this instance.

Increasing interest rates have caused difficulties for home buyers, but they have also, at the same time, increased the value of the concessions provided by the State Bank. The number of people seeking State Bank assistance has been increasing, and the bank has moved to control assistance to those who can do with less or who can afford to buy privately, so that more can be made available for those in greater need.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: PETROL SUPPLIES

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

Leave granted.

Mr Keneally: I hope the Minister is going to behave himself.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I always behave myself.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The honourable member knows that my behaviour in this place is exemplary. I am pleased to be able to advise the House that, as a result of a decision by members of the Australian Institute of Marine and Power Engineers to end their strike, the Government will be taking action which will allow petrol to become available to the public from tomorrow. From the opening of trading tomorrow at service stations in the designated metropolitan area, limited sales will be allowed on the odds and evens basis.

Tomorrow being an odd numbered day (that is, the date), the owners of vehicles with a registration number ending in an odd number will be able to buy up to \$7-worth of petrol in any one sale. On Saturday, even numbered vehicles can be supplied, and so on until further notice. Those holding coupons issued since Monday will be able to use those coupons on any day until the current period of restriction expires.

Exemptions for the supply of fuel in emergencies will continue to be available until the expiry of the rationing period, and full details will be announced in tomorrow's *Advertiser*. The current restrictions on sales in areas outside the designated metropolitan area will be maintained until further notice. The Government is in a position to announce these decisions following a meeting I had late this morning with representatives of the oil companies to review the latest supply situation. The decisions are based on the following: the return to work by members of the Australian Institute of Marine and Power Engineers; the arrival at Birkenhead, either early this evening or early tomorrow morning, of the *Cellana*, carrying about three days supply of motor spirit; the berthing at Port Stanvac, tomorrow morning, of the *Esso Gippsland* to begin to remove fuel oil in storage and a resumption of refinery operations as a result; there should then be full production from the refinery by next Wednesday; the arrival of the ship, the *Mobil Australis*, with a further eight days supply of petrol, due at the end of next week.

When the Government is able to confirm the unrestricted availability of petrol from the refinery, and the schedule of the *Mobil Australis*, it will be in a position to consider the lifting of all restrictions on petrol sales in South Australia, and I hope this will occur very early next week. The decision by the members of the Marine and Power Engineers to return to work has relieved a very grave situation in South Australia.

As I informed the House yesterday, it was necessary to introduce and maintain the rationing and restrictions to ensure that fuel remained available for essential services in circumstances where the Government did not know when, next, South Australia would obtain further supplies of petroleum products. At the same time, the arrangements which have been in force since last Wednesday have ensured that, during this period of rationing and restrictions, petrol has been available to more people and for longer than in any previous period of severe shortage of petroleum products during the last 10 years. This has been especially important in allowing people to travel to work when no other transport has been available, and allowing industry and commerce to avoid, to the maximum extent possible, the need to stand down employees.

In particular, the Government wishes to place on record the role public servants, petrol resellers and the oil industry have played in minimising inconvenience to the public.

An honourable member: But not the Minister.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The distribution—we know that the State would have been in safe hands if the honourable member who interjected had been in charge. He would have used his best offices—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:—with his *confreres* in the trade union movement—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier sought leave to make a Ministerial statement.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Opposition was obviously disappointed that I did not respond to the interjection. I did not want them to be disappointed.

The SPEAKER: I ask that the honourable Minister not respond now.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Certainly. I hate to disappoint the Opposition. The distribution of permits and coupons and the answering of many thousands of telephone calls has been handled, in the main, by officers of the Energy Division and other divisions of the Department of Mines and Energy, with valuable assistance from many other departments where required. These officers have worked very long hours under great pressure and their

public spirited contribution is fully recognised by the Government.

Mr Keneally: And the Opposition.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: One would not have thought so. The public, too, have co-operated in overcoming the difficulties which have been forced on them by this prolonged strike, and the Government appreciates the level of co-operation throughout the whole community.

HANSARD LEADER'S RETIREMENT

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): By leave, I wish to refer to the retirement at the close of business on 25 September, tomorrow, of the *Hansard* Leader, Mr Gordon Stacey. Everyone in this House will regret that Gordon is leaving us. He has been a fine Leader of *Hansard*, has certainly followed in the footsteps of some very distinguished people, and has performed his job admirably. He has been a friend to members, and the relative newcomers to this House will certainly agree that he has always been helpful and has done everything possible, as did his predecessors, to make our entry into this place a little smoother. He went out of his way to make sure that we could understand exactly the procedures of this place.

Mr Keneally: I think he ought to come into the Chamber.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: If I can talk a little longer, I hope Mr Stacey will make himself apparent. He entered the Public Service in 1949 and commenced duties in the then Country and Suburban Courts Department. He joined the *Hansard* staff in 1953 as an Assistant Reporter, and progressed to Reporter, Senior Reporter, Assistant Leader, and ultimately Leader of *Hansard* in 1978.

Mr Stacey has played a major role in introducing significant changes in the reporting of Parliament. It is significant that his period as Leader of *Hansard* has coincided with a tremendous amount of technological change in this place. He has supervised the introduction of a tape recording system, including the microphones we now have in the House of Assembly, to be used as a back-up to the usual and traditional system of manual reporting. More recently he has supervised the installation on a six-month trial basis of two work stations and a print-out machine as the first stage of a considered transition and the possible use of word processing as a means of transcribing reporters' notes. At all times he has kept up with modern technology but has never at any time forgotten or lost sight of the traditions of *Hansard*—traditions which in this place anyway have always been held very highly indeed.

We wish him well in his retirement. We hope that he will come and see us from time to time, and still occasionally pass on the good advice which I think we have all had periodically from him. We wish him very well and thank him for all he has done for us.

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

Leave granted.

Mr BANNON: I simply wish to add, very strongly and warmly, to the comments made by the Premier on the retirement of Mr Gordon Stacey. It is a hell of a job sitting up there trying to record the sometimes incoherent remarks of members here on the floor, sometimes in circumstances of stress and heat, and sometimes in the early hours of the morning, although mercifully we appear to have eliminated that just at the time Mr Stacey retires from the fray. Having been around a long time, and being a wise man, he suspects, I guess, that those times will recur at some stage in the future.

Speaking on behalf of the Opposition, I would very much like to thank him for the great job that he has done as a reporter, and as the Leader of the team of reporters. *Hansard* is, of course, our enduring record in the annals of time, and if we are incoherent, ungrammatical, or stupid, we rely to an extent on *Hansards'* judicious alterations, not indeed of the sense or the words we use, but of the way in which they are formed. In this, Mr Stacey has been very sensitive and has maintained the very scrupulous and high professionalism which marks *Hansard*.

His career is an indication of how vital it is to have that type of *Hansard* reporting. Heaven help us if we get on to a robot tape system, or something of that nature. The tradition of the *Hansard* reporter goes back hundreds of years. Mr Stacey has been a very worthy carrier and forwarder of that tradition.

The SPEAKER: On behalf of Mr Stacey, who is unable to respond directly on his own behalf, let me say that I know that he has contemplated this move for some time; it is in no way a reflection of events of some three weeks ago. The expressions by both the Premier and the Leader of goodwill to Mr Stacey and appreciation of the work that he has carried out on behalf of the Parliament, and for continued good health once he leaves the department, will be very much appreciated by him. In the interim period, until the necessary formalities are concluded, *Hansard* will be in the capable hands of Acting Leader Mr Kevin Simms.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: DELHI PETROLEUM

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I thank the House. This statement has only recently come to hand. I am pleased to inform the House that, earlier today, I was advised that, following extensive negotiations, the board of Delhi Petroleum Incorporated had confirmed arrangements which would allow C.S.R. Limited to obtain a major interest in the company.

Acceptance by Delhi shareholders of this offer will bring to an end a period of uncertainty for Delhi, a company that has made a major contribution to the development of the Cooper Basin to the point where it is a major natural gas, liquids and crude petroleum resource. Depending upon the arrangements finally reached, it will also increase substantially the level of Australian equity participation in the ownership of companies involved in developing the Cooper Basin.

During the past 18 months, I have had the opportunity to meet with senior executives of Delhi at Dallas, Texas, and also with senior executives of C.S.R. As a result of those discussions, I am able to assure the House that this take-over bid is in the State's interest as, under C.S.R.'s direction, Delhi will accelerate its involvement in the search for natural gas and oil in the Cooper Basin area.

In this regard it is significant that Mr Gordon Jackson, General Manager of C.S.R. Limited, has said today that 'following the merger C.S.R. intends to provide Delhi with the funds to enable it to press ahead vigorously with further exploration and development of gas and liquids in its licence area in South Australia and Queensland'. The success of this bid will therefore substantially improve the future projects for South Australia.

QUESTION TIME

INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION

Mr BANNON: Will the Premier say whether he now intends to appear before the Industrial Commission to give evidence about the State of the South Australian economy and, if he does not, will he be moving for the repeal of section 146b of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, which prompted his being subpoenaed?

Last Tuesday, in answer to a similar question, the Premier told the House that he believed that the summons for him to appear in the Industrial Commission had been incorrectly served and that, in any case, the Government was putting certain matters before the court which would mean that his appearance would not be necessary. However, on 23 September the court heard argument from counsel for the Premier and the union on whether or not the Premier should appear and decided that his attendance at the court would be required.

I would like to quote two or three extracts from the transcript of those proceedings as to the nature of the argument to further explain the question. Mr President Olsson is reported as saying, at page 33 of the transcript:

You will recall yesterday that in the very speech that he gave—this was the speech the Premier gave to the Chamber of Commerce and Industry dinner on Friday—

the Treasurer, in effect, pointed out that it was incumbent upon him and his Government to accept the direct responsibility for the proper economic management of the economy of the State. Now, here's a statement by the proposed witness himself saying that it is his ultimate responsibility.

Mr Jackson, counsel for the Premier, said:

Yes, I would draw a distinction between his ultimate responsibility and his knowledge such as to qualify him as an expert.

A bit later, President Olsson is reported as saying, at page 35:

... because he is the person who himself says that he is responsible for the proper economic management of the State's economy, and it is the state of the South Australian economy and likely effects in particular upon employment and inflation that are in issue.

Mr Jackson then said:

That is so, and again I state my difficulty in that I am unaware of the precise nature of the evidence that is required of him. But it does seem to me that if he is to be asked to give opinions of the state of the economy then he must be qualified and what I say is that the responsibility in terms of making policy decisions is not of itself sufficient.

Later, Mr Jackson said the following, at page 36:

I am unable to put it in those broad terms but I do say that involved in the questioning must be the adducement of a series of facts, and in that respect does he have, it must be asked, direct knowledge of the facts concerned.

Then, Deputy President Stanley asked:

Would he be in any different position than any qualified economists who is employed by his department? Such an economist relies on information given him by other people and by reading various journals and statistics and so forth; and all the Premier or the Treasurer gets is a collection of that information being given to him, upon which he makes decisions and guides Cabinet. He must claim, to that extent, to be some sort of an expert.

Then, President Olsson said:

At least have information.

Deputy President Stanley said:

Yes.

Mr Jackson said:

I don't deny that. I say that the degree of expertise which he has is not sufficient to qualify him as an expert.

I think that was well summarised by the Premier's counsel at page 53, when he said:

I press the submission that in terms of the alternatives available as to how evidence can be adduced from the Treasurer in terms of his qualification as an expert or by direct knowledge that I

would argue that this commission ought to conclude that he is unable to give evidence because, as I have indicated, I submit that he cannot be qualified as an expert.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: If it is of any comfort to the Leader, the same arguments would apply to him in the eyes of the court. I am unable to say what arrangements are made at present. In answer to the second part of the Leader's question, 'No'.

TELEVISION COMMERCIAL

Mr SCHMIDT: Will the Minister of Education ask the Attorney-General, under whose portfolio is the International Year of the Disabled Person programme, to take up with the Federation of Australian Commercial Television Stations the banning of the commercial produced in South Australia by the I.Y.D.P. secretariat depicting handicapped children from Seawinds? The commercial, which is being banned by the federation, depicts three children from Seawinds who appear to be in a sorrowful state and who are then transformed to a state of happiness. An article appeared in today's *Advertiser* concerning this matter, as follows:

Mothers of children who appeared in an SA-produced TV commercial are indignant over the decision to ban it because it was branded offensive.

Mrs Liz Pilcher, of Morphett Vale, mother of Anne, 3, a child at Seawinds who was in the commercial, said: 'My daughter is not less than human. She has the needs and feelings of any other human being and should have the opportunity to express what these needs are and of taking action to see they are met. How can you overcome ignorance and fear if you can't show that mental retardation is no cause for ignorance and fear?'

Similarly, Mrs Val Rolls, of Morphett Vale, mother of Kylie, 7, said that the International Year of Disabled Persons 'has been set aside to break down the barriers of fear and ignorance for the disabled, the handicapped, the retarded or whatever.' It is for this reason that the parents are upset about this commercial being withdrawn.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I thank the honourable member for his obvious interest in this matter. I was made aware of the banning of the advertisement as recently as this morning. I think it was in this morning's *Advertiser* in which the notice was given. I think the House should be made aware of the fact that neither the State nor the Federal Government has been involved in this banning and that the Federation of Australian Commercial Television Stations (FACTS) is in fact a body which prides itself on the fact that it is self-monitoring; it disciplines its own organisations. To that end, I believe it decided to ban this advertisement on the basis that it might be offensive to other disabled persons. Whether it arrived at the correct assessment in deciding to ban the advertisement is questionable. I shall certainly be pleased to take this up with the Attorney-General so that in turn he can discuss the matter with the people concerned.

EMPLOYMENT

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Do the Premier's statements at the Chamber of Commerce luncheon last Friday which he made in outlining the results of a Government study and in which he said that there would be several thousand more jobs as we entered the last decade of the century (a long way in advance) mean that few extra jobs will be created in South Australia in the remaining eight years of the 1980s? Will the Premier now detail what jobs will be created during this decade, including jobs from well publicised resource projects?

Mr O'Neill: He is not an expert, you know.

The Hon. D. C. Brown interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: As the Minister of Industrial Affairs says, that sort of question is so ridiculous that I could almost have been asked if I could name the names of the people who are going to occupy the jobs. I do not think that the Deputy Leader read this, so I suggest that he ask Mr Muirden to read it a bit more carefully. We will enter the next decade with several thousand more jobs. If the Deputy Leader believes that there is suddenly going to be an up-turn in the number of jobs by several thousand as at 31 December 1989, so that we will suddenly see that upsurge, he cannot really be serious. The whole object of the exercise and the whole point of the speech was to say that there would be a steady increase in the number of jobs being created in South Australia during the 1980s, and even the Deputy Leader can see that.

There is a quotation from one of my favourite Bacon essays on ambition—and members opposite are certainly ambitious for government—which is that an overly ambitious man prefers to see things going backwards, and takes pleasure in it because it satisfies his ambition. Obviously that applies aptly indeed to members of the Opposition.

CUMMINS AREA SCHOOL

Mr BLACKER: Can the Minister of Education say when it can be expected that the Cummins Area School will be provided with a library resource centre? The Cummins Area School Council first made representations to the Government of the day in 1969 for a library resource centre. This area school was one of the very last of modern schools built without a library resource centre. Since that time, it has been an Education Department prerequisite that library resource centres be an integral part of school complexes.

The proposed Cummins Area School library resource centre commands a high priority in the Eyre region building programme. Many constituents believe that had previous building priorities been maintained a library resource centre would now be constructed and operating. The Chairman of the Cummins Area School Council, Mr Jeffrey Pearson, has expressed considerable concern at the lack of forward planning by the Education Department and about the inability of the department to provide the priorities of either a three-year or a five-year building programme. The project at Cummins was on a priority list, but now its future appears to be unclear.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The member for Flinders has previously addressed himself to this question and has spoken to me in private on the issue. The fact that he has chosen to raise the matter in the House is an obvious expression of his concern. I can say, however, that the information I gave to him previously is still confirmed, namely, that the Cummins Area School programme is not included in the present financial year's programme, and that, in fact, the Education Department, far from not having had a forward plan, has revised its previous five-year forward plan, which was based on priorities across the whole of the State but which gave equal priority to the first priority in every single educational region.

What the Government has done is to reassess the priorities across South Australia on a State-wide basis, and this means that some regions may not have a first priority on the basis that they are reasonably well looked after, and that others may have as many as two, three or four priorities, depending on how they have been treated in the past. The Cummins Area School resource centre is certainly a priority within that region—it has not slipped from the Education Department's priority list—but it has not been included in capital works for the current year. I shall be

pleased to discuss the matter with the Education Department with a view to giving the honourable member a more precise forward plan for the future.

MURRAY RIVER

Mr KENEALLY: I address my question to the Premier, and it is one that he might be able to answer.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has been called to ask a question, not to make unnecessary comment.

Mr KENEALLY: Yes, Mr Speaker. Has the Premier now received a reply, formal or informal, from the Prime Minister to his submission titled 'A permanent solution to the River Murray Salinity Problem' and, if so, does the reply indicate when a meeting between the Prime Minister and the Premiers of South Australia, New South Wales and Victoria will take place; and, if not, what action has the Premier taken to arrange the earliest possible meeting? On 15 September the Premier, in reply to a question, advised me that a formal reply to his submission had not been received. He further advised that the meeting arranged for Albury had been postponed because of the Prime Minister's illness. The Prime Minister is now back at work; a meeting can therefore be arranged. Bulletin 6 of the River Murray Salinity Action File states:

Arrangements are being made to reconvene this most important meeting as soon as possible after the Prime Minister recovers.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am pleased to inform the House that I have received formal replies from the Prime Minister and the Premiers of the other States. A meeting has now been agreed to be convened in Melbourne on 16 October. Mr Wran, Mr Thompson, the Prime Minister, together with the relevant Ministers, and the Minister of Water Resources and I will be attending.

FOOTBALL FINAL

Mr MATHWIN: Can the Minister of Transport say whether it is intended that the State Transport Authority will run extra buses from Glenelg to Football Park on Saturday next to enable the supporters of the great Tigers, Glenelg, this year's premiers, to travel to the game?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: On my instruction, the State Transport Authority has negotiated with the South Australian Football League, and extra buses will be put on line to convey people to Football Park, not only for the great Glenelg team but also for the great Norwood team. This will be advertised in the paper. My only regret is that I am not providing buses for the great North Adelaide team.

REMISSION FOR PRISONERS

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Can the Premier say whether the Government is proposing to follow the precedents of past or other Governments and recommend to the Governor that remissions be granted to sentenced prisoners for the period of the Royal tour this year? The Governor has power under the letters patent to exercise the prerogative of mercy and grant remissions. In the past Governments have recommended remissions to mark Royal tours, as an act of humanity by Her Majesty's Vice-Regal representation. What action is the Government proposing to take in regard to this matter to mark the Royal tour of 1981?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The matter has not been considered. I will examine it.

MEDICAL RESEARCH BENEFITS

Mr BECKER: Will the Minister of Health request the South Australian Health Commission to investigate the medical research benefits and the possibility of purchase of a positron emission tomography X-ray scanner (called P.E.T. and described as a cousin to the C.A.T. scanner)? I understand that the P.E.T. scanner allows physicians to examine the brain and body in ways never before possible, providing metabolic portraits and revealing the rate at which sick and healthy tissues consume biochemicals. Physicians have begun to use P.E.T. scanning in determining therapy for people who have had strokes or epileptic seizures. Some researchers are using P.E.T. scanners to explore the brains of people suffering from schizophrenia, manic-depressive illnesses and senile dementia. I understand that P.E.T. scanners are being set up all over the world. Six years ago there were only four medical centres in the United States where teams of scientists were actively engaged in developing P.E.T.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I have already had the article in *Time* magazine referring to the P.E.T. scanner brought to my attention. I have asked the Health Commission for a report on it.

ALFRED STREET COTTAGES

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Has the Minister of Environment and Planning now examined his powers under section 13 of the South Australian Heritage Act to determine whether he is able to intervene in the matter of the Alfred Street cottages? Will the Minister in fact intervene? It has been put to me that the Minister may have been reluctant to intervene in this matter because the committee set up under section 5 of the South Australian Heritage Act has, I understand, been disbanded, having served out the three months extension of term given to it by the Minister. There is no indication as to what is to occur, as far as that committee is concerned, after 30 September. In the community, it is assumed that this source of advice available to the Minister is at present no longer available to him. Under section 13 of the Act, there is power to declare an area of land as part of the physical, social or cultural heritage of the State or an area of significant aesthetic, historical or cultural interest. Given that there is in effect a picket line in that area of the city at present, and that I know that the Minister has had personal representations in this matter, some indication as to the Government's interest, let alone the possibility of action, would certainly be appreciated.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I have asked my department for a report on that matter, and when it is available I will take up the matter again with the honourable member.

HEIGHTS SCHOOL

Dr BILLARD: Will the Minister of Education seek a report on why children living within walking distance of the Heights school have been refused entry to year 8 for 1982 while other children who live closer to other schools have had their applications for entry to the Heights school accepted?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I thank the honourable member for his question, and I will certainly obtain a report from the Education Department on that matter. A personal observation is that it would be unfortunate indeed if children living in close proximity to a high school such as the Heights were deprived of admission to the school on the

basis that children from more remote areas were allowed to go there and take up the available places.

INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Mr PLUNKETT: Will the Premier say whether we are any nearer the view expressed by the Premier in February 1980 that planning had to start right away for a new airport of international standard north of Adelaide, following the commitment announced yesterday by the Minister of Transport of \$8 000 000 to upgrade West Beach airport, plus another \$3 000 000 to provide international facilities? As a representative of an electorate very sensitive to changes made to West Beach airport, I have been studying the very many statements made on this matter by members of the Government since it came to power. The Premier began in February 1980 by hoping that Adelaide Airport—he did not say whether he meant West Beach or Two Wells—could become a major international airport in Australia. Some weeks later he began to refer several times to the Two Wells project, only to have his enthusiasm dampened by the Federal Minister, Mr Hunt. The Premier complained on 24 February last year that Mr Hunt was not taking him seriously. About 14 statements later, the Premier made this public statement:

There is no way the Federal Government can spend a lot of money on Adelaide Airport to bring it to international standard, because any true international airport would have to go north of Adelaide.

After a further round of statements from the Prime Minister, the Federal Minister for Transport, our Lord Mayor, the Minister of Tourism, and assorted airlines, many of them contradicting each other, Mr Hunt finally said that Adelaide Airport would be upgraded. Yesterday, the State Minister of Transport told us that \$11 000 000 was now firmly committed in this financial year. He said he was confident that international flights would be with us later in 1982. It was left to Mr Ben Hickey, in today's *News*, to reveal exactly what work will be involved.

With all this in mind, it is confusing to my electors to look back to a reply given not so long ago by Mr Hunt to Mr Jacobi, the Federal member for Hawker, when he said that there were no firm plans to introduce international air services to Adelaide. Finally, there was another reply from Mr Hunt to Mr Scott, the Federal member for Hindmarsh, in which he said that there was no proposal to establish an airport north of Adelaide. I think the Premier has to give us a further statement—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is explaining the question, and he is not permitted to comment in so doing.

Mr PLUNKETT: Thank you, Sir. As the chance for a new airport out of Adelaide and out of my electorate which offers the only real hope of getting full international facilities without annoying tens of thousands of Adelaide people—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: 'Are we any nearer having an international airport in South Australia?' I think was the question.

Mr Trainer: North of the city.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes, we are.

Mr Trainer: North of the city.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The member for Ascot Park seems to be obsessed with something—I am not too sure what. Is he a fellow supporter of the Minister of Transport? Does he support North Adelaide? Yes, we are nearer. The moneys that have been announced by the Minister of Trans-

port yesterday will go a long way towards providing international facilities at West Beach.

That will obviously, for some little time to come, make up for the deficiencies which we have had and which have militated so strongly and badly against South Australian citizens. However, there is no doubt that in the long term alternative arrangements will be necessary. At this stage, it looks to be some time after the turn of the century, and I think this has been accepted by the Leader in his interesting dealings with Sir Freddie Laker, which did not seem to come to very much.

Also, the Federal Government has accepted that that is a possibility that is going to have to be looked at very seriously indeed in the long term. In the short term, the funds that are available will provide international facilities, baggage handling in particular, but also customs and immigration facilities, in the long term, for Adelaide. That certainly will keep us going well. I may say that the Minister of Transport has reported to me already that British Airways has already expressed an interest in the further examination of further services coming to Adelaide when facilities are available.

FLOOD RELIEF

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Will the Premier obtain for me a report from the appropriate source as to how much money has been paid to people who have made claims based on hardship for flood damage during the recent flood in my electorate and that of the member for Coles (the Minister of Health), and whether any money has been made available to the Payneham or Campbelltown councils for flood mitigation work? The Premier would be well aware that his Government announced shortly after the floods occurred that it would sympathetically view any applications made where hardship could be shown. Those applications were to be made through the Campbelltown or Payneham councils, as the case may be. I am wondering whether or not the Government has had to pay out any money as a result of that. My experience to date has been that every case put forward has been rejected.

I may not be correct in this, but I believe that through the Coast Protection Board the Government made money available for the restoration of foreshore damage in seaside councils. I am wondering whether or not the same consideration will be given to the very costly problem that will face Campbelltown council, in particular, with the purchase of land so that it can better control Fourth Creek, which was the creek that caused most of the damage, and whether the Government will consider giving any assistance to the council for future flood mitigation schemes.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I shall be delighted to get a report for the honourable member. Money has been paid in several instances. I will get details of that, and certainly any application by the council will be treated on its merits when it is received.

PENSIONER PAYMENTS

Mr WHITTEN: Will the Minister of Health bring down a report on the nature and extent of hardship being suffered by pensioners living in nursing homes in South Australia? I have received numerous representations from persons who care for aged parents and relatives and who are having to support them financially. I cite just one example of a woman aged 91 years who paid \$368.90 in nursing home fees for the month of August. Her pension for that month was \$278.80. Her daughter, who is also an age pensioner,

paid the balance for the month, which was \$90.10. She explained to me that she cannot carry on much longer making these payments. She asked what assistance she and other people in similar circumstances could hope for, but I could not advise her. I believe that a full inquiry should be conducted into this very real problem. I might add that I have instances that I would be prepared to provide to the Minister.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The honourable member would be aware that both income maintenance through the pension and the level of fees, and in fact the whole area of nursing homes, are the responsibility of the Federal Government. I would be pleased to make available to the honourable member a copy of the submission made by the South Australian Health Commission to a House of Representatives committee inquiring into this matter which highlights the matters that he has mentioned, and they are matters of which the State Government and the Health Commission are very conscious indeed.

RIVERTON T.A.B.

Mr SLATER: Can the Minister of Recreation and Sport give any information regarding an investigation into a shortfall of funds at the Riverton T.A.B. subagency? I understand that the major crime squad, the Auditor-General and the Chairman of the T.A.B. (Mr Powell) have made investigations into a shortfall of funds which is supposed to have occurred at the Riverton T.A.B. subagency. It is believed, according to a press report, that the amount may be between \$300 000 and \$500 000. I have been asked to ask this question, which I think involves a matter of public interest.

I noted a press comment a week or so ago which stated that the Minister said that the Government would consider making up any losses faced by the three racing codes which must result from the Riverton T.A.B. shortfall. The Minister is reported as saying that he could not confirm at that stage whether the Government would make good the losses, and that Cabinet would take it into consideration. Can the Minister give to the House and the public any information regarding that investigation into the Riverton T.A.B. subagency?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The honourable member's question is an important one. It is a very serious matter, and it is regarded by me as being a very serious matter. I was first apprised of the incident on a Sunday night by the Chairman of the T.A.B. I cannot remember now how many weeks ago it was, but it was the week before it broke in the press. He told me that the board had discovered a shortfall of \$350 000 in the Riverton T.A.B. subagency. He said that the board regarded it as being an extremely serious matter, with which comment I agreed.

I asked him to have a report in my office by first thing the next morning, which was a Monday, because I wished to give a preliminary report to Cabinet. Overnight I thought about it, and on receiving Mr Powell's report I suggested, and he agreed, that the Auditor-General should be called in, because we wanted to have a close look at the internal auditing procedures of the T.A.B. and see when it had picked up the shortfall and what action had been taken.

The board of the T.A.B. has been extremely responsible in the action it has taken already. Completely on its own initiative, the board called in its solicitors for an independent investigation, and it also called in the Auditor-General. The police were also informed immediately. So, three investigations are going on. I have already received a copy of the report from the solicitors. I am not going to divulge any information from that, because legal action may be

following, and I am sure the honourable member would not wish me to bring people's names to the attention of the public in this way.

However, the board has met quite often since that time, and I am informed from the initial reports that have been made available to me that the sum is not \$500 000 but is more likely to be \$350 000. I will say at this stage only that it appears that the shortfall occurred because the Riverton subagency, or its proprietor, gave T.A.B. betting on credit, which is completely against the rules of the T.A.B. I will also say at this stage that certainly disciplinary action has been taken within the T.A.B. I say no more than that at this stage.

As to whether the Government will make up the shortfall as far as racing clubs are concerned, the \$350 000 would normally be shared equally between the Government and the codes, which would mean that if it was \$350 000 the codes would be short by some \$175 000. I would not put any proposition to Cabinet at this stage until I have a full report. I have not received the police report on which prosecutions would be based, if any, and I also need to receive the report from the Auditor-General.

PETROLEUM

Mr HEMMINGS: As Government back-benchers are unable to provide any questions—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Napier will not receive the opportunity to continue to ask a question on the authority of the Chair if he flouts the convention on asking questions.

Mr HEMMINGS: Is the Deputy Premier aware of a plan to send a fleet of more than 100 tankers to Victoria to bring back petrol to be used in South Australia at the weekend? If so, does the Deputy Premier know what groups are behind the plan, and can he say what the Government's attitude would be to such a plan?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I think that, if the honourable member has read the paper or listened to the air waves today, he would realise what action the Government has taken in relation to one reported case of someone who was bringing in fuel by tanker and selling it for 43c a litre. The Government placed an order on him for 24 hours so that he cannot sell it. I think the honourable member, if he was in the House, also may have heard the statement I made to the House at the beginning of Question Time, when I indicated that restrictions were going to be very considerably eased tomorrow. Although I do not know the detail of what he is talking about, I would think that that would be a heavy disincentive to anyone wishing to bring in tankers of petrol and selling it for 43c a litre; I think they would have very few takers. If the honourable member has any firm details of this scheme, I would certainly be interested to know what he is talking about. However, as I have said, in relation to the other selling of petrol (and I think the Deputy Leader of the Opposition asked me a question earlier and said that he was very disturbed about this movement), the Government has taken firm steps to contain that situation. I would think that the subject matter of the honourable member's question is a bit out of date at this stage.

LIBRARY STAFF

Mr HAMILTON: Can the Premier say whether it is a fact that a request for an additional or assistant research officer for the Parliamentary Library has been rejected by

the Government? In the country edition of the *Advertiser* of 7 July 1981 an article by Greg Kelton states:

Parliament needs more library staff—M.P. Some M.P.'s were having to wait up to six months for information from the library at State Parliament, a Labor M.P. said yesterday.

Mr Hamilton, the member for Albert Park, said research staff were six months behind in providing information for M.P.'s from both sides of the House. There was a clear need for extra research staff.

The article further stated, in part:

Mr Hamilton said yesterday Mr Tonkin had said M.P.'s should make more use of the research facilities at the Parliamentary Library. However, there were too many delays with this service and on some issues he could not afford to wait for the information he had requested.

It further states:

'I understand there has been an application put to the Government for the appointment of another research assistant,' Mr Hamilton said.

The article further states:

The President of the Legislative Council, Mr Whyte said . . . 'I haven't heard of anyone having to wait six weeks for information let alone six months,' Mr Whyte said.

'There could be slight delays, and this problem will increase in the future because of the workload of M.P.'s. There are only two research officers in the Parliamentary Library at the moment. We will probably have to increase this number and I have already discussed the matter with the Premier.'

On the following Saturday, 11 July 1981, Greg Kelton's article in the *Advertiser* stated, in part:

Like all back-benchers, Mr Hamilton has the services of an electorate secretary who is responsible for handling all correspondence but has neither the time and probably not the qualifications to carry out research. Mr Hamilton has been forced into the situation of having to second his wife—without pay—to help out with his workload . . . With the amount of research that M.P.'s require for the many speeches they make and questions they ask in the Parliament, it is little wonder that the two researchers are falling behind with their work . . . Mr Whyte agrees that the library staff just cannot handle all the questions posed by M.P.'s and says there have been instances of delays of up to six months in providing information.

My responsibilities as a member of the Opposition were pointed out to me when I came into this Parliament: the role of the Opposition is outlined in the Parliamentary booklet, as follows:

. . . it should be the group which is best able to put the opposite point of view, and to test, to probe, and to criticise the policy of the Government. It has a duty to expose as well as to oppose . . . A responsible Opposition is as necessary to the effective working of Parliament as a responsible Government.

I ask the Premier whether this is the price he places on democracy, an amount of between \$15 000 and \$22 000, to have an effective Opposition and democracy in this State?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The answer to the honourable member's question is 'No'. In answer to the various remarks he made about the Opposition, I suggest that he commends those remarks to his Leader and studies them carefully himself.

IN-SERVICE WORK

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: I have a question for the Minister of Education, if he chooses to listen.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: On what justification is the Government considering the curtailing, from the start of the 1982 school year, of all in-service work held under the auspices of the Education Department during school time?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I will bring in a report for the honourable member.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN LAND COMMISSION

Mr CRAFTER: I ask the Premier to tell the House how much this Government will be paying the Commonwealth Treasury in respect of the South Australian Land Commission this financial year, two years before repayments were required to begin, in 1983-84? Is the reference to the sum of \$36 000 000 in this year's Commonwealth Budget papers expected from the State of South Australia the \$36 500 000 of capitalised interest on loans for the Land Commission documented in the Auditor-General's Report?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: It is hoped that we will be able to use the capital sum to pay out both capital and interest that is owed. Negotiations are still in progress.

WORKERS COMPENSATION ACT

Mr McRAE: Does the Minister of Industrial Affairs propose in this session of Parliament to increase the maximum payments available under the Workers Compensation Act and, if not, why not? It is well known that for eight years the maximum levels under the Act have been \$18 000 and \$25 000 respectively. I trust that the Premier is not laughing at me for asking this question. The sum of \$25 000 is to provide for widows and was deducted—I am shocked to see his behaviour—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr McRAE: —to provide for six years average weekly earnings of their late husbands. I notice that the Minister of Industrial Affairs is laughing.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr McRAE: Scandalous!

An honourable member: You're performing, that's why.

Mr McRAE: I am not performing; I am trying to explain the situation. Eight years ago a just system was set up that provided for two amounts, \$18 000 which was paid upon four years employment level in the wage brackets of those years, and \$25 000 in the case of widows. In order to achieve adjustments in relative terms, one would have to bring those figures to approximately \$36 000 and \$44 000 respectively. Considerable adjustments have taken place in such backward parts of Australia as Queensland and Western Australia, where adjustments of up to \$12 000 have been made in the last three years. Considerable adjustments have also been made in every other State and territory of the Commonwealth. This is a serious matter, and I hope that the answer I receive will be in the proper vein.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The honourable member says that it is eight years since these amounts were adjusted. For six of those eight years the honourable member was a member of the Government that did nothing.

Mr McRae: You blocked it in the Legislative Council.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I indicate that I have had some discussions with the United Trades and Labour Council on this matter. There is a possibility that something could be done next year.

DELHI AND C.S.R.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Can the Premier give the House any further information that he may have which enabled him to make certain remarks in his Ministerial statement earlier today? In the Ministerial statement, which related to negotiations that have taken place between Delhi and C.S.R., the Premier referred to the fact that during the past 18 months he had had an opportunity to meet with

senior executives of Delhi at Dallas and senior executives of C.S.R. He also said:

As a result of those discussions I am able to assure the House that this take-over bid is in the State's interest, as under C.S.R.'s direction Delhi will accelerate its involvement in the search for natural gas and oil in the Cooper Basin area.

In view of that long period to which the Premier referred, I presume he would have additional information that he can give the House.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The honourable member's question is obviously hot off the press. All I can say is that, when I spoke to both of those organisations, we discussed the specific issue of the sale of Delhi and the effect that the lack of sale was having on the Cooper Basin exploration programme. I discussed with Delhi the potential sale and the potential problems there were. I also discussed the potential sale with C.S.R. I am not prepared to give any further information at this stage.

DUST NUISANCE

Mr KENEALLY: Will the Premier consider making a grant of money available to the South Australian Housing Trust to enable that body to overcome the severe dust nuisance caused by Housing Trust developments in Port Augusta and Port Pirie? Each year at this time, the windy season in Port Augusta and Port Pirie, dust nuisance caused by Housing Trust developments is extreme. In past years the trust has been able to allay this dust nuisance somewhat by the building of fences and the use of watering trucks, etc. I understand from advice that I have received that this year the Government is not allowing the Housing Trust to spend the money. It sometimes requires an extensive amount of money to overcome this extreme dust nuisance. The money of the Housing Trust should rightly be directed to housing. I ask the Premier whether he will make a direct grant to the Housing Trust that will not affect its housing programme but will overcome what is an extreme dust nuisance in the two cities that I represent.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I shall be delighted to ask the Minister of Housing to examine the matter.

WOMEN'S STUDIES RESOURCE CENTRE

Mr TRAINER: Can the Minister of Education assure the House that there will be no reduction in funding to the Women's Studies Resource Centre? The centre is staffed by teachers seconded from the Education Department, but the Miscellaneous line in the Budget is the one that covers funding of operating costs, and it appears that that line has been reduced. Concern has been expressed to me from some quarters about what has already happened in the department with the abolition of the women's advisers in the Department of Further Education and the Education Department. Similar concern has been expressed to me regarding the Women's Studies Resource Centre and the evidence that has been tendered to me—

Mr RANDALL: On a point of order, Sir; on previous occasions I have endeavoured to ask relevant questions about the Budget and I have found that one has to be very careful in asking those questions. I believe the member for Ascot Park is asking about a Budget line, and that that is out of order.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: You're trying to waste time so we won't get many questions in today.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: You've been busy writing them out.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Premier is no different from any other member in this House. I do not uphold the point of order. I accept the situation that detailed information relative to Budget lines comes up in Estimates Committees, but there has always been, to my knowledge, the opportunity to answer questions of a general nature related to financial matters.

Mr TRAINER: Thank you, Sir. In response to your ruling, I wish to point out that it is about this Government's policy on and attitude towards the Women's Studies Resource Centre that I am trying to get further information in this question. Hostility, it has been suggested to me, has been shown by quite a few Government back-benchers, and it has been suggested that this might be a forerunner of Government policy.

Mr Randall: Which ones?

Mr TRAINER: The back-benchers that have been mentioned to me—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member not to comment.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The matter is certainly under review, and I anticipate being able to give the honourable member much more specific information when the budgetary lines are under discussion in about two and a half weeks time.

BLACK HILL NURSERY

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Will the Minister of Environment and Planning now admit that it has been a deliberate policy of his Government to run down the Black Hill nursery as a commercial operation? Some time ago my colleague in another place, the Hon. John Cornwall, put on notice a question in relation to the amount of purchases from that nursery, the answer to which indicated, certainly to those who looked purely at the figures, that there has been some running down in the operations of the nursery. The Minister at the time dismissed this on the grounds that seasonal factors were operating. Various people who have visited the nursery in the past couple of weeks have been appalled at the situation they find there as compared with the healthy operation that existed not long ago, and have added their voice to others who have said that it is the deliberate policy of the Government to sell out to the private enterprise sector of this industry.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The answer is a very definite 'No'.

SOUTHERN BOAT RAMP

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: It is very unusual to get two questions in one day.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Will the Minister of Environment and Planning say when members can expect to hear of any firm Government plans for the long awaited southern metropolitan boat ramp, following the discovery by a private consultant that a ramp was needed—a discovery known for years to everyone concerned? Once again, the popular boating season is coming around, with the question of the southern boat ramp still as far as ever from being settled. The previous Government had reached the stage of very advanced negotiations and consultation with local government on a specific site. Since then we seem to have been retreating.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: There have been more reports, but no obvious progress. The boating public is awaiting

some sign of impending action, most particularly a firm or projected date for a start on a site that has been positively determined.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: In due course, but I point out that this matter comes under the portfolio of my colleague, the Minister of Marine.

QUESTIONS

Mr KENEALLY: Can the Premier assure the House that in future Question Time periods he will make it possible for the Opposition to ask 20 questions, as against the four or five we have had since the session started?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I have been absolutely delighted indeed to see the activity that there has been on the Opposition benches today, trying to find enough questions to ask. It is a very healthy sign indeed!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

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

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

VALUATION OF LAND ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD (Minister of Lands) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Valuation of Land Act, 1971-1981. Read a first time.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The Valuation of Land Act, 1971-1981, provides that the Valuer-General shall give Notice of Valuation to the landowner of land valued under the Act, and that any person dissatisfied with that valuation may within sixty days of receipt of the notice object to the valuation. In the past, the Valuer-General has made general valuations of each local government area on a five-yearly cycle. For the purposes of water and sewer rating and land tax, equalisation factors are applied to those valuations in the intervening years to maintain equity of valuation bases.

Approximately one-fifth of the State is revalued comprehensively each year, and notices are sent to individual landowners. The direct cost of giving those notices is approximately \$28 000 per annum. By the greater use of computer technology and improved procedures and management of the valuation process, the Valuer-General is progressing towards a situation in which he will be able to revalue the whole State more frequently. This increase in the frequency of valuations will greatly increase the annual cost of sending out notices of valuation.

The notices sent to landowners provide them with the opportunity to lodge a statutory objection to the valuation within sixty days of the notice. Most landowners tend to ignore the notices of valuation and only question the valuation when they receive a consequential rate or tax notice. In these circumstances, the Valuer-General has reviewed valuations when they have been queried by the landowner at any time.

Potential savings in cost of \$135 000 per annum can be made if the Act is amended to repeal the provision requiring notice of every valuation. The present Bill therefore effects such a repeal, and provides that objection to a valuation may be made at any time.

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 are formal. Clause 4 repeals section 23, which presently requires the Valuer-General to give notice of each valuation. Clause 5 amends section 24 of the principal Act to enable a landowner to object to a valuation at any time.

Mr BANNON secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 23 September. Page 1145.)

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Elizabeth): I have concluded my remarks.

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): I rise on this occasion to address myself in general to the State Budget, and in particular to some matters of interest that I believe should be drawn to the attention not only of members of this House, as has been done by other honourable members on this side, but, more importantly, to the attention of members of the general public, especially as what I will say relates to the importance, in my view, of the role of both the Public Accounts Committee and the Public Works Committee, in the first instance. In the second instance, I propose to make some remarks about the way in which it might be possible to relieve the situation at the present time related to the single tier we have in the money market with interest rates and, in the third instance, and for most of my time, to discuss a matter of very grave importance, as I see it, to large numbers of my constituents and to rural South Australians in general which relate to the item 'Economics and Marketing' to be found on page 77 of the details of the Estimates of Payments. I am referring to the Economics and Marketing Division of the Department of Agriculture and its vitally important role in determining how best to dispose of the produce of farms in South Australia to those markets available.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Provide the customers with what they want.

Mr LEWIS: Indeed, as I am reminded, their job is to provide the customers with what they want in the form in which they want it, and to avert what might be by analogy a rather stupid situation which is otherwise likely to arise (and I say this in the most facetious terms, hoping that it illustrates the point I am trying to make). There is no reason for the food processors union to go on strike because someone decides to make peanut butter by laying out peanuts on a railway track and collecting the substance that remains when the train had gone past with a razor blade.

Mr Slater: That's silly—that's ridiculous.

Mr LEWIS: That is what I think of the attitude of the Meat and Allied Trades Industry Union, and the A.C.T.U. that endorses it, to live sheep.

Mr Slater: I didn't think you were a union basher.

Mr LEWIS: I am not. I am merely possessed of what I consider to be some capacity for some common sense.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: You're certainly possessed by something.

Mr LEWIS: It might help the member for Elizabeth to know that I am not possessed of the same indifference with which he finds himself presently possessed in the difficulties he has in sitting in this Chamber whilst his Leader is here.

I know it is uncomfortable, but nonetheless he has to suffer from time to time when his Leader wishes to be present in the House and he is also here. Never mind; the alternative Leader of the Opposition is worthy of his place in this Chamber as much as any other member, especially since it is likely to keep the Leader and Deputy Leader honest.

I turn to the role of those two committees to which I referred—the Public Accounts Committee and the Public Works Committee. In case any member missed the opportunity of hearing the remarks made by the Chairmen of those two committees (the member for Goyder, Chairman of the Public Works Committee, and the member for Hanson, Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee), they can refer to the Address in Reply debate to see the speeches of those gentlemen. The comments of the Chairman of the Public Works Committee are recorded on pages 134 and 135 of *Hansard* of 22 July. Outlined there, as never before in this Chamber, is the role of those two committees in examining the way in which funds appropriated in the public interest are spent, or are to be spent, depending on whether it is public accounts, in which case it is spent, or public works, when it is to be spent.

It is worth noting that it is only by means of these committees that Parliament can really determine whether or not proposals put forward by Ministers and coming from the bureaucracy (from the Public Service) are indeed realistic in terms of the people who are the elected representatives of the masses—that is us. The people who are the elected representatives are accountable to the people of the State through the ballot-box. We authorise the collection of taxation, and we appropriate for specific purposes that revenue so collected from taxpayers, from citizens, from electors.

Whilst I do not doubt the integrity of public servants at all, I nonetheless take the view that their objective is to make their job as simple, uncomplicated, straightforward and expedient as possible. That is natural. Anybody who is responsible for any organisation of human beings, which has as a goal a corporate function, a collective responsibility, and some specific purpose, finds himself needing to expedite and to simplify wherever possible the chains of command and the method by which information is obtained. By 'command', I mean the way in which information and direction is delivered to and received from those people working for them and from the general public who may make input from time to time.

The structure within any corporate enterprise, whether a Public Service department or a large firm in the private sector, is at once a line of command and a career structure. These people within any organisation recognise that their futures as individuals within those organisations depend on their ability to get along with their peers in the organisation, and are therefore constrained by that environment, at least in some part, to judge what they will do according to the way in which they respond to the social pressures put on the prospects and relationships that determine their promotion, their career. If it was not plain before, I hope it is plain now that the organisational structure of such bureaucracies, whether in the public or private sector, is at once a line of command and a line by which information is obtained from those people working in the organisations at the lower levels by those people working at the higher levels, as it is also a career structure. It therefore consists of people who are equally concerned not only to do the job of getting information up and down, make the necessary decisions, advise their superiors and execute their superiors' directions, but also not to destroy, not to detract from their own promotional prospects.

Accordingly, if we did not have a Public Accounts Committee, we might just find that public servants too often

collectively, corporately within their departments, did the things which caused less waves within those departments but which were not necessarily most effective in meeting the goals their organisation was established to achieve—meeting and providing the services that were intended to be provided by that organisation. So we have a Public Accounts Committee which analyses the way in which money provided to that Public Service department is spent, and the purpose to which it is applied. It is, if you like, a sharp focus taken at random on a number of operations throughout the public sector which may or may not be highlighted by another auditing arm of the function of the public sector, namely, the Auditor-General.

The Public Works Committee, on the other hand, examines in prospect the proposals put to the Government by the public sector experts for the purpose of providing the capital works which are believed to be needed by the public sector in the interests of providing a service to the community, and ensures that the way in which that money is spent, and the purpose for which it is sought to be spent, is absolutely necessary and desirable. This is especially in terms of the benefits that will accrue by spending the money in the way in which it is proposed.

Perhaps it is regrettable that the Public Works Committee does not, and cannot, examine all such appropriations, since it is constrained to consider only those appropriations of a substantial sum. Whilst it does have the power to examine smaller amounts, it is required only to examine those projects which are at the outset to entail the expenditure of more than \$500 000. Perhaps we should review that.

In addition to these two bodies which look at the operations of Public Service departments, I believe that there ought to be another body, and that that body ought to look at the operations of statutory authorities. The Government agrees with this view and, as is well known, is intending to introduce legislation to establish such a committee of this Parliament to review the functions of statutory authorities. By so doing, it will enable even wider arms of government presently not subject to the scrutiny of the elected representatives of the people to be so scrutinised.

I agree with anyone who would put the view that, if the elector finds himself or herself disadvantaged in their dealings with statutory authorities (the quangoes, in colloquial jargon), they can go to their elected representative in either Chamber or either Parliament and seek to have what they consider to be the wrong directed to them redressed or at least investigated. If the member is prudent, it will be investigated by him and by such other people, such as Ministers, who may be able to assist in the course of that specific investigation. However, there is no general brief, and I consider that to be an omission from our previous system.

I am heartened also to learn that the proposal is to make that a committee of the Upper House, as I believe that Chamber to be properly the place through which a review of Government activity and the Public Service bureaux ought to be conducted. I have said that previously in my Address in Reply speech of just over 12 months ago.

Having made those remarks about those agencies, I wish to raise a matter which I intend to raise, given the opportunity, during the course of the Estimates Committee debates, with the Premier as Treasurer, and that is the introduction of a second tier in the money market on interest rates. I intend to put forward facts to support a view I hold that interest rates for first house buyers need not be as high as they are currently, and a mechanism to do this does exist which is acceptable in economic terms to those people qualified in economics.

I believe we could encourage people in our community, such as age pensioners, by giving them incentives through the taxation system to place their funds in savings accounts at very low nominal interest rates of, say, 2 per cent and thus keep their nest egg safe against some misfortune in their future, saved against a rainy day, intact instead of at home in limbo. At present, we frequently read of instances in which age pensioners have that nest egg stolen from them. They are afraid to put it into finance houses or the banks for fear that the interest that accrues on it will add up to such a sum as will mean that they are denied what they consider they have worked for all their lives, that is, their pensioner benefits card and their pension. How unfortunate it is then that that money goes out of circulation; it either goes into that old sock or into Milo tins in the backyard or under the bottom drawer in the chests-of-drawers at home. It goes right out of circulation, it is available to no-one, and it does no-one any good. It can be destroyed by fire or stolen, and lost forever as a means of securing the future for which it was saved by those people who sought to be secure in that way.

It could have been put into these low interest rate accounts and then made available to first home buyers at four percentage points higher, which would mean a 6 per cent interest rate and not the present 15-plus, as is the case in many instances. I believe that the Federal Government could save itself much money at present by doing that, and I will soon explain how it can be done. I believe also that young people would benefit from it and appreciate it, and they would settle down in life more quickly. They would have, as young married couples, the opportunity to acquire the house in which they wish to live, rather than paying rent. Much earlier in their married life, it would give them a more stable marriage, and it would provide them with a more secure environment in which to raise their young children. It would be less likely to put so much additional pressure on what might already be in some cases a difficult relationship in their marriage that causes that marriage to break down, and when the marriage breaks down, certainly one, if not both, of the partners in the marriage become single parents, dependent upon the welfare dollar. There is the rub and that is the nub of my argument. Let us look at what we save by ensuring that we do not give additional pensioner benefit cards to age pensioners who have saved their money and put it into finance houses in the form of fixed deposits or debentures, thus accruing interest rates which make them ineligible for those benefits for which they have considered they have worked all their lives. They keep that money at home, otherwise unavailable. However, by saving this miserly amount the Federal Government creates an enormous welfare burden, not just this year or next year, or for the decade or less before those elderly people see out their three score years and 10, but for the rest of the lives of the young people where they have lost a marriage upon which they based their hopes and where they have therefore lost hope and faith in this system.

I want to turn now to the problems that have arisen as a result of the A.C.T.U.'s decision taken about a fortnight ago to support the A.M.I.E.U. in its determination to require importing countries to buy from Australia one carcass for every live sheep they import. In making my remarks, I am, as are all honourable members, indebted to officers of the South Australian Department of Agriculture. Let us examine the issues surrounding the export trade in live sheep. The department's staff researched this material to which I refer following the call by the A.C.T.U. for that ridiculous quota of one carcass for one live sheep. If we review the trade, and thus the economic importance of live sheep exports to South Australia and the nation, we find the crisis in the meat processing industry, as well as the

export trade's effect on slaughtering, the employment implications of the live sheep trade, and the effect of the A.C.T.U.'s suggested quota on live sheep exports. We find the slaughtermen's employment quite unrelated to live sheep export.

It is a fact that the processing sector of the meat industry is currently going through a period of lower utilisation and lower financial returns which is largely due to a drop in the utilisation of slaughter for cattle from 84 per cent nationally in 1977 (in which South Australia had 100 per cent) to 60 per cent in 1980. South Australia has dropped from 100 per cent in 1980 to 71 per cent. They are the most recent figures available. I intend to advance arguments and figures to support those arguments which show that, in the last six years during which live sheep export markets have expanded, slaughterings of lambs and sheep have remained relatively stable, contrary to the mistaken impression and the publicly expressed opinion of the A.M.I.E.U. and the A.C.T.U., which supports it. Producers have responded to the profitable export market in live sheep by increasing the proportion of ewes in their flocks and, whenever seasons permit, the total sheep numbers on their farms. That has happened without affecting total slaughterings.

If anything, it has increased, because there are more ewes and therefore more lambs. Of those lambs, many are sold as fats, and accordingly, they are slaughtered for that trade. It needs to be remembered that the live sheep trade has meant additional employment opportunities in the stock-feed processing industry, in the transport industry, and in many other allied industries. In fact, according to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, it would seem that there would have been no more than an increase of 100 jobs had there been no live sheep exports since 1976-77, and yet, because there have been live sheep exports, we have seen an increase in the number of jobs from 944 in that year, 1976-77, to over 1 600 in the present year. That is a substantial improvement on the 100 jobs that would have resulted if farmers had decided to produce all the lambs that they have now decided to produce in response to the demand for live sheep, and if we had killed those sheep.

The problem of unemployment of A.M.I.E.U. members is not related to live-sheep exports, but largely due to the drop in cattle being slaughtered. The processing section of the meat industry is going through a period of low utilisation and low financial returns for that reason. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* without reading it a table which illustrates that point. It is entitled 'Slaughtering in Australia and South Australia', from the years 1975-76 to 1980-81.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Can the honourable member assure me that the table is of a purely statistical nature?

Mr LEWIS: It is, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Leave granted.

Slaughtering in Australia and South Australia

	Cattle and Calves '000		Sheep and Lambs '000	
	S.A.	Aust.	S.A.	Aust.
1975-76 ..	549	10 615	2 841	32 840
1976-77 ..	656	11 980	3 427	31 613
1977-78 ..	744	12 968	3 240	29 105
1978-79 ..	659	11 348	2 522	26 790
1979-80 ..	510	8 846	3 438	29 948
1980-81 ..	543	8 506	3 550	32 410

Mr LEWIS: It can be noted, for instance, that the number of cattle and calves slaughtered in South Australia in 1975-76 was 549 000, and in 1980-81 it was marginally fewer, with 543 000. However, in 1977-78 it peaked at 744 000. When one looks at the column dealing with sheep and lambs it can be seen that, in South Australia, 2 841 000 sheep and lambs were slaughtered in 1975-76, and last year there was a substantial increase on that figure, the total

number slaughtered being 3 550 000. The Australian total for that same period remained fairly static, being 32 840 000 for 1975-76 and 32 400 000 for 1980-81. So, there has been no change in the overall number of sheep and lambs slaughtered in the five-year period, during which time we have seen a tremendous increase of more than 4 000 000 head of live sheep being exported. However, there has been no change in the number of live sheep slaughtered.

From 1 500 000 in the first year I referred to, the export trade in live sheep has grown to something like 5 800 000, and it could be higher this year. I seek leave to insert a further table in *Hansard*, which is purely statistical, and which details the slaughter capacity utilisation of the abattoirs throughout all States and in total for Australia, and I wish to show how this has affected the A.M.I.E.U. job requirements and the number of jobs. I seek leave to have that table inserted without my reading it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Can the honourable member assure me that the table is purely of a statistical nature?

Mr LEWIS: I can.

Leave granted.

Slaughter Capacity Utilisation—Cattle

	Capacity ('000 head)	1977 %	1980 %
N.S.W.	3 582	92	58
Vic.	3 162	78	50
Qld	3 062	90	71
W.A.	992	80	60
S.A.	674	100	71
Tas.	300	100	67
N.T.	242	50	100
Australia	12 050	84	60

Mr LEWIS: I thank the House for that consideration. To make the whole picture complete, it is desirable for us to consider the slaughter capacity utilisation of sheep and lambs in Australian abattoirs. Honourable members know that the equipment and the chains used to slaughter cattle are not appropriate, nor are they used to slaughter sheep and lambs. Again, I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it a table entitled 'Slaughter Capacity Utilisation—Sheep and Lambs' for the years 1976, 1979 and 1980.

Leave granted.

Slaughter Capacity Utilisation Sheep and Lambs

	Capacity ('000 head)	1976* %	1979 %	1980 %
N.S.W.	10 776	86	86	90
Vic.	14 370	81	72	74
Qld	1 729	94	82	76
W.A.	7 536	85	59	56
S.A.	4 792	77	67	73
Tas.	1 103	100	73	82
A.C.T.	261	69	73	100
Australia	40 567	83	73	75

Mr LEWIS: It is to be noted that in five years to 1980 sheep and lamb slaughtering were highest in most States of Australia in total. In 1977 slaughtering were higher in New South Wales, Queensland and the Territories, and these figures are used as a base. I refer to another table which illustrates the percentage of the sheep population which is slaughtered each year for the five-year periods ended June 1965, June 1970, June 1975 and June 1980. It can be seen how there has been no long-term change. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it that table which illustrates that the percentage figure moves from 20.8 to 21.6—a slight increase.

Leave granted.

	Slaughtering as a % of sheep pop.	Slaughtering plus live exports as a % of sheep pop.	% change in pop.
5 years ended June 1965	20.8	20.8	+10
5 years ended June 1970	21.9	21.9	+6
5 years ended June 1975	24.5	24.9	-16
5 years ended June 1980	21.6	24.9	-10

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

Mr HEMMINGS (Napier): The Budget, as presented by the Premier, once again clearly shows what this Government is all about. It is a Government for the privileged class, the wealthy, and there is no way in which the working class, the ordinary people in the community, can gain any comfort from what I would describe as the financial madness we have before us now. If the community is looking for a fair deal in relation to education, health, delivery services, housing, community services, such as community welfare and libraries, then it might as well look elsewhere. There is nothing forthcoming. There was nothing last year and there is nothing this year. The Premier has gone on record as saying that next year will be just as dismal. It is patently clear that the Tonkin Government is not capable of running this State on a sound financial basis: it is not fit to occupy the Treasury benches, and the quicker it gets out the better it will be for the people of South Australia.

This Budget is lacklustre, static, and devoid of any innovation. Its main objective seems to be directed towards tidy book-keeping rather than energising the dynamics of a healthy public sector. It is a dismal irony indeed that this Liberal Government, whose stated philosophy is based upon the creative capacity of individuals, should itself produce such an unimaginative display, as far as this Budget is concerned. This was going to be the Government of initiative, the Government to get things moving. We all know what two years have given us. They have given us stagnation. The *Advertiser* editorial of 21 September 1981 clearly states the point that I am making.

That editorial refers to 'the seeming lack of daring amongst so many decision-makers throughout the community, the lack of adventurous spirit, the spirit of ingenious will, which in the past has made this State tick and which is making dreams come true elsewhere'. The editorial further stated that the Government had a role to set goals and create an environment for constructive innovation. The record of the past two years shows that this Government is clearly incapable of carrying out that role. It has deliberately and effectively demoralised the Public Service.

Within the policy areas of that service, there exists little more than gloom and despair. Nothing is being done to encourage new projects and to attempt solutions to the ever-increasing problems created by this miserable Government. The massive talent in the Public Service—that reservoir of administrative and intellectual energy—now operates in a vacuum. It has no leadership. The latest cuts in departmental expenditure and staff levels included in the Budget can only reinforce that trend. The evidence shows that the private sector will not be unaffected by these cuts. When will this Government realise that the private sector only responds to a healthy public sector?

By abolishing the death duties (thereby incurring a loss of about \$30 000 000 to the State), the Government has had to rely on extra revenue from two sources. It expected

to receive further revenue from an expanding economy. It is a general proposition that, for every 1 per cent in economic growth, the State accrues an additional \$4 000 000. Growth in South Australia is very low at the moment and compares very badly with the rest of Australia, especially New South Wales and Queensland. By following the budgetary policies of this Government, we can expect this situation to remain for some time.

The Government also expected to receive a much larger share of Commonwealth funds. With the planned Federal Budget surplus this year of around \$1 560 000 000, it is clearly not the Fraser Government's intention that State funding will increase. In any case, the political framework of new federalism will not allow the States further assistance.

Thus, we find that the Government has now landed itself in fairly serious trouble and has been forced to plunder reserves just to pay for its administration. Of course, this can be only a short-term solution. The State of New South Wales adopted a similar course for a short time but now receives greater revenue through an expanding economy, something which is clearly not happening here.

The hapless Minister of Local Government and Minister of Housing has really suffered under this Budget. The razor gang got stuck into his areas of responsibility and, true to form, he took the least line of resistance and took it lying down, very quietly. Within the areas affecting local government, the Budget is consistent in cutting funds for staffing levels. The Department of Local Government has been hit particularly severely with cuts in expenditure of at least 7 per cent. It is rumoured that staff levels will be reduced by about 5 per cent.

The actual amounts involved are difficult to trace through transfer of funds. However, the following points are made very clear: subsidies to local government libraries appear to be reduced from \$3 951 000 to \$3 300 000. An amount of about \$600 000 was left in a reserve fund from last year, and brings this year's figure in money terms to the level allocated in 1980-81. However, with an inflation component added, at least \$400 000 will be lost in real terms. This makes a mockery of this Government's statement that it places real importance on local library services.

Yet again the community is made to suffer. When one thinks of the history and background of the western region, which, for many years, has been deprived of adequate library resources, obviously the people in that region will be made to suffer for a few more years. The Institutes Association has been cut by about 20 per cent in real terms. The Litter Control Council has been cut by the inflation rate. The Local Government Assistance Fund, usually used for information services to the community, has also been reduced by the inflation rate.

We now come to the petty part of this Budget regarding local government. The two scholarships previously offered by the Local Government Office have also been given the axe or have been reduced extensively. The Keith Hockridge Memorial Scholarship has been reduced from \$9 000 to \$1 000. That scholarship was set up by the previous Labor Government to give senior local government officers a chance to travel abroad and learn something for the betterment of local government in South Australia. The Canberra course for senior local government officers has also suffered, being reduced by 50 per cent. It will now be offered every two years instead of every year. Those cuts are a paltry and unnecessary move which will and should be seen as a lack of commitment on the part of the Government to increase performance standards in local government. This Government pays lip service to promoting efficient local government. Since gaining office, it has had a

record of giving local government more responsibility but denying it financial assistance.

A most interesting manoeuvre is the transfer of funds within the South Australian Housing Trust administration expenses from 'Control of rent' to the Emergency Housing Office. The Treasurer made great play of this in his Financial Statement to the House. On page 22 of his statement, he says:

A Government decision to assist further with the housing problems of youth and the aged by extending the services of the Emergency Housing Office is reflected in the increased grant to this office in 1981-82.

A sum of \$100 000 has been taken from 'Control of rent' to the Emergency Housing Office. Inspectorial duties under the Housing Improvement Act are now undertaken by health surveyors. Therefore, local government is, in effect, paying the cost of the extra money being provided for the Emergency Housing Office. This Government has assisted no-one. Regarding local government, this Budget contains no initiatives for councils to expand involvement in community services, economic development, or housing, all of which need stimulation at this time.

I now turn to housing, and this Government's failure to grapple with the problem. Although the greatest proportion of blame lies fairly and squarely on the Fraser Government in relation to welfare housing, this Government must also bear some responsibility, as it has not in any realistic way attempted to make up the shortfall in providing increased welfare housing funds. There has been a slight increase to the South Australian Housing Trust made by this Government, but it in no way reflects the situation regarding the vast number of people on the waiting list, and it will not assist the trust to direct its talents to any worthwhile project that could alleviate the problem. Housing shortages and the homelessness which now face so many South Australians rank second only to the tragedy of unemployment as this State's major social problem. Since 1974-75, the last year of the Whitlam Government, in regard to payments to South Australia for housing, the sum dropped from \$103 900 000 to \$38 200 000 in 1980-81. I seek leave to have figures relating to all States inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Can the honourable member assure me that they are purely of a statistical nature?

Mr HEMMINGS: Of course, Sir.

Leave granted.

Net Payments to the States for Housing 1974-75 to 1980-81
(\$m constant 1980-81 prices)

Financial year	Total Federal payments	State repayment of advances	State repayment of interest	Total State repayments	Net Federal payments
Australia					
1974-75	709.6	34.7	159.5	194.2	515.4
1976-77	550.3	34.7	167.3	201.9	348.4
1978-79	411.2	37.9	181.9	219.9	191.3
1980-81	276.0	35.6	164.7	200.3	75.7
New South Wales					
1974-75	227.3	12.3	55.8	68.1	159.3
1976-77	179.2	12.2	57.5	69.7	109.6
1978-79	136.4	13.2	62.0	75.2	61.2
1980-81	92.3	12.3	56.0	68.4	23.9
Victoria					
1974-75	180.5	10.7	43.9	54.6	125.9
1976-77	144.5	10.4	45.8	56.2	88.3
1978-79	106.9	11.0	49.1	60.2	46.7
1980-81	67.9	10.4	44.2	54.6	13.3
South Australia					
1974-75	103.9	4.3	24.2	28.6	75.3
1976-77	82.5	4.5	25.4	29.9	52.6
1978-79	60.9	5.0	27.7	32.7	28.1
1980-81	38.2	4.8	25.1	29.9	8.4

Net Payments to the States for Housing 1974-75 to 1980-81
(\$m constant 1980-81 prices)—*continued*

Financial year	Total Federal payments	State repayment of advances	State repayment of interest	Total State repayment	Net Federal payments
Western Australia					
1974-75	69.1	3.1	13.4	16.5	52.6
1976-77	52.5	3.1	14.3	17.4	35.1
1978-79	38.6	3.3	15.9	19.2	19.4
1980-81	27.9	3.2	14.6	17.8	10.1
Queensland					
1974-75	80.6	3.1	13.4	16.5	64.2
1976-77	56.6	3.1	14.6	17.7	38.9
1978-79	42.5	3.4	16.4	19.9	22.7
1980-81	33.9	3.3	15.0	18.3	15.6
Tasmania					
1974-75	48.1	1.4	8.8	10.2	37.9
1976-77	34.9	1.6	9.6	11.1	23.7
1978-79	25.9	1.8	10.7	12.5	13.4
1980-81	15.8	1.7	9.8	11.6	4.3

Mr HEMMINGS: This year, as the result of the new Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, the sum coming to South Australia has dropped even further. We are to receive the miserable sum of \$34 700 000, and if we exclude the figure for Aboriginal housing, which was not included last year, then that figure must be even lower. The recent Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement is a tragedy. Over the next five years the Federal Government will make a base amount of \$200 000 000 available to the States for housing, yet last year \$200 300 000 was paid back to the Commonwealth by the States in interest and capital repayments. The Labor Government in 1974-75 made \$850 000 000 available to the States for housing, including Aboriginal and pensioner housing. That \$850 000 000 has now been cut back to \$200 000 000.

As a result, increasing burdens are being imposed on low and middle income earners, who have been left to fend for themselves in the private housing market at a time when that market is under great stress. The obsession of the Fraser Government with holding down domestic and public sector activity in order to allow free rein to foreign corporations has caused chaos in the housing finance market and in the housing industry generally. The contractionary monetary policies of that Government have fuelled high interest rates and led to restrictions on the availability of housing finance for low and middle income earners. The housing industry has been sacrificed to make room for the expansion of resource development activity.

The great tragedy is that not only will the present generation in need of housing suffer hardship as a result, but this deliberate policy of housing neglect also jeopardises our ability as a State to cope with the emerging housing needs in the future. The Housing Industry Association has criticised the Fraser Government's welfare housing cuts, and so has the Real Estate Institute of Australia—not two bodies that normally would be sympathetic to the Labor Party cause. The institute had this to say:

People who have been forced out of the home-buying market and cannot afford to rent in a private residential market will have to join the ever-lengthening queue for a diminishing supply of Government welfare housing.

As a result of this Government's economic policies, fewer people can provide for their own accommodation. They are being forced into the queues for welfare housing at the very time when the Fraser Government has drastically and dramatically reduced the amount of funds for the States. What do people do when they cannot get access to welfare housing? They become homeless. To the maximum that Australia is becoming a nation of tenants and landlords, we should add 'and homeless people'.

What did South Australia get this year? South Australia received an additional \$2 367 000 transferred from the Department of Aboriginal Affairs. The Housing Trust received \$1 600 000 under the Housing Assistance Act for Aboriginal housing in 1980-81, and this has been cut by \$1 443 000 in 1981-82, a fact which has been obscured by the transfer from the Department of Aboriginal Affairs. In advances, we got \$20 761 000, and in grants, \$13 952 000, giving a total of \$34 714 000. If we take out the Department of Aboriginal Affairs money, the sum is further reduced to \$32 347 000. Looking at the break-down of the grants to the Housing Trust, we see that the figure for the aged was \$3 030 000, for Aboriginal housing \$3 810 000, and untied grants, for general purposes, totalled \$7 110 000.

Let us look at the changes from last year's allocations in money terms only. Advances were cut by 16.8 per cent; aged grants were up by 2.7 per cent; Aboriginal grants were cut by 9.8 per cent; and untied grants were cut by 8.7 per cent. The overall cut to South Australia in money terms was 13.3 per cent, taking into account the transferred Aboriginal housing grants.

The above figures do not allow for a 10.75 per cent to 11 per cent inflation rate. This means, for example, that South Australia was cut by 23 per cent. The apparent rise in aged housing of 2.7 per cent is a cut of 8 per cent in real terms. Aboriginal housing, under the Housing Assistance Act, suffered a cut of about 20 per cent in real terms. That is what we are getting from this Fraser Government this year.

The Tonkin Government has been well aware since it gained office of the ever-growing problem of low income earners seeking Housing Trust accommodation. The waiting list has grown from 18 615 in June 1980 to more than 20 000, but the Minister of Housing has been too busy dismantling the Housing Trust operation in the home purchase arena to worry or concern himself with making any positive attempt to redress the situation. I should like to refer to a report in the *Advertiser* of 5 September under the heading, 'Slanging Match between Housing Ministers', which stated in part:

Housing Ministers from Liberal and Labor State Governments attacked the Commonwealth in what the sources said was a substantial blow to Commonwealth-State relations. The main attacks had come from Victoria's Mr Kennett and Western Australia's Mr Lawrence. At one stage the States had demanded that the Commonwealth sign over more money 'right now'. Mr McVeigh refused. He said the Budget was the Budget, and they had got all they were going to get from it. Mr McVeigh told the State Ministers they should convince their Premiers that housing should be given priority in State Budgets.

Later, the report states:

Mr Kennett earlier this week sought the support of the Australian Democrats and Senator Harradine (Ind.) in getting the Senate to add \$400 000 000 to the Budget housing allocation to the States.

I would have had more respect for the Minister if he had thrown his full support behind Mr Kennett, but he had only this to say:

'Our housing for needy people must suffer unless we can find funds elsewhere,' Mr Hill said. 'It was disappointing we could not convince the Commonwealth of our need for more funds in the welfare housing area.' Mr Hill said one encouraging point of the meeting was that Mr McVeigh had agreed to take up with the Prime Minister, Mr Fraser, the possibility of South Australia's deferring repayment of some funds due to the Commonwealth under existing Commonwealth-State arrangements.

I can tell the Minister, right now, how far he will get with that proposal—nowhere at all. Despite the ever-growing list, the number of houses and flats built dropped in 1979 from 1 857, which represented 22.1 per cent of the total houses and flats built in the State, to 1 408, or 16.9 per cent, in 1980. That refers to homes and flats built by the South Australian Housing Trust. It would be interesting to see how many houses and flats were built in 1981, when the

Minister sees fit to release the annual report of the South Australian Housing Trust.

Not only has there been a drop in public housing, but the number of private dwellings built has fallen also. If we take the figures for building and loan approvals for the March quarter in 1981 (I would like to quote the South Australian figures), dwellings for which approval was given in March 1981 totalled 1 584, a drop of 18.2 per cent, as opposed to March 1980. New dwellings approved for loans

totalled 1 084, a drop of 23.3 per cent from March 1980. All dwellings approved for loans totalled 5 677, a drop of 6.6 per cent from March 1980. I seek leave to have the figures for all States inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Can the honourable member assure me that this table is purely of a statistical nature?

Mr HEMMINGS: Yes.

Leave granted.

Building and Loan Approvals for Dwellings
March quarter 1981

	Dwellings given approval		New dwellings approved for loans		All dwellings approved for loans	
	Number of dwellings March qtr 1981	% Change on March qtr 1980	Number of dwellings March qtr 1981	% Change on March qtr 1980	Number of dwellings March qtr 1981	% Change on March qtr 1980
New South Wales	13 520	3.7	5 576	-18.7	21 950	-13.5
Victoria	6 194	-0.4	4 200	-9.5	18 197	-0.5
Queensland	9 459	23.8	3 575	-5.1	11 085	+1.1
South Australia	1 584	-18.2	1 084	-23.3	5 677	-6.6
Western Australia	3 816	-4.4	1 817	-17.4	6 551	-8.5
Tasmania	638	-24.9	338	-15.9	1 595	-5.5
Northern Territory	474	-12.4	182	-47.2	522	-4.2
Australian Capital Territory	626	33.8	539	13.5	1 652	7.6
Australia	36 311	4.7	17 311	-13.9	67 229	-6.2

Mr HEMMINGS: There is nothing in this Budget which will promote a reversal of this trend of a continuing reduction in private sector housing. I urge the Government to reassess its attitude to welfare housing, so that there can be a ray of hope for those people caught in the bind of not being able to afford private housing and not being able to be accommodated by the South Australian Housing Trust.

Let me now deal with State charges. The Premier said on page 8 of his Financial Statement, under 'Charges and fees', that increases in fees and charges levied by various State agencies were announced in recent months and that we would all prefer that these increases were not necessary. Well, Sir, there are plenty of people in this State who would agree with that comment, because they have been subjected over the past 12 months to one of the most savage ranges of increases seen in recent years. Areas which touch everyone have been affected: bus and train fares; water charges; electricity charges; gas charges; and, of course, Housing Trust rents. That is to name just a few. I think the member for Hanson admitted quite freely in his contribution yesterday that there have been 60 increases in State charges by this Government over the past year. Most of those increases have been justified by the Premier on the user-payments principle. All I can say is that this Government is either ignorant of the havoc and misery that these increased charges have caused, or it is acting in a completely callous fashion.

There is a barometer by which we can clearly see how the Government's financial policies have affected the low income groups and the disadvantage in this State, and that is through the number of Housing Trust tenants who have been forced by circumstances to seek some form of rent relief from the Housing Trust. The figures are frightening. I will quote from page 9 of the Forty-fourth Annual Report of the South Australian Housing Trust, which gives the numbers of people who received rent reductions. In 1978-79, there were 12 012; in 1979-80, the first year of this Government, the figure increased to 13 939; and, as at 30 June 1981 (and this information was received in answer to a Question on Notice) there were 16 763 tenants in receipt of rent reduction, representing 41.1 per cent of the total Housing Trust rental stock. In addition, 4 180 pensioner

benefit card holders were paying concessional rents below the full rents for the dwellings they occupied. Therefore, 51.3 per cent of trust tenants were paying reduced rents. So the figure grew from 12 012 in 1978-79, the last year we were in office, to a staggering figure in June 1981 of 16 763. I seek leave to have this information inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member may seek leave to have statistical material inserted on the assurance that it is only statistical.

Mr HEMMINGS: It is, Mr Speaker.

Leave granted.

Rent Reductions

2. The following numbers of tenants in various categories were in receipt of rent reductions at 30 June 1981:

	Number	Percentage of tenants
(a) Lone parent families	5 276	12.92
(b) Aged pensioners	3 659	8.96
(c) Unemployed	2 093	5.13
(d) Invalid pensioners	1 788	4.38
(e) Civilian widows	1 667	4.04
(f) Wage earners	615	1.51
(g) War pensioners	651	1.60
(h) Social Services (sickness)	471	1.15
(i) Special (married minors, etc.)	421	1.03
(j) War widows	122	.30

Mr HEMMINGS: These people are in such circumstances that quite correctly they are in receipt of a rent reduction. However, they also bear the full brunt of these savage increases in State charges. No wonder they are at their wits end! The frightening thing is that it will not stop there. If this Government follows its stated course, those people will be slugged again and again because of this Government's financial stupidity. If the trend continues (and I prophesy that the figures will go up and up during each year of the reign of this Government), then the Housing Trust will find itself in a situation in which something like 60 or 70 per cent of its tenants are in receipt of rent reductions and

where the cost of maintaining those rent reductions will be borne by the remaining 30 per cent of people.

Mr GLAZBROOK (Brighton): I believe that it is time that members of the Opposition understood and realised, as do, I believe, many South Australians, just how responsible this Budget is. It is a Budget of common sense.

Mr Slater: That's absolutely ridiculous.

Mr GLAZBROOK: Just listen, and perhaps the honourable member will learn why. For many years previous successive Governments have lived in an economic climate of growth, spending enormous sums of money on the provision of services and facilities which, in some cases, the community has been told it needed. However, the question that begs to be asked and answered is simply: have we in the past been totally prudent in our desire to get today what we perhaps cannot pay for? The total liability of the State debts is now \$2 672 000 000—that is money that South Australia owes to various lending and other institutions. The interest on that money must take first bite of any Budget. In fact, this year the total interest payment will be \$214 875 000, enough to run the departments of Mines and Energy, Attorney-General, Corporate Affairs, Industrial Affairs, Public Works, Chief Secretary, Fisheries, and Marine. That is an incredible list of departments that could be operated just on the interest to be paid.

If we look at an analogy, if Mr Average Wage Earner continually spent \$100 more than he earned each week, he would eventually end up either in the Bankruptcy Court or probably in gaol. If a business spent more than it earned, what could the directors expect as a direct consequence, particularly if the business continued to lose money over a great number of years?

Mr Slater: How long has this been going on?

Mr GLAZBROOK: I will come to that, too. The business would obviously founder, and there would have to be a final day of reckoning. Many people in business have had to sell everything to cover such a debt. Many people have also, because of the law, been able to walk away leaving shareholders bearing the brunt of the debt. What happens when Governments spend more than they earn? Surely that could be labelled 'irresponsibility'. Whilst this Government is changing its emphasis on the use of Loan funds to consolidate the losses of the past (and I emphasise that point), it is working towards the point where such uses stop.

It must be remembered that for the past 10 years the previous Government took this State like an express train going the wrong way. In 1960, the total State debt was \$749 000 000. In 1969, at the start of the Dunstan decade, it was \$1.4 billion but in 1979 the State debt had risen to \$2.447 billion. In 10 years that train had gathered speed with such momentum that it was difficult, almost impossible, to stop and the State debt had increased by \$1 billion. It was not until the train drivers had changed that the people of South Australia pulled the cord and said 'Stop'. The Tonkin Government came in and applied the brakes, and for the past two years it has tried to slow and stop the downhill run of the withdrawn economic and development gravy train that was on its way to disaster.

As the Treasurer announced in his Budget speech, when the difficulties are outlined, fully understood and appreciated, the people of South Australia will see that this Budget is both realistic and responsible. This is so necessary to the strategy of both retrieval and revival for this State. Some people, urged on I might add by the Leader of the Opposition in his statements, are saying that the Tonkin Government should not be passing the buck, but they need to understand, just as much as the Opposition needs to understand, that the previous Government spent an additional \$1 billion in trying to achieve what it claimed to be social

changes. I state loud and clear that not only has the train to disaster that it was on been stopped but also a new train is now slowly gathering speed along the track headed for the destination of recovery.

Mr Kenelly interjecting:

Mr GLAZBROOK: It maybe some distance away; we do not deny that. As each month passes, that train will gather more speed and will soon reach the spring of the economic growth and stability summer that we are all seeking.

Mr Kenelly: That destination seems to get farther away.

Mr GLAZBROOK: But it is not a destination to disaster. In adopting responsibility (and this is what this Budget does), some people will obviously get hurt, and we do not hide that point. There is so much to be done in so many areas, but the money is just not there. The sooner the Opposition wakes up to the fact that it has spent all the money the sooner it will come to the realisation that it cannot achieve what it thinks it can achieve. There is one way, of course, in which the Opposition can achieve it, and that would be to ask the people to pay more and more in taxes. I am quite sure the people will not want to spend more.

In 1979, areas such as the Public Service, local government and the Federal Government employed nearly one-third of the work force of this State, which was fast becoming a parasitic State, living off taxes to pay those they employed.

Mr Slater interjecting:

Mr GLAZBROOK: No, I did not. I said that the State was fast becoming a parasitic State, because they were living off the taxes for the people they employed. Historically, Governments have not been required to pay into separate accounts such things as long service leave payments, superannuation payments, capital cost replacement sums for equipment, etc., but rather have taken the necessary amounts out of each year's Budget.

This has been a fault of previous Governments, not just of one Government. It has been a historic thing. Because inflation did not exist, it seemed reasonable that sums of money could be allocated each year. However, with the spiralling costs of wages through inflation and the cost of equipment, it has almost reached the stage where it will soon become extremely difficult to cover the cost of replacing items. With the spiralling costs of wage increases, greater percentage payments, even of superannuation on the State superannuation scheme, take effect.

At June 1981 there were 17 900 contributors to the State Superannuation Fund. Those contributors were drawn from the Public Service, and included teachers and railway employees. There were also 4 000 contributors from statutory bodies, making a total of 21 900 contributors. The contributions that these people make today is only 28 per cent of the total sum involved. There is no scheme in the private sector where an employer picks up 72 per cent, and it should be noted that the figure of 21 900 people who contribute to that scheme represent only one-third of the workforce that is eligible to be in the scheme. I do not know whether honourable members know, but retired persons who are on superannuation benefits also receive an additional 95 per cent in payment for the cost of living increases, which the State picks up.

Mr Slater: Ninety-five per cent?

Mr GLAZBROOK: Yes, it is passed on, and the Government picks it up. The percentage cost of superannuation to the Government represents 4 per cent of the Government's total wage and salary bill, and this will rise to about 10.5 per cent by the year 2020; that is, if there is no significant increase or growth in the manpower of the Public Service. Of course, it depends also on there being no substantial

growth in the number of people who are eligible to go into that scheme.

Today's cost of the superannuation budget is \$29 600 000 a year, and it is now quite likely to peak at about \$74 300 000 (in 1981 dollars) by the year 2020. So, it can be seen that, if the two-thirds who are not in the scheme at the moment and who are eligible decided to join this most generous scheme that the Labor Administration brought in in 1974, the State would be further down the tube, by another \$59 000 000 in 1981, peaking at a further \$150 000 000 in the year 2020. In budgetary terms that is an amount equal to the whole amount that we would spend on the Department of Industrial Affairs. I ask how much further we can go when the fiscal Budget shows quite clearly that there is just not the money around for these other increases.

The drain on the State's economy is indeed getting greater and greater and, if there were a continuation of the push for a greater proportion of the tax dollar, the people endanger themselves and the very substance of a State's economy. For instance, in 1970, \$57 out of every \$100 was paid for teachers wages in this State, yet in 1981 \$90 in every \$100 pays for teachers' wages in the Budget allocation. In 1969-70, \$43 was left out of every \$100 for additional educational resources material, but in 1981 only \$10 is left. So, the cake has suddenly gone from \$43 out of \$100 to only \$10 out of every \$100.

Mr Kenelly: No, that logic is impossible.

Mr GLAZBROOK: The point that I am trying to make to the honourable member is quite clear: that the Labor Government not only had greater leeway to do what it wanted with its promises, but also it used an additional \$1 billion to put this State deeper and deeper into debt. It therefore is not surprising that the salvation of this State must be in industry, in commerce, and the royalties necessary to bridge the gap between the haves and the have nots. With regard to mineral royalties, the New South Wales Government in 1978-79 received \$35 650 000; Victoria received \$60 111 000; Queensland received \$57 981 000; Western Australia received \$57 810 000; and Tasmania received \$2 193 000. The Commonwealth Government received \$28 031 000, and South Australia received \$4 500 000 in royalties.

Mr Kenelly: What does that mean?

Mr GLAZBROOK: I am trying to show you that because other States have an additional income from which they can meet a great deal more than this State can meet, we must be more prudent and more responsible with our money and not spend more than the previous Government did during its time.

By the middle of this decade, say, around 1985, we could be earning some \$20 000 000 from the Cooper Basin liquids scheme, and from increasing sales of gas and liquids to New South Wales. With regard to Roxby Downs, depending on the market prices current at the time of mining and production, the State could expect to receive royalties of 2½ per cent of production. If production is allowed to go ahead, sales could be between \$700 000 000 to \$1 000 000 000 in 1981 dollars.

Mr Kenelly: During the term of this Budget?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GLAZBROOK: The honourable member will recall that I said mid-1980s, provided that production is allowed to go ahead. It could be expected to earn this State, with a royalty figure of 2½ per cent, approximately \$50 000 000. So, if there was an additional \$50 000 000, plus \$20 000 000, the State would be on the way. That may be available if this work is allowed to go ahead.

What we must all realise is the necessity to share not only in that growth which we anticipate and which we must

work towards but in the responsibility to achieve it. Therefore, of necessity, we will have to put up with some difficulties and some hard times for the time being. We should act as responsibly as we can. We must resist unjust wage demands; if necessary we will have to even mark time or tread water.

An honourable member: M.P.s' salaries?

Mr GLAZBROOK: Why not? If we keep swimming in ever decreasing circles as we have been doing we will not only get nowhere and get very tired, but we will be in danger of becoming exhausted and likely to drown in our own helplessness, nudged on, I might say, by the results of the previous Labor Government's erroneous philosophies. It reminds me of the modern parable, namely, when a person was drowning he looked up and asked God to save him, and suddenly a voice came down and said, 'Try moving your arms first'. In other words, we have to start moving ourselves and taking that first step towards saving the future of the State and the future of our families. We must accept that first responsibility and acknowledge it.

It was with great interest that I read the Premier's announcement concerning the additional capital works programme in housing. Earlier, the member for Napier said that the assistance in housing was going down-hill, but he forgot to take into account the announcement of the \$20 000 000 expenditure that the Premier announced on Tuesday.

The Leader of the Opposition said recently that the amount that this Government was spending on capital works and authorities was decreasing and that capital works were depressed, but quite the opposite is the case. There is an additional inflow of capital into housing. The Leader of the Opposition's rhetorical complaints on Tuesday seemed to be completely barren of real understanding. No positive attitude was expressed concerning what he would do as Leader of a Party in Government, unless he continued the Labor philosophy of perhaps adding another billion dollars to the State debt. Who does he think will pay for these debts? Who will want to pay increased taxes so that the Leader and his Party can proudly boast about what they have achieved?

Opposition members earlier in this debate harped about pay-roll tax decreases to supplement employment, and the Leader of the Opposition referred to that point. He advocated that more and more money should be poured out on job creation schemes. He did not say what sort of schemes, nor did he say where the money would be coming from. He cannot wave a magic wand to produce thousands of millions of dollars to spend on a scheme. Will more money be taken from the Loan Account to generate a level of employment and jobs? However, how is one going to pay the interest debt? I said before that the interest rates this year to be paid amounted to \$214 000 000, which is an incredible amount of money, so I do not know where on earth the Leader expects to get that money. Perhaps he expects to whistle for it; I do not know. Perhaps he would seek to increase other taxes. Perhaps he would sack people, but that would be against his philosophy. Whatever the action he would seek to take it would seem to be irresponsible, because the public does not want to pay more taxes. What is the Leader on about in what he is saying? Does he need to grandstand all the time when he knows already, because of inflation and wage demands and better conditions, that there is hardly any fat left to carve off any more. As yet, I have not heard one sound suggestion from the Opposition—only criticism. Let us be realistic for once and work for the State and for the future.

I want to say a little bit more about interest rates and how this affects what our statutory bodies and other people pay in interest on what they earn. It was with interest that

I went through the Auditor-General's Report: on page 80 it states, under 'Receipts and Payments', that the Engineering and Water Supply Department's total receipts were \$116 125 000. Further down the page, the amount of interest that was paid is shown, and it was \$61 837 000. Thus 53c in the dollar of the rates collected must go in payment of moneys borrowed for the works. That means that only 47c in the dollar is usable for other purposes in E. & W.S. Department work.

I was interested to look at the figures for the Festival Centre. Income for the sale of tickets for the year was \$1 128 000, and the interest payable on that institution was \$1 420 843—in fact, it was more than the receipts were. When one looks at the other avenues involved (and thank goodness it has other sources of income), such as the restaurants and a few other facilities and some endeavours it has, it can be seen that the interest rate payment on money borrowed is 26.1 per cent that must be paid back against the receipts received.

Let us look at ETSA, which is not quite so bad. On page 238 of the Auditor-General's Report we see that the income, the revenue, was \$273 339 000. The interest payments it had to pay out were \$43 522 000, which was a 16 per cent interest rate that it had to pay back on its capital borrowings.

Let us look at the Housing Trust. I listened with interest to the member for Napier when he was talking and condemning the Government for the attitude it was taking on housing in the Budget. Members may not have looked at the Auditor-General's Report, and I urge them to do so. On page 343 they will see that the total income of the Housing Trust was \$85 927 000. If they look down the page they will see that interest paid on money borrowed to help build houses was \$28 508 000. This was 33.17 per cent that had to be paid in interest payments.

This high rate of interest negates a lot of work that should be done because of the enormous sum that has to be paid in interest rates. I could go on and quote many examples of what happens in the area of interest. In looking at the simplistic way of doing accounts in this State, I will take out three or four simple areas, and we know from the accounts presented to us that the income we expect to earn this year from taxation and other sources amounts to \$1 675 000 000; that is the income of this State. Let us look at the expenditure in a very few areas. Health will cost this State this year \$200 986 000. Welfare will take \$46 336 000. Education will take \$507 282 000. Interest, which I mentioned, will take \$214 857 000.

If we add one more department, the Chief Secretary's Department, being for essential services, police and fire brigade, we find the lines of expenditure this year will be \$111 538 000. Those few areas in the State's economy will take \$1 081 017 000 out of the Budget, of \$1 675 000 000. What I want to get at is that this leaves \$593 983 000. This is all that is left to run the other departments. When the Opposition says that this is happening and criticise and say, 'Look what they are doing; they cannot manage the economy,' let me stress the point that members opposite could not manage the economy, because they had to borrow an additional \$1 000 000 000. What we are trying to do, quite simply and responsibly, is say, 'Right, we have to be realistic.' As I said before in an analogy, if a normal wage earner was to spend \$100 more per week than he receives, everybody in the community would say that he was irresponsible.

When I was in private business I could never understand how Governments got away with spending so much money and running up such big Loan account deficits and so forth. I know that the Treasurer is now working towards not having to use such things as Loan moneys to prop up the

State. We will have to accept responsibility and stand up and say, 'Look, we cannot do this.' When the Leader of the Opposition says that we are attacking the public sector, he is right. We are saying that we must be responsible first. If this Government shows responsibility to the community, the community will see that the Government is acting responsibly and will take the lead also.

We cannot keep living on borrowed time. We cannot keep living on borrowed money. This Budget is one of the most responsible documents that this House has seen for a long time. It is very bad for the Opposition to keep criticising it and trying to pull it to pieces. We have not had one concrete suggestion of what should be done to increase the benefit to this State. All that we hear is that we should spend more money on this or that, without any thought whatsoever of where it comes from.

It can only come from one place, and that is from the people, unless you keep borrowing and borrowing. If you borrow too much, you will end up spending all the money on interest payments and you will not be able to spend any money on wages and salaries, and the resources needed to run the State. I commend this Budget.

Mr PLUNKETT (Peake): It is scandalous that this, the third Tonkin Budget, not only condones Fraser's new federalism policy, but puts further burden on the public sector. It is a Budget of a Government that has turned its back on the unemployed, the under-privileged, and the homeless. It is a Budget that now slugs small businesses and some private enterprise. The Budget offers no incentive to the industries that create employment. It does nothing to assist the depressed building and construction industry.

Over the past two years the brick industry in the Adelaide area has been forced to retrench 120 brickmakers. There has been a lot of retrenchment in the tile-making factories. The member for Brighton has just referred to Mr Average Worker on the average wage. Is he aware of the average wage? The average weekly wage is now \$295.10. This figure is a distortion designed to convince Australians that we are well off.

When we consider that nearly 70 per cent of workers earn under the average wage and almost 50 per cent earn less than \$220 per week, the picture becomes clearer. The mythical average of \$295.10 is brought about by including Mr Fraser's \$100 000-plus; the Managing Director of C.R.A., who gets an estimate, with perks, of \$400 000 a year; the Managing Director of B.H.P., who earns an estimated \$500 000; and a Federal public servant (some of the fat cats) who earns well in excess of \$30 000 per year.

The overall situation becomes grimmer when we examine the income of welfare recipients such as old age pensioners, supporting mothers, invalid pensioners and the unemployed. Quite clearly, Liberal Governments have turned Australia into a society of the haves and have-nots. The Henderson poverty report states that more than 2 000 000 Australians live below the poverty line, yet the Liberals complain that welfare levels in Australia are too high. Welfare recipients are already living in squalor and are forced into the demeaning position of having to accept charity and hand-outs.

Fraser and his supporters predicted a boom, while hundreds of thousands of Australians are now being forced into the role of beggars. I notice that the member for Brighton has conveniently left the Chamber. The Premier warned us what a tough Budget this would be. It is a Budget that will have a most severe effect on the economy, and in particular on the ordinary man in the street in South Australia. Government expenditure has been cut by 3 per cent in real terms. Some areas—health, education, community welfare, public works—have fared worse than that.

Some areas have gained, although the State systems have suffered. Private schools have benefited in some cases.

Winning departments, with the exception of public works, are those headed by the razor gang. These departments, headed by the Premier, the Minister of Industrial Affairs, and the Attorney-General, have looked after themselves very well. Again, the public has suffered—the ordinary man in the street. In June, the Premier warned that there would be some cuts in real terms in every area of the State's Budget. He said it was fairer that everyone missed out rather than one section missing out on the lot. That has been the case. The average South Australian has fared very badly, not from increases directly from the Budget, but from back-door rises. The public has been misled by increases prior to the Budget, increases in public, and others not announced at all.

Week by week, the Tonkin Government raised various charges to help itself out of its own financial problems. Almost every possible licence, permit, registration fee, and fare has become dearer; water and electricity bills, Housing Trust rent, motor vehicle registration, public transport, petrol, beer, cigarettes—the list is endless. Unfortunately for all South Australians, Dr Tonkin's Government has still not managed to balance its Budget. The Premier has indicated that many more increases can be expected. Commissions on race bets, lotteries, application fees, company registration fees, rises not evident in the State Budget but back-door rises, have occurred.

Next time we step into our car, pay a bill, use a bus, train or tram, we will remember that Dr Tonkin is not increasing taxes! The Budget is a document that shows the average person the rises with which he has been lumbered, the slashing of public works, cuts in education funds, community welfare grants, the public sector—the ordinary man in the street will be affected. When the individual and the public sector lose the services of Government departments, due to cutbacks and changes in systems, the private sector must suffer. The effect is direct in cases such as the building and construction industry. In other sections of the community, the effect is less direct, but all sections of the community must suffer.

With cutbacks in public works programmes and depressed capital works, the State's development is at risk. My colleagues have consistently warned the Government of the dangers of these cutbacks. We must concern ourselves with the hardships being faced by individuals and family persons in this State.

I turn now to detailing that concern. It is a fact that the rising interest rates are forcing many families into extreme hardship, and in some cases into poverty. My greatest concern for the people of this State is the decrease in the Tonkin Government's ability to see the stress and the hardship that is occurring as a result of its policies. Mr Tonkin's first step should be to convince Mr Fraser that interest rates have to be lowered. One of Mr Fraser's election promises in 1977 was that interest rates would be cut by 2 per cent in 1978. Instead, we have seen an increase of 2 per cent since the Federal election of last year. The Premier and his Canberra colleagues must be made aware of the 135 000 householders paying off mortgages in Adelaide alone. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

IRRIGATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr KENEALLY (Stuart): Earlier today, in Question Time, I asked the Premier if he would make some funds available to the Housing Trust to overcome a very severe problem that my constituents face almost yearly, and that is the dust that comes from housing development within my electorate. Before addressing myself specifically to that question, I would like to say that the State owes a debt to the South Australian Housing Trust. I think we would all agree that it is certainly the best housing commission in Australia, and able to compare with any in the world. It has provided a significant service, and it could continue to do so if resources were made available to it. It will do the job it is charged to do if the resources are there, but that is a matter for another discussion.

My electorate, which includes Port Augusta and Port Pirie, is particularly grateful to the South Australian Housing Trust; the co-operation that has existed between the officers of the trust and the local community has been splendid. I would like to pay a tribute to gentlemen such as Mr Edwards, Mr Crichton, Mr Taylor, Mr Jim McIntosh (before he resigned), Mr Lambert, and many others who have been very good friends of my electorate, as of many other electorates in South Australia.

I would like to pay a tribute to the regional officers—Mr Bywaters and Mr McCowat, recently retired, and their staff, because they also have done what they can in my electorate to make life easier for those people who are their tenants, and they have contributed significantly to the towns. All the problems I have taken to the South Australian Housing Trust have not been resolved, either to my satisfaction or to the satisfaction of many of my constituents, but everyone knows that that inevitably is the case.

Dr Billard: Not all?

Mr KENEALLY: I said not all. There has never been any lack of willingness or readiness to assist demonstrated by officers of the trust.

That brings me to the issue that I want to discuss today. It relates to the dust from which people in my electorate suffer almost annually. Port Augusta is built on a sandhill, and any development that takes place there inevitably causes a dust problem. Port Pirie, because of the nature of the soil there, requires a considerable amount of fill before a major housing development can start, and the result of the carting of fill is that a dust problem is created there. My constituents understand this. They know that there is a certain degree of inconvenience involved each time a housing development starts. As I hope to point out to the House, what happens in my electorate is not mere inconvenience. It is a hazard to those people who live near developments, whether they be Housing Trust or private enterprise developments.

I would like to explain my concern to the House by using one or two brief examples. In the Clontarf Street area of Augusta Park a few years ago those constituents were almost buried by the moving sand. Their front fences were under sand drifts. There were sand dunes in their driveways 20 and 30 yards long, and 2 or 3 feet high. Air-conditioners were ruined, carpets were ruined, curtains were ruined. One could go into bedrooms and they would be covered in dust. Furniture items, such as lounge suites, were affected by dust and, despite all the attempts of the tenants, they could not keep that dust out.

When this matter was referred to the Housing Trust at that time it took what action it could to solve the problem.

It spent a considerable amount of money building fences as bulwarks against the dust. It consolidated the area and used water trucks, at considerable expense. That was not a complete remedy, but nevertheless it was a serious attempt, and to some extent an effective attempt, to solve the dust problem. That particular experience has been mirrored in the Port Augusta/Wilsden area and in the West Augusta Housing Trust area. I have made representations over the years to Mr Crichton, manager of the estate, and also to Mr Bywaters at Port Augusta, to have something done when these dust problems occur. They normally occur in what we regard at Port Augusta as the windy season in September, October and early November, when grounds are drying out and when, strangely enough, most Housing Trust activity takes place.

On each of those occasions over the years I have been able to achieve some result. I must say that people who live in the city really have no understanding of this dust problem. This was the fact with some of the Housing Trust officials until they happened to be in Port Augusta or Port Pirie when the dust was blowing; they could hardly believe what was happening. Over recent years, the Housing Trust has subsidised the high water charges that people have had to pay to keep the sand down around their houses, and has taken a lot of action. In fact, it has sent people up there to put masking tape over doors and windows to keep the dust out. This does help a little bit, but it does not solve the problem.

We know now in Port Augusta and Port Pirie that, because of the clearing done in the expectation that the Redcliff project would go ahead and that we would have a major housing project in Port Augusta and Port Pirie, we will be faced for some years with cleared land over which dust moves very freely. This cleared land, which abuts the sandhills, makes a ready access path for dust that we in Port Augusta must face. I personally have faced this in the three houses I have owned—a railway home, a Housing Trust home, and now my own home in Port Augusta. So I can speak from my experience. My experience is not nearly as bad as that of some of my constituents who come into my office in tears, or fury, looking for somebody's blood. Although they get all the help they can from my electorate office and the local Housing Trust office, it sometimes comes just a little bit too late.

What I particularly want to stress is what has happened this year. We are now facing another very dusty period and, as usual, my constituents have been in to see me and, as usual, it blows dust one day after you have had an inch of rain at Port Augusta. The member for Eyre ought to know that, if anybody does, because in his own electorate he has plenty of experience of this happening. I have taken the normal action of going to the local Housing Trust office—very well received—and to the Housing Trust in Adelaide—very well received. They would like to help because they know they have largely caused the dust problem, but this year, for the first time in many, we have been told that the Government will not allow money to be made available to overcome the very severe hazard that my constituents face as a result of the activity of a Government department. That is no criticism of the Housing Trust. We know that houses have to be built; we know there will be inconvenience. It is the extent of that inconvenience, which I have described as a hazard, about which I am critical.

This year, there will be no water carting in Port Augusta and Port Pirie. This year, no fences will be constructed. This year no bulwarks will be put up against moving dust, because this year the Housing Trust does not have the finance. It has been told deliberately by the Minister and the Government that it is not to waste money in that area. It is not a waste; it is something to which my constituents

are entitled and it should be provided for them—protection against the dust. That, as I say, is not a criticism of the Housing Trust, or of its officers, who are well aware of the situation I describe and would be very happy to do something about it. However, this is the first year in many that they are able to do anything. This is a direct criticism of the Government. It is within the power of the Premier, as Treasurer, to make a special grant available to the Housing Trust over and above that which it needs to spend on housing or maintenance of housing to provide a remedy to my constituents because of the dust that has been caused.

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

Dr BILLARD (Newland): I want to continue some remarks I began in the Budget debate when discussing the factors that affect the public in choosing whether or not to use public transport systems. Towards the end of my remarks I discussed the five major points that affect public acceptance: reliability, frequency, accessibility, comfort and cost, in that order, with cost being the least important of those five major factors. This information was the result of research in several areas in Europe, and was the basis on which public transport authorities in Europe were operating.

I want to discuss the implications of trying to achieve these factors and the other problem areas, such as the level of cost recovery from fares, the methods of ticketing, and consideration of the capacity that a public transport system will have in achieving these factors. One of the striking things I found, generally, in Europe was that public transport systems have a much greater level of acceptance than they have in Australia. Governments can therefore afford to invest much greater sums in ensuring that much more expensive and therefore much more comfortable and acceptable systems are provided. Part of the cost of those systems comes from fare recovery. Here again, Europe seems to have a very different standard from that accepted in Australia.

This Government has come under some criticism from users of the public transport system over increases that it has made in bus and train fares in each of the past two years. In South Australia, the level of fare recovery, that is, the percentage of the total income from fares relative to the total running costs of the public system, is still only in the low 30s. In the year just ended, the Auditor-General's Report figures can be used to show that the level of fare recovery was 33.6 per cent for the S.T.A. If we look back over the past few years, we can see that the percentage has hovered between 32 per cent and 34 per cent for several years.

However, in Halmstad in Sweden, for example, the level of fare recovery is 51 per cent, which is considerably above the level in Adelaide. In Essen in Germany the level was 60 per cent, and in Newcastle in the United Kingdom the level was 60 per cent but I am told that it used to be between 70 per cent and 80 per cent. In the Greater London Council area, I am told that the level of fare recovery, that is, the proportion of a cost of a trip that is paid for by fares, is around 70 per cent to 80 per cent.

In fact, there was some debate ensuing in the United Kingdom while I was there as to what is the correct policy about the fixing of fares and some councils, notably the Greater London Council, had recently had substantial changes in its membership. It was proposing a most radical step, which was to reduce the level of fare recovery to 57 per cent. That was considered to be a most radical step. We can see how radical it is when we look at the level of fare recovery in Adelaide which, for the last year, was 33.6 per cent. That means that a 66.4 per cent subsidy operates on the running costs, not the capital costs, of the public

transport system in Adelaide. There are dramatic differences, and this has substantial implications for the type of service we can supply.

The second major difference between overseas public transport systems and ours was the capacity that those public transport systems could carry and, by implication, the demand for those public transport systems. Typically, the l.r.t. systems and the l.r.t.-type systems at which I looked could carry and were designed to carry between 8 000 and 15 000 passengers an hour in each direction. The demand for carriage of passengers to the north-east suburbs using the l.r.t. to Tea Tree Gully would be about 9 000 to 10 000 passengers a day, and that would be an optimistic estimate. There is an order of magnitude of difference between the numbers of passengers that have to be carried on those systems, and obviously l.r.t.-type systems are specifically designed for heavy capacity usage and are not considered appropriate for lower capacity usage.

In fact, in Essen, in spite of the sophisticated hierarchy of public transport, including an S-Bahn system, which is a modern rail commuter system, a U-Bahn system (what we call the l.r.t. system), tram systems, which are equivalent to the old-fashioned trams, and bus systems, it is still found that, in spite of the huge investment in that great hierarchy of public transport, 50 per cent of all passengers use the bus system so that there is still a great demand to get people to their homes.

I would also like to talk about the method of ticketing used. I can simply give my own personal view of the different ticketing systems that were operating. There are implications, both in terms of manpower and capital investment, in the types of ticketing systems that are chosen. For example, in the Newcastle system (the Tyne and Wear system) the ticketing systems were expensive. I understand that each station cost £250 000 to construct, of which £125 000 was due to the ticketing system. That is an expensive cost to pay for ticketing because, if you need automatic ticketing you have to have barriers, you have to have a substantial number of ticketing machines, and a high capital cost is involved.

In London, the other tack was used. They had some automatic ticketing machines but the emphasis was on the employment of a large number of people who are used to inspect everyone's ticket as they leave the station.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask honourable members to reduce the tone of their voices.

Dr BILLARD: By far the best system, in my view, was the German system which did not involve the use of barriers but simply involved the use of roving inspectors plus a heavy fine. That seemed to me to be the most convenient system from the public's point of view and to load least cost into the tickets. Obviously the degree to which the public can be encouraged to buy their own tickets without human intervention has significant implication in the providing of frequent bus services, because if bus drivers are required to sit and sell tickets as passengers enter a bus it makes the service much slower.

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

Mr SLATER (Gilles): Yesterday, in Question Time, I was rather intrigued by the response to a question by the member for Henley Beach from the Minister of Tourism in which she made some remarkable comments. The question was in regard to so-called damage being done to the South Australian tourist industry as a result of a dispute involving the maritime union and the power engineers. During the course of her reply, the Minister said, in part:

It is absolutely heartbreaking to me that right at this moment the Government is spending considerable sums by way of invest-

ment in South Australia's tourist future to promote this State to South Australians and to people interstate.

In last night's *News* a full-page advertisement for the Hit the Trail campaign appeared, yet who can hit the trail in South Australia right now? We are all prisoners in our own homes because we have not enough petrol in our cars, and that is the responsibility of a small group of unionists in the Eastern States who are sitting on comfortable incomes of in excess of \$20 000 a year . . .

There was then an interjection by an honourable member who asked, 'What's your income?' The Minister did not reply to that, but said:

At least I work 365 days a year.

I appreciate that perhaps Ministers of the Crown do work particularly hard, but I challenge the Minister to confirm the fact that she works on the job for 365 a days year. It may be, of course, that she is counting her domestic duties at home in the 365 days. She must work on Good Friday, on Christmas Day, on Easter Sunday and all those holy days—

Mr Mathwin: On Pancake Tuesday, too.

Mr SLATER: And probably on Pancake Tuesday, as the member for Glenelg has mentioned. She would only have one day off every four years on 29 February, which would be a leap year. I think the Minister has tried to exaggerate the situation somewhat in response to that question, 'What is your income?'

For the benefit of the House, it is in the Estimates of Payments from the Consolidated Account. The salary of the Minister of Tourism is quoted as being \$54 720 a year, including \$5 500 electoral allowance and \$2 860 a year expenses allowance. That is far more than the income of the marine engineers of which members opposite were so critical.

An honourable member: She works much longer and doesn't have one week off in two.

Mr SLATER: That is a determination made by the industrial tribunal in regard to the award, and that is the wage. I do not deny income to a worker who is worthy of that income, as the members for Todd and Newland do. I think they are entitled to it. It ill behoves a Minister of the Crown to criticise a person earning that income. I mention in passing that, in addition to the Minister's income, her husband is the Managing Director of a company in my district, and I would guarantee that his income is almost greater than is the Minister's. The family income would be in excess of \$100 000 a year and so I believe it is in bad taste for the Minister to criticise the maritime and power engineers.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr SLATER: I will leave that matter and refer to a matter that I raised earlier in the House concerning a gymnasium at the Adelaide College of the Arts and Education. I have submitted several petitions to the House—

Mr Mathwin: We want one over on the south side. You are well catered for.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Glenelg will not be warned again.

Mr SLATER: I have asked two questions of the Minister of Education about the matter but I have not receive a very satisfactory answer on either occasion. The Minister has wavered on the matter. First, he has said, and I agree, that the Adelaide College of Arts and Education is autonomous and makes its own decision, and secondly, that it is Federally funded. I think that was an excuse for the Minister to use to get out from under. There has been a great deal of public interest in the matter, and I think it would be a real tragedy if that gymnasium were turned into a dance studio for a select few. These thoughts are best expressed in a letter to the Editor in the *Advertiser* last week, headed 'Gym move questioned', which stated in part:

Sir—We the undersigned respectfully request that the Ministers responsible for Recreation and Sport, Education and Health, examine the wisdom of the decision by the Adelaide College of the Arts and Education to dismantle and close the Adelaide Campus gymnasium (Kintore Avenue) and convert it into dance studios.

The gymnasium is one of only two non-commercial gyms in the city centre proper, which could be available for community use (the other is the YMCA gymnasium in Flinders Street).

However, it is the only gym that is within convenient walking distance for a workforce of thousands and which is so located that recreation, health and fitness groups can conveniently use the superb running paths along the River Torrens and parklands as part of their healthy activities. In the past the gym has been used by a significant number of recreation and fitness groups.

Demand for the gym for these purposes has not abated; in fact, with the increasing awareness of the need to lead a more active lifestyle the need is greater. We request that the Minister of Recreation and Sport examine the desirability of a first-class facility such as this one being restricted to dancing use only.

The letter is signed by S. M. Gray and 42 signatories of the Adelaide College of Advanced Education. This represents only a small part of the persons who take an interest in this gymnasium threatened with proposed closure. It would be a tragedy if the gymnasium were lost for all time. To build a gymnasium of that nature would probably cost in the vicinity of \$400 000 to \$500 000. I think it would be a terrible thing for it to be used for only an exclusive few. I still ask the Minister of Education and his colleagues in the Government to make further representations concerning a decision on whether the gym will be allowed to be used by a certain section of the community to the detriment of people involved in recreation, fitness and health. I make that sincere request to the Minister.

The final matter that I want to refer to in the few moments that I have left concerns a matter in which I had

an interest for some time. The Minister of Recreation and Sport asked me five months ago whether I would support it. I refer to the legal betting on the foot race, the Bay Sheffield. I said that I would support betting, and that it would enhance the Commemoration Day celebrations at Glenelg. Since the Minister's approach to me, I understood that amendments to the Lotteries and Gaming Act would come before Parliament during this session. However, I have been told that that will not be the case and that the Government has changed its mind.

Of course, people have made certain preparations in anticipation that bookmakers would be able to field this year on the Bay Sheffield, which is a very important part of the Colley Reserve celebrations at Glenelg each year. I believe that no harm would be done by allowing people to wager on the Bay Sheffield. The Bay Sheffield is the richest foot race in South Australia. Of course, its prize money could be greatly improved if betting was legally allowed on the race. Similar examples of this are the Stawell Gift in Victoria and the Bendigo Thousand which attract thousands of people and attract interstate and overseas competitors. For instance, the prize money for the Stawell Gift last year was \$22 000. The winner, George McNeill, came from the United Kingdom for the event and won it.

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

Motion carried.

At 5.28 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 29 September at 2 p.m.