

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 5 October 1982

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

## ASSENT TO BILLS

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

Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act Amendment,  
Racing Act Amendment,  
Statutes Amendment (Enforcement of Contracts),  
Supreme Court Act Amendment.

## JUDICIAL REMUNERATION BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

## SOUTH AUSTRALIA JUBILEE 150 BOARD BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

## DEATH OF HON. G. J. GILFILLAN

The **Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer)**: I move:

That this House expresses its deep regret at the death of the Hon. Gordon James Gilfillan, a former member of the Legislative Council in this Parliament, and places on record its appreciation of his public service, and that as a mark of respect, the sitting of the House be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

I am sure that all honourable members who knew Gordon Gilfillan will be saddened to learn of his death. The most that can be said for Gordon Gilfillan would not be enough adequately to express the very high regard in which he was held by members of his own Party, members of this Parliament and members of the community generally. He was a member of the Legislative Council for the Northern District from 1962 to 1975; he was Legislative Council Party Whip from 1968 to 1975 and Secretary of that Party from 1968 to 1970. He served on the Subordinate Legislation Committee and on the Public Works Standing Committee for many years. Indeed, I think it can be said that he was a man who commanded the very greatest respect, particularly in and around Jamestown and in the area where his interests basically lay.

He had an interesting career inasmuch as, while he was a member of this Parliament, he was also Mayor of Jamestown between 1959 and 1972, which is an extraordinary record. The members of this Government Party very much regret his passing and we extend our very deepest sympathies to his wife Catherine and to his three children. I am certain that they will know that the services which Gordon Gilfillan gave to the State of South Australia will long be remembered, not only by the people of his own particular area, but by members of this House and by the people of South Australia generally.

**Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition)**: I would like to join the Premier in his remarks of condolence on the death of the late Mr Gilfillan. I was not personally privileged to know the gentleman, but colleagues of mine who did have been quite unanimous in their comments that he was someone who was universally liked; a man who was courteous, polite and affable (as I would think would distinguish somebody who held a position in local government for the period of time that he did in the Northern part of the State).

He has been described in fact as a politician of the old school; I do not know what that says for the new school. Certainly our members who had contact with Mr Gilfillan are universal in their respect for him and I would certainly strongly endorse the remarks of the Premier and join him in expressing condolences to the late member's family.

**The SPEAKER**: Before calling members to stand in their places as a mark of respect to the late honourable member, I do indicate that it was my good fortune to have known Mr Gilfillan quite well during the period of time when I served in the same position in this House as the honourable Leader serves now, and I found that he was most meticulous in his approach to subject matter which was given to him for research and information which he was asked to glean. It is my intention, on behalf of the House, to afford his widow and family a copy of the tributes which have been made today.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

*[Sitting suspended from 2.9 to 2.20 p.m.]*

## ABSENCE OF CLERK

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier)**: I move:

That two months leave of absence be granted to the Clerk of the House of Assembly (Mr G. D. Mitchell) whilst absent overseas on Commonwealth Parliamentary business.

Motion carried.

**THE SPEAKER**: Having regard to the motion just carried by this House, I inform members that, during the Clerk's absence and under Standing Order 30, his duties will be performed by the Clerk Assistant (Mr D. A. Bridges). I have appointed Mr G. R. Wilson (Second Clerk Assistant) to carry out the duties of Clerk Assistant and Sergeant-at-Arms.

## PETITION: HAIRDRESSING SCHOOL

A petition signed by 247 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to retain the Hairdressing School at the Croydon Park College of Technical and Further Education was presented by Mr Abbott.

Petition received.

## PETITION: INTERPRETING AND TRANSLATING COURSES

A petition signed by 9 000 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to maintain sufficient staffing levels and facilities to continue the much needed interpreting and translating courses at the South Australian College of Advanced Education was presented by Mr Lynn Arnold.

Petition received.

**PETITION: HOUSING TRUST RENTALS**

A petition signed by 16 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to oppose the implementation of increased Housing Trust rentals, as announced, was presented by Mr Crafter.

Petition received.

**PETITION: NORWOOD FIRE STATION**

A petition signed by 618 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Chief Secretary to give an unequivocal undertaking to the residents of inner eastern suburbs of Adelaide that the Norwood Fire Station will continue its services at the level currently provided without fear of closure was presented by Mr Crafter.

Petition received.

**PETITION: INTEREST RATES**

A petition signed by 56 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge all politicians to unite nationally to do all within their power to reduce interest rates across the board was presented by Mr Hamilton.

Petition received.

**PETITION: BLACK FOREST PRIMARY SCHOOL**

A petition signed by 412 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to make an urgent commitment to carry out redevelopment of the main building at Black Forest Primary School was presented by Mr Langley.

Petition received.

**PARLIAMENT HOUSE SECURITY**

**The SPEAKER:** On the last day of sitting members both sides of the House were shocked by an irresponsible act by a member of the public who had physically occupied a position of privilege in the House (the Speaker's Gallery) because he was an acquaintance of members of this and another Chamber. That person's actions outraged members, staff and the general public and but for some, to me, unanswered questions at the time of the occurrence, the perpetrator could well have been placed in police custody or alternatively been called before the Bar of this House for contempt of Parliament.

Such irresponsible acts will not be tolerated and members of the House and, indeed, members from another place who introduce guests to this Chamber should recognise that they, whether they are in the immediate precincts or not, could be included in any censure by this House.

The so-called 'asbestos incident' has served only to highlight yet again the current vulnerability of the House to intrusion, with the result that the safety and welfare of members, staff and the general public are at risk to such irresponsible acts. Unauthorised intrusion to the privacy of members, particularly Ministers and the Leader of the Opposition, have been drawn to my attention and there has been concern expressed with the safety of papers and materials in members' rooms and to the theft of personal effects from both members and staff.

Members have rightly asked why positive action has not been taken to redress deficiencies of this nature. The answer is simple and regrettable. It is because a number of people,

members and staff, have given less than the necessary commitment to protect the institution of Parliament and actively to participate in measures which are accepted in every other Parliament in Australia and in many overseas. Rear Admiral A. H. C. Gordon Lennox, Sergeant-at-Arms in the House of Commons, in an article titled 'Some Security Problems in Parliament' in the Parliamentary Periodical *The Table* vol. 39 1970, stated:

There is no physical demarcation between the House of Commons and House of Lords and the activities of one House may well overlap into the area occupied predominantly by the other, . . . for general security purposes the Palace of Westminster must be considered as a single unit.

The opinion is so obviously true for the South Australian Parliament that it really should not require stating. However, it does, because, unless and until the reality of that truism is grasped, proper security in this Parliament is at risk.

Mr President and I are having discussions on the vital issues and have agreed that in the first instance security of the whole House of Parliament should rest jointly and separately with Black Rod and the Sergeant-at-Arms. Discussions with these officers, and other advisers, are continuing and members, staff and the public will be progressively advised of actions being taken which involve them as persons, but no details of measures which are in effect and require secrecy to be of value will be necessarily promulgated. All members and staff have an important role to play for their own and the public's safety and wellbeing. I expect total commitment and support to follow, as a matter of course.

In respect of this House, starting tomorrow, I can advise that no person will be admitted to the Speaker's Gallery unless personally sponsored by a member of the House and that the member limits his sponsorship to three persons (as within Standing Orders), and advises me or my Deputy that such persons are in the gallery behind the roped section. Members of Ministerial or the Leader's staff may have access to the same gallery, subject to the wearing and prominent display of an identity card.

Members are asked to co-operate with the staff by drawing attention to any person without a known authorised purpose in the House precincts moving about in other than recognised public access areas. Any member who becomes aware of the presence in the House of a person who is emotionally disturbed about any issue or, alternatively, who is acting strangely, has the responsibility to draw my or the Sergeant-at-Arms' attention to the person and the circumstances, without delay.

**QUESTIONS**

**The SPEAKER:** I direct that the written answers to questions, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 79, 80, 95, 96, 125, 128, 132, 135, 138, 148, 157, 162, 163, 166, 169, 170, 173, 174, 175, 176, 179, 180, 183, 185, 189, 191, 195, 197, 199, 202, 203, and 204.

**MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: HOUSING TRUST**

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

Leave granted.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The article by Mr Peter Ward in the *Australian* this morning suggests that the Housing Trust may not be able to continue to carry out its functions if it continues to rely heavily on semi-governmental borrowings to finance its programmes. I think what the article

really means to say is that the trust's published income and expenditure statements are likely to show increasing deficits if current trends in interest payable and rental rebates continue, and that this will present a problem for Government in determining how the deficit is to be financed.

The implication in the article is that, until recently, the Housing Trust has been a self-sufficient, surplus-generating operation. That is simply not the case. The Housing Trust has been supported for many years by low interest rate loans from both State and Federal Governments. The two Governments, in providing funds at lower than their cost, in effect have been subsidising the operations of the trust. Indeed, it is at least arguable that, in the interests of better information, those subsidies should be made more explicit by charging a higher rate of interest accompanied by a specific subsidy from the respective Governments' Budgets.

It is true that Commonwealth support for welfare housing has diminished in recent years. The same cannot be said of the State. This Government has made up the short-falls in Commonwealth support by increased allocations from the Budget which carry the same concessional rate of interest as Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement funds; by increased allocations of the semi-governmental borrowing authority (within the limits of aggregate imposed by Loan Council); and by searching out sources of funds for arrangements which fall outside Loan Council control. The Government has initiated a forward projections exercise to determine the extent of the problem facing the trust. From that exercise will flow the information necessary to determine how that problem might best be overcome in terms of both the funds levels required to mount programmes at various levels and the best method or methods of reporting accurately the financial effects of the Government's housing policies on the trust and the Government.

There are two key elements in the financing of any operation, including housing. The first is to obtain sufficient funds to carry out the required programmes, and the second is to keep the cost of that finance to a minimum. The South Australian Government Financing Authority is intended to assist in both of these areas. It is certainly expected to enable the raising of funds on better terms than could be managed without it, and it is difficult to see the logic in a suggestion that its existence might cause the trust's cost of funds to be higher than they would be otherwise.

Without knowing exactly what documents Mr Ward has in his possession, it is difficult to comment on them in detail. However, it is apparent that they are out of date in at least one major respect. The Government has given approval recently for the trust to seek innovative arrangements which would give it access to additional houses for its rental assistance programme. Overseas borrowings do not represent a practicable course to follow because they are subject to Loan Council constraints which effectively preclude their use in the welfare housing area.

In conclusion, may I return to the central problem which is that, unless the Commonwealth is prepared to provide substantial increases in concessional rate funds (in which case the subsidy burden falls on the Commonwealth taxpayer), the State will have to attract increasing amounts of funds for housing unless it is prepared to see the rate of delivery of the housing programmes drop. Funds in the quantities required are simply not available at rates of interest which are substantially below market rates. Since the Housing Trust's rental assistance programme is such that it cannot cover its full costs, including debt servicing at commercial rates of interest, one way or another a subsidy will be required. As I have said, the Government is working on that problem and the South Australian Government Financing Authority is part of that work.

One thing is certain: this Government will continue to support welfare housing activity, including the activity of the Housing Trust. The Government's record to date leaves no room for doubt as to the extent of its commitment. The word 'bankruptcy' implies that the trust could be left to flounder in a financial morass from which there is no escape. This imputation is so patently at odds with the record as to deserve no credibility at all.

#### PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (Hon. D. O. Tonkin)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. State Government Insurance Commission—Report, 1981-82.

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

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. Pipelines Authority of South Australia—Auditor-General's Report on, 1981-82.

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

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. Industrial and Commercial Training Act, 1981—Regulations—Prescribed Hours (Hairdressing).
- ii. Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act, 1972-1981—Regulations—Rural Industries Machine Safety.
- iii. Long Service Leave (Building Industry) Act, 1975-1982—Regulations—Contribution Rate.
- iv. Long Service Leave (Casual Employment) Board—Report, 1981-82.

By the Minister of Education (Hon. H. Allison)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act, 1979-1982—Regulations—Parking Offences.
- ii. Education, Director-General of—Report, 1981.
- iii. Technical and Further Education, Director-General of—Report, 1981.
- iv. Legal Practitioners Act, 1981-1982—Regulations—Public Notary Forms.
- v. Rules of Court—Local and District Criminal Courts Act, 1926-1981—Jurisdiction and Fees.
- vi. Public Examinations Board of South Australia—Auditor-General's Report on, 1981-82.

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

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. Local Government Act, 1934-1982—Regulations—Parking.
- ii. Outback Areas Community Development Trust—Report, 1981-82.
- iii. South Australian Local Government Grants Commission—Report, 1981-82.
- iv. South Australian Urban Land Trust—Report, 1981-82.
- v. Parks Community Centre—Report, 1981-82.
- vi. State Opera of South Australia—Report, 1981-82.
- vii. West Beach Trust—Report, 1981-82.
- viii. Corporation By-laws—City of Noarlunga—By-law No. 11—Bathing and Controlling the Beach and Fore-shore.

By Hon. D. C. Wotton, for the Minister of Transport (Hon. M. M. Wilson)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. Building Societies Act, 1975-1982—Regulations—Investments.
- ii. Road Traffic Act, 1961-1981—Regulations—Parking.
- iii. Traffic Prohibition (Balaklava).
- iv. Highways Department—Report, 1981-82.

By Hon. D. C. Wotton, for the Minister of Recreation and Sport (Hon. M. M. Wilson)

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. Racing Act, 1976-1982—Rules of Trotting—Stewards.
- ii. Fees.

iii. Racecourses Development Board—Report, 1981-1982—

iv. Soccer Football Pools Act, 1981—Regulations—Rate of Duty.

By the Minister of Health (Hon. J. L. Adamson)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

i. Hospitals Act, 1934-1971—Regulations—Hospitals Compensable Patients.

ii. South Australian Health Commission Act, 1975-1981—Regulations—Hospital Compensable Patients Charges.

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

*Pursuant to Statute—*

i. South-Eastern Drainage Board—Report, 1981-82.

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

*Pursuant to Statute—*

Advances to Settlers Act, 1930-1972—

i. Balance Sheet and Revenue Statement.

ii. Auditor-General's Report on, 1981-82.

iii. Pastoral Act, 1936-1980—Hundred of Baldina—Resumption of Travelling Stock Reserves 292, 293 and 294.

iv. Registration of Deeds Act, 1935-1982—Regulation—Fees.

By the Minister of Fisheries (Hon. J. W. Olsen)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

i. Fisheries Act, 1971-1980—Regulations—Prawn Authorities Fees.

### STATE BANK REPORT

The SPEAKER laid on the table the annual report the State Bank for the year ended 30 June 1982, together with profit and loss account and balance sheets.

Ordered that report be printed.

### PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

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

Birdwood High School and Primary School—Consolidation and Redevelopment,

Kingston South-East Community School (Establishment),

Happy Valley Water Filtration Plant, Associated Distribution System Augmentation and South Area Depot Construction.

Ordered that reports be printed.

### QUESTION TIME

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the period for asking questions without notice to be extended to 3.30 p.m.

Motion carried.

The SPEAKER: I advise members that questions that would normally go to the Minister of Transport and Minister of Recreation and Sport will be taken this afternoon by the Deputy Premier.

### GAS PRICES

Mr BANNON: Will the Premier say what action he is taking, particularly in his role as Minister of State Development, to protect South Australian manufacturers and other energy consumers from soaring natural gas prices? Under an arbitration decision in late August or early September, the price of gas was increased by 80 per cent as from 1 January 1982. The principal users of natural gas (ETSA, the

South Australian Gas Company, and Adelaide Brighton Cement Holdings Limited) all reacted strongly to the award that was made. The General Manager of the Electricity Trust, Mr Dinham, was quoted as saying:

... the price decision would have drastic consequences for the State.

A Director of Adelaide Brighton Cement Holdings Limited, Mr Fry, stated that the new price was appalling and that it would effect his company's competitiveness on overseas markets, an area that the group had expanded with great success in recent years. He added that prices would have to rise significantly. In the *Advertiser* on 15 September the Deputy Premier was reported as saying that the South Australian Government and the Pipelines Authority of South Australia had 'received legal advice that there were strong grounds for an appeal against the arbitrated 80 per cent rise in natural gas prices,' and he indicated that appeal action would be taking place.

I have since been advised that the appeal is not to proceed and that the Government recently has been seeking support for a package of gas price rises which, among other things, would postpone the arbitrated \$1.10 price per unit (gigajoule) until next year, after the State elections.

Under that package, natural gas prices would rise from the current 61.34c a unit to 90c, a 47.5 per cent rise, back-dated to 1 January this year. In 1983, gas prices would rise a further 22.2 per cent, to \$1.10, which is the arbitrated price for this year. In 1984, there would be a 22.7 per cent rise to \$1.35 a unit, and in 1985 there would be a 20 per cent increase, to \$1.62 a unit. The compounded increase over the period would be in excess of 160 per cent, a figure, I am told, which would add significantly to costs faced by local manufacturing firms.

The 47.5 per cent gas rise proposed this year would cost gas users about \$30 000 000. It would have the effect of increasing ETSA tariffs by about 9 per cent before the end of December this year, and that would follow the 16 per cent tariff rise from May. It has been put to me that the gas producers must be required by the Government to achieve certain gas exploration targets if they are to be awarded price increases. The Premier, in his responsibility as Minister in charge of economic development in this State, is called on to explain what he will do.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Leader of the Opposition seems to have a source of information in one of the organisations with which I have been having discussions in the past two or three weeks. In all fairness, it is a silly question because, if what the Leader is saying is correct, he is doing his best to thwart the Government's efforts to offset the price increase that was awarded under an appalling contract, as I have described it previously, negotiated by the Labor Party.

A little knowledge is a dangerous thing, and the Leader of the Opposition has asked a question which is, in part, correct and, in part, incorrect. I have been negotiating with the companies with a view to reaching some agreement which will ameliorate this very large price increase which, as I have said, was awarded under the terms of this disastrous contract negotiated by the Leader's Party. He likes to stir the pot and to cause trouble, seeking to detract from any efforts by this Government to ameliorate this price increase. We as a Government are wrestling with a problem made in terms of that contract by the Leader and his Party, and we are seeking to ameliorate this price increase. However, the Leader is doing his best, with stupid questions such as this, to sabotage that effort.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: You don't like the question.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I do like the question. It shows how silly the Leader of the Opposition is. Let me remind him of the actual position. This Government inher-

ited a contract which was written by our predecessors in the 1970s but the details of which were not known to this House and are still commercially confidential. Before we can show that contract to interested parties, we have to gain the permission of the parties to that contract. That contract is still commercially confidential, and that is how much this House knew about it!

This contract, under which gas would be sold to New South Wales to the year 2006 but which ensured our supplies only to the year 1987, had these amazing clauses in relation to price whereby, instead of writing a long-term contract where people could plan for the future, this strange arrangement was instituted—strange from the point of view of the public of South Australia and of the people for whom the Leader says he is spokesman, or the people he says he is quoting—and nobody could plan, because they do not know what the price of gas will be. It is a year-by-year arbitration (a silly arrangement), and it is retrospective, so that if the arbitration takes the best part of a year, as it has this year, the price is retrospective to 1 January. This Government has inherited a situation whereby this contract has led this year to an increase being awarded of \$1.10. That is a statement of fact. What the Leader of the Opposition would have done, had he been in Government, Lord knows. They wrote the contract, so what they would have done about it, I do not know. What the Leader is trying to do is perfectly obvious to me: he is trying to sabotage, for base political motives, the efforts of this Government to ameliorate the price increase, and he is doing it in the most despicable fashion possible.

The Government immediately took advice in relation to whether or not this arbitration could be challenged. It had not happened before, but nonetheless the Government took advice and was advised that there were grounds for a challenge. So the Government, in co-operation and consultation with the Pipelines Authority, which is charged legally with the negotiations and with instituting the challenge, suggested that the challenge should proceed; so that is in place. The Leader's contention that orders had gone out for that challenge to be removed is absolute nonsense. That challenge is in place, and it will proceed unless some arrangements can be made whereby that price rise can be ameliorated.

What would the Leader do in this situation? Would he allow the situation to drift on? Is he suggesting that we should allow this challenge to go on and that we should not be negotiating with the producing companies in relation to a price arrangement? Is that what the Leader is suggesting?

*Mr Bannon interjecting:*

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I have already answered a question in relation to that matter, and I have given the lie to the Leader's remarks. He is completely off the track, and he knows it, but he persists in that calumny, because he knows that he cannot deal in the truth. What would the Leader do in this situation? Would he sit on his haunches, wave his hands around (as I am told a former Premier did) and say, 'She'll be right, we'll find plenty of gas; let the court fix it up'? Would he let all the uncertainty continue? What would the Leader do if the appeal were lost? Would he go to the High Court and prolong the uncertainty for the next 12 months? What would that do for the companies?

I point out to the Leader that I have been in contact, not only with the producers, seeking to pull together all the interested parties in this matter, but I have also had discussions with ETSA, Sagasco and the commercial users, who are well apprised of what I am doing. Obviously the Leader has a fellow traveller in the system who has fed this information to him. The Opposition is obviously frightened that the Government might be able to retrieve something from this situation which, as I have said, is the result of a

most appalling piece of work undertaken by our predecessors. There are many examples of the former Government's lack of acumen in its business dealings. The Leader has now been floating, of all things, a suggestion of some sort of investment fund, with a State guarantee, hoping to attract public funds at less than the rates of interest available elsewhere, and to invest in industry, commerce and enterprises which cannot obtain funds from normal channels.

We know what that course of action has achieved in terms of the Labor Party and South Australia in the past. The present Government has had to rescue more than one of those operations. In the present situation, what price would the Leader negotiate or accept, or would he ride in on a wing and a prayer and let the court—

**Mr Bannon:** Resign, and I'll tell you.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** He would resign: I think that that is the best suggestion he has made all day. The sooner the Labor Party gets someone with a bit of strength, like the member for Elizabeth, the better it will be served. But we know that the Leader has the numbers where it counts. Of course, it is perfectly obvious what the Leader is trying to do.

**Mr Bannon:** You should face your responsibility, instead of trying to duck.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Obviously, the Leader does not like the answer, or else he would keep his mouth shut. Is the Leader advocating, by way of interjection, that we sit down and do nothing; that we let the court decide the issue; that we try to negotiate an alternative that is acceptable; or that we should wave our arms and say, 'She'll be right, mate'? Lord knows what the Leader is advocating, and certainly no-one on this side of the House knows.

If the Government is successful in renegotiating a price acceptable to the gas users (that will be difficult, because they have the award), the Leader would desperately try to detract from that achievement. The Leader, by floating information publicly, is deliberately trying to sabotage those negotiations, which until this time have been confidential and mostly subject to discussion, with a view to detracting from the efforts of the Government should it be successful in negotiating a price downwards. That is about as low politically as a person can sink.

Has he got the good of the consumers in this State at heart? Of course, he has not. We heard this nonsense last night from his Deputy. He suddenly became the prophet of light and gladness. I heard him on one of the newscasts last night. He is going to cast off this gloom and doom. Elect Big Jack! What we need is a burst of optimism!

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** It must have upset you.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** By jingoes, I laughed for five minutes!

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Talk about a comedy act. What about the optimism he was talking about last night? He and his Leader have done their very best to talk this State down. Now, we have this blatant attempt to sabotage Government efforts to alleviate this price increase in the interest of consumers. It is an appalling performance.

## ECONOMIC PLANNING

**Dr BILLARD:** Does the Premier believe that there is confusion in the Government's approach to handling economic policy planning and investment inquiries for South Australia, as alleged by the Leader of the Opposition? In last weekend's *Sunday Mail* there appeared a statement by the Leader of the Opposition under the headline, 'Call me Mr Economy'. Although the basis for this self-praise is not altogether clear, the statement does make claims implying

that there is confusion in the administrative machinery of the Government dealing with investment and related economic matters. Therefore, I ask the Premier whether he considers the present arrangements appropriate, or do we need a Mr Economy to revise the whole economic structure?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I did notice that in the *Sunday Mail*. At least the Leader has the good grace to look embarrassed about the whole thing today. But, I noticed the comment, 'Call me Mr Economy'. It was a most extraordinary one, because it seemed to imply in some way that Mr Economy, whoever he was, somehow had the answer to all the world's economic problems, which stem, as they do, maybe from New York, Washington, Tokyo, London, West Germany. Wherever there was a problem Mr Economy could solve it. If that is so, I am absolutely amazed by this paragon—words fail me. I cannot think of appropriate words. I cannot imagine why this instant expert on the world's economy is not currently commanding very large sums as a consultant to the United Nations, to the British, the United Kingdom, or perhaps in Washington to Mr Reagan's Government.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** He has had offers, I hear. I am sure he would be offered a great deal of advice on that matter. However, it seems that the Leader is going to stick with South Australia. That is very good. I seem to remember hearing one of his predecessors, as Leader of the Labor Party, say that many times. Events, of course, have proved that that was not true either.

The question of the organisation of the State Development portfolio and the organisation of Government departments really, I think, in South Australia has proved to be a model for other States. I am very surprised indeed that the Leader launched out on this criticism. Apparently, he has had it in the pipeline. Obviously, there was a staff mix-up somewhere. Following the rather unfortunate drubbing that he received in the Estimates Committee hearings last week, both from the Minister of Industrial Affairs and from me, he came out of that Committee with egg all over his face. I think honourable members who were present could recognise that. In fact, I remember reading the transcript of part of his questioning. I think he said something like this:

Why is there not centralised control over State Development because we are duplicating effort by having a Department of State Development, Trade and Industry, Mines and Energy, Woods and Forests, Agriculture, Marine, Tourism, and so on?

Why do we not centralise the whole lot? That would be absolutely ridiculous. It would not be possible for one Minister—even somebody who calls himself 'Mr Economy'—to take on board all of those portfolios and do the job properly. It would be absolutely ludicrous.

I can remember that, when Mr Dunstan was Premier, he took on a multiplicity of portfolios. There was difficulty in finding sufficient talent on the Labor Party benches to take on Ministerial portfolios in those days. Apparently, the present Leader of the Opposition thinks that that situation pertains again.

**The Hon. H. Allison:** He is dead right, too.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I would not disagree with the Minister of Education. It was made quite clear to the Leader at that time. He quoted Queensland and said that it would never happen in Queensland, totally ignoring the fact that a Co-ordinator-General in Queensland does exactly the same job as does the Director of State Development. He oversees the activities of inter-related functions of various departments and puts them in the right direction to help any project that might come up before the State Development Office. He does it well. Not only has Queensland adopted the format with the Co-ordinator-General but also it has been adopted in New South Wales, Western Australia and Victoria. Perhaps

the Leader does not believe that his Labor Party colleagues in New South Wales or Victoria are adequately prepared for this sort of administration but they certainly find no problem with it. Certainly, Queensland is doing very well. New South Wales is not doing terribly well with development at present and Victoria is falling behind. However, Queensland is certainly doing well and has adopted the same format which has been working successfully in South Australia for literally three years now.

I found the whole play, the statement and the attitude of the Leader, as reported in the *Sunday Mail*, quite remarkable. Again, it demonstrates clearly that he just does not understand what it is all about. It shows a lack of reality. It reinforces the attitude which became so clearly apparent when my colleague the Deputy Premier was answering a question a little time ago. It indicates a lack of business sense, business acumen and also a lack of knowledge of fundamentals of negotiation and of finding a proper agreement and sticking to it. It is, indeed, absolutely pathetic.

### CELLULOSE RETRENCHMENTS

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** Will the Premier intervene in the proposed labour retrenchments at Cellulose by establishing a committee of inquiry to report on the following matters: first, the future viability of products; secondly, the reason, if any, why the current products are not acceptable to the retailers; thirdly, whether the current South Australian retailers will continue to market products produced at Cellulose; fourthly, the extent to which the sale of products can be increased on South Australian markets; and, fifthly, request the company to allow a further three months from 5 November to allow such investigations to be made and reported?

The Premier would be aware that a crisis is pending in the township and area of Millicent as, on 5 November, some 137 workers at the Cellulose factory are to be retrenched. I have seen a list of the names of people involved. Some have up to 27 years service. Included are home owners living in the district. Many are over 50 years of age and it has been put to me, by a committee that came to Adelaide last week, that the possibility of a great number of those people finding employment in that area will be nil. I am sure the Premier understands the circumstances occurring at the moment. The question and terms of reference I have raised with the Premier today are points of view put to me last week by a nine-man committee which travelled from Millicent. I understand that a meeting was to be held yesterday on site which I believe Mr Lincoln Rowe attended. I have heard no results of the meeting or the circumstances involved.

It is believed by those people that it is much too early for the company to have made a decision that retrenchment should occur on 5 November, but all of the avenues that are possible to explore have not been explored, and there was more time given by the company and for the Government to see its way clear to put experts into the situation to follow up the market trends, the quality of the products, and so forth, so that there would be some chance at least of saving some of the jobs. I would appreciate the Premier's giving me his reply.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I cannot say that I am delighted to give the Deputy Leader the reply, because it is not a terribly good one, but I do appreciate his concern. It is a concern which I share and which my colleague the member for Victoria shares and is indeed very actively involved in addressing. May I say, first of all, that the position at Cellulose has arisen because the equipment is not producing, and is not capable of producing, a product which can be

marketed. That is something which the company has been aware of for some considerable time. The question of managing a contracting overseas market for the products which it already manufactures in other States and being saddled with a product that is not marketable either overseas or within Australia, of course, makes the choice to the factory, to the plant to close down, almost a foregone conclusion, and I am not going to go into the reasons for all of that. That is the situation as it is. I have had discussions with senior executives of Australian Paper Manufacturers Pty Limited about this matter.

The discussions have centred basically on what can we do to help Cellulose to maintain its production and keep it operational, and the answer that has come back has been that the company is most grateful for the offers of help and assistance, but there is no help or assistance which is at present possible to keep Cellulose operating. The reasons for that are that to put in new plant would cost several millions of dollars. In fact, I heard one estimate of about \$20 000 000, if the whole thing were to be brought up to a satisfactory condition now, and the company just has not got those capital funds to expend. At present the company has not got that money to invest because the world market is so contracted that, even if they were now able to make a product which was attractive, they still would not be able to sell it and, therefore, service the debt that they would incur in upgrading the plant. So they are arguing that they are in a difficult position now, and I can understand that.

The Government certainly is not in a position to assist directly and I think those sorts of sums are very properly left to companies themselves to allocate and spend on a purely commercial basis. We have had discussions, as I have said, with senior members of A.P.M.; the Director of State Development has had discussions with those same directors. He has been constantly in communication with them over the past two or three weeks. He has offered help and assistance. He has maintained the closest possible contact and indeed we have done everything we possibly can to persuade the A.P.M. people to keep Cellulose perhaps going for a little longer but, unfortunately, again it is a question of running at an enormous loss with a product which is not saleable, with that loss multiplying for every day that the plant remains open in its present form.

Yesterday, the member for Victoria, together with Mr Lincoln Rowe, from the Minister of Industrial Affairs Department and the Trade and Industry Department, went down and had very useful discussions with management, the trade union representatives and the workers at Cellulose. The meeting, I understand, was amicable. It was not an easy meeting, also by the same token, because of all the implications, but I understand now that as a result of that meeting there are further discussions going forward between the company, the workers, and the union representatives.

Those discussions are being conducted to see, first, in what way people (and as the honourable member said, some of those staff members are over 50 years of age and have had many years service) can be helped by early retirement schemes, and, secondly, what other alternative arrangements can be found. I know that no stone will be left unturned in regard to help. On behalf of the Minister of Industrial Affairs, I can commit constant assistance by way of advice and anything else that can be given in regard to the people at Millicent who will lose their jobs as a result of this closure.

I will certainly take up the plea made to me earlier by the member for Victoria, which was supported by the attitude expressed by the Deputy Leader today, and I will make a further approach to the management of A.P.M. to see what I can do. However, I must be honest: I have very little hope that such an approach by anyone will have very much useful

effect on what seems to be an inevitable happening at the Cellulose plant. I do not like it one little bit, and I am sure that no member of this House likes it, but that situation has developed. All we can undertake to do is to cushion the blow as far as we can.

There is some small comfort: I have been told that, if the market turns up, and if the world situation improves (as I have no doubt it will, but it is a question of when), there will still be a nucleus at the plant and it may be possible at a later date to move back production with upgraded plant. Unfortunately, that is of very little help and comfort to the people who will be stood down. The Government will continue its representations and will make new representations to see what can be done to help the situation as it affects individuals at present.

## URANIUM

**Mr ASHENDEN:** Is the Minister of Mines and Energy aware of the recent statements of the Leader of the Opposition in relation to his attitude to uranium mining and what effect it will have on uranium mining projects in South Australia?

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I am aware of the latest attitude, which is hot off the press this afternoon. The Leader of the Opposition is in print, talking about renegotiating contracts, with the concurrence of the joint venturers, with Western Mining. That comment sits strangely at odds with what the Leader has said elsewhere. I have what are probably his second last words, which are to be found in a publication called *Span*. On the front of that publication is to be found what is meant to be a reproduction of the face of the member for Norwood, although he is hard to recognise. Nonetheless, the pamphlet is circulated in the Norwood electorate. An exclusive article, signed by John Bannon, to the people of Norwood, states:

Only when members in South Australia were able to read the actual decision—

talking about the gobbledegook that came from the Federal conference—

on the precise wording of our expanded anti-uranium policy could they judge media hysteria—

the media should note that—

and suggestions of a sell-out. Nobody who reads the policy can say it aims at allowing uranium mining.

The Leader then went on with a bit of fancy footwork in relation to the Premier's challenge that the Leader should say where the Labor Party stands in relation to the Roxby Downs development, and so it goes on. That comment sits strangely with the Leader's very soft shoe approach to public questioning by the Premier and the media as to where he and his Party stand in relation to the uranium question, and particularly Roxby Downs. There it is for the electors of Norwood: the Labor Party will close down the developments.

*The Hon. D. O. Tonkin interjecting:*

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** One could almost say that the Leader speaks with a forked tongue: if he is talking to a group, we get a certain message, but when he is talking to another group, another message emerges, as though the Leader's tongue moves in two ways. It is quite clear that the Leader's attitude depends on the audience to whom he is talking. The facts of life are that uranium projects in South Australia were dear to the hearts of the Labor Party some time ago, particularly uranium conversion and enrichment, in regard to which a former Premier (now Director of Tourism in Victoria, installed with all due pomp and ceremony yesterday) grabbed the national headlines in

the *Australian*, as I recall, proclaiming that South Australia was at the forefront in the fight for uranium enrichment.

*The Hon. D. O. Tonkin interjecting:*

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The *Australian* gave the former Premier a pat on the shoulder for his valiant efforts to secure uranium enrichment for South Australia. However, a lot of water has gone under the bridge since then, and we know that the policy of the Labor Party sounds the death knell for any contemplation of projects that would cost up to \$1 billion, such as uranium enrichment, for South Australia. In regard to Roxby Downs, I read with some interest the Leader's words in *Span*, as late as the July/August edition. That pamphlet has a facsimile of the member for Norwood on the cover and circulates to the public of South Australia. The Leader is quite unequivocal in stating:

Nobody who reads the policy could say it aims at allowing uranium mining.

We know what would happen under the Labor Party, despite the soft shoe approach of the Leader to the media. The Labor Party would close down the developments.

### WILDLIFE

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** What advice did the Minister of Environment and Planning take before delegating his powers under the Act to issue permits for the control of wildlife to certain local government authorities in the Upper North agricultural areas of this State? What has been the effect of that delegation, and for how long will it remain in force? The Minister (or someone) announced a while ago that the Minister's powers to issue permits for the control of wildlife had been delegated to certain local government authorities in the Upper North agricultural areas of the State. This action has drawn criticism from some sections of the community on the grounds that a delegation to those local government authorities, in effect, is a delegation to primary producers who have a particular vested interest in the outcome of any particular control programme.

It has also brought forth comments from certain quarters that, indeed, the Minister should have available to him the necessary machinery for the issuing of such permits without involving local government in what seems to be a fairly controversial issue. I am not requesting specific figures as to the number of licences issued or the number of animals killed, but perhaps the Minister will give the House that information once it becomes available.

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The situation to which the honourable member referred came about as a result of a letter I received some time ago from the United Farmers and Stockowners, requesting the opportunity to discuss with me the problems experienced by many landholders in the North of the State particularly, in regard to the movement of fauna (particularly kangaroos and emus) further south as a result of drought. I agreed to meet with the U.F. & S. and took up a further suggestion that the discussions should also include representatives of local government from the areas most affected. That meeting took place, and there were representations from the U.F. & S., the Local Government Association, and senior officers of the National Parks and Wildlife Service.

It was made clear to the people at that meeting just what was available in the way of the issuing of permits for destruction purposes. It was also made clear that the arrangement that was in process prior to that meeting, under which it was possible to obtain the permit through local national parks rangers, was not sufficient in areas where the landholders were some distance away from national parks. As a result, I indicated to the meeting that I would take up the matter with local government authorities in those areas

and have them provide the permits that usually would be provided by local rangers.

It was only yesterday that I actually signed the letters to the local councils to enable them to take up that responsibility. The reason for the delay was that it was arranged at the meeting that the U.F. & S. should consider the problem areas and, indeed, notify the local government authorities and also notify me, so that I could forward details of the required conditions to the local council. Those letters went out yesterday. As I have indicated through the media, I made quite clear to the local government authorities that it will be necessary for the national parks officers to keep a very close tab on the number of permits available under these circumstances. The length of time during which we will be continuing on with the special provision will depend entirely on the conditions that have come about as the result of the drought. That was made quite clear to the people at the meeting, and I believe that it has been understood by them. I have every confidence that with the joint role of local government and the U.F. & S., and particularly with the officers of my own department, through the National Parks and Wildlife Service, this responsibility will be carried out well in the near future.

### FEED BARLEY

**Mr LEWIS:** Will the Minister of Agriculture find out whether there is a racket going on in feed barley? Why is it that, whilst farmers have been restricted, and are still restricted, to a maximum of 10 tonnes of feed barley for drought feeding of their stock, thousands of tonnes of barley have been moved recently from country silos by Australian National to metropolitan Adelaide storage, when this feed barley was and is obviously needed in the same areas from which it is being taken? Members would be aware (and if they are not, this is for their information) that 10 tonnes of feed barley is enough to reserve feed 3 000 sheep for seven to eight days, and the present estimates of reserves in country silos vary enormously. For instance, at Peake, a siding in my electorate, some people believe that there is 1 000 tonnes in the silo; others claim there would not be a grain over 600 tonnes. Recently the Parilla silo was emptied out, and less than a fortnight ago the last 300 tonnes was taken out of Tintinara to Port Adelaide, despite the fact that several farmers were waiting to get supplies from there. I would like to know who is benefiting from that kind of approach, whether the merchants are making a killing on the side—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is now starting to comment and debate the issue. I ask the honourable member to stick to description relative to the question which he asked.

**Mr LEWIS:** Then, Mr Speaker, may I ask whether it is in the interests of Australian National to carry grain in both directions, or the fuel companies that supply them, or is it in the interests of the growers. It certainly is not in the interest of stockowners.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is now going against the direction given by the Chair that he should not debate the issue. If he transgresses again, I will call upon the Minister to answer the question.

**Mr LEWIS:** I would like to know whether the Minister has the power to stop this transportation of barley from the country to the city and back again immediately.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** The member for Mallee has raised a series of questions, and purported allegations that had been drawn to his attention before coming into this House today. In the time available I think it would be appropriate for me to clarify the position and the responsibilities of the Australian Barley Board (S.A. Division).



First, it is the board's responsibility to obtain the maximum amount within its capacity for the barley growers and to ensure that, before barley is exported from South Australia, the board secures and stores within appropriate facilities within this State what it considers to be the requirements of the State between harvests.

In the period since the 1981-82 harvest, the Australian Barley Board stored some 99 000 tonnes of grain in this State's storage facilities for local consumption. This is a record amount held. For example, last year it held 86 000 tonnes; the year before that, 50 000 tonnes; the year before that, 54 000 tonnes; and even in the year before that (the 1977-78 harvest year), which was one of the worst drought years that this State has experienced, it held only 51 000 tonnes. In my view, there can be no reflection on the Barley Board for the action taken with respect to storage of grain this year. The sales of grain to 4 October amounted to some 93 500 tonnes, leaving a balance of 5 500 tonnes currently stored at the Wallaroo terminal. That is grain that is stored and is still available for sale in this State.

The implied allegations raised by the honourable member in relation to manufacturers making a killing, or at least some section of the community taking advantage of others, are really a little unfair. I am satisfied, after consulting with the Australian Barley Board representatives this morning, that there are no grounds for that allegation. The last stock feed manufacturer secured a contract of feed barley supply from the Australian Barley Board in South Australia in January 1982. All new barley purchase contracts since that date have been with sundry buyers; sundry buyers are farmers and livestock producers, whether they be broad acre or intensive livestock producers.

On the basis of the information given to me from the Barley Board this morning, I can assure the member that no contracts have been entered into with retailing manufacturers since January of this year, and that any deliveries that may have been made from silos in this State to that section of the industry, that is, the manufacturing industry, since January 1982 would have been deliveries as a result of grain involved in contracts before that date. It is understandable that manufacturers who purchase in advance their requirements for the given period, or harvest to harvest year, cannot take delivery of it at the time of purchase so it is by sheer convenience that C.B.H. and other storage facilities around the State hold the grain and then have it delivered by truck or by rail as and when convenient.

In regard to this year's crop, it is clear that the yield will be down dramatically; in fact, in a recent assessment the board estimated that it will receive some 600 000 tonnes this year compared to 1 100 000 tonnes received following the last harvest, representing a 45.4 per cent drop in anticipated barley production in South Australia this year.

*At 3.30 p.m., the bells having been rung:*

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

### JUDICIAL REMUNERATION BILL

Third reading.

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

Members present during the previous debate will recall that the third reading was rescinded as this is a money Bill, which requires a message from the Governor in order to become a properly enacted law. Somewhere between the Parliamentary Counsel and the Treasury the original message from the Governor was misplaced. The error of omission

was discovered by the Clerk of the House, and the third reading on this occasion corrects that omission.

Bill read a third time and passed.

### APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

**Mr GLAZBROOK (Brighton):** I bring up the report of Estimates Committee A, and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

**Mr GLAZBROOK:** I bring up the minutes of proceedings of Estimates Committee A, and move:

That the minutes of proceedings be incorporated in the votes and proceedings.

Motion carried.

**Mr RUSSACK (Goyder):** I bring up the report of Estimates Committee B, and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

**Mr RUSSACK:** I bring up the minutes of proceedings of Estimates Committee B, and move:

That the minutes of proceedings be incorporated in the votes and proceedings.

Motion carried.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer):** I move:

That the proposed expenditures referred to Estimates Committee A and Estimates Committee B be agreed to.

**Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition):** Before us we have the Budget as it emerged from the Estimates Committees debate, which occurred over a period of two weeks, during which time each Minister and all the lines were subjected to questioning which was based on information supplied to us and which was responded to by Ministers in conjunction with their Ministerial advisers and departmental officers. I think it is true to say that, as on previous such occasions, we emerged from that process not as enlightened as we should have been. I suggest that that is not particularly because information is not provided, but because relevant information is often not available. Rather than evoking a response in the provision of relevant information, answers to questions tend to be in the form of an address from the Minister, at great length, seeking to obscure rather than enlighten the Committee, which is a pity because it makes the yielding of results very difficult.

After going through that exercise the Budget before the House has not been improved in any way, and explanations given have certainly not made it look very much better. Most of the criticisms and matters that the Opposition highlighted at the time of the Budget's presentation have been confirmed by the Committees' deliberations. I think it would be useful at this stage of the debate to draw attention to a thread that seemed to run through the way in which the Government has handled this, its last Budget before an election.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** Its last Budget forever.

**Mr BANNON:** It is the Government's last Budget before an election, and indeed, as my Deputy has interjected, it is to be hoped that it is its last Budget. I would suggest that the thread to which I refer has been increasingly apparent over the last 12 months. It was even apparent here in the House today in response to questions. It consists of treating questions and comments of the Opposition as some sort of attack at every stage on the Government. That is not to say that sometimes questions and comments are not attacks. Of course, sometimes they are, as that is part of the role of the Opposition, but that is not always so, and within the

context of the operation of the Committees it was not always the case that the Opposition was seeking to attack the Government, but rather to seek explanations.

However, the Government showed an enormous sensitivity. The way in which it attempts to denigrate members of the Opposition and me indicates how that sensitivity shows itself: that is all right, and that is politics, but I would suggest to the Government that, if that is the way that the next State election will be run, it will find that people out there in the community are not prepared to accept that sort of approach as being the approach of a responsible Government in difficult times to solving the problems that we all face. Personal denigration is something that we must accept (we will accept it), but it will not help the Government.

Further, there has been a refusal to accept responsibility, particularly in the economic area, for the problems of the administration of the State. Time and again we have been told that problems are due to factors beyond the Government's control, or that they are subject to interstate and overseas influences, and that indeed the State's poor performance must be measured against what the Government claims as being the poorer performances of other Administrations. All of this is built around the concept of buck passing, of attempting to shed responsibility. I suggest that, even in the best of times, that is not acceptable behaviour, but in the difficult times that we now face it is much less than acceptable. What makes such behaviour even more difficult to face with any sort of equanimity is the fact that the Liberal Party, when in Opposition, chose to heap all responsibility and all blame onto the Government of the day.

There is no question that time and again the Liberal Party in Opposition maintained that the Government was totally responsible for the state of the economy in South Australia, and all sorts of other conditions and decisions. I refer to the decision to close down the Whyalla shipyards, brought about by a combination of what occurred in the world economy and the failure or the refusal of the Federal Government to come to its support, together with matters related to seasonal conditions and a whole range of matters. The responsibility for all of those factors was sheeted home at the time to the State Government, which was seen as the repository of decision making in the economy.

However, the present Government, in office, has found the situation to be somewhat different, but rather than being penitent about the way in which the Liberal Party performed in Opposition, on the contrary, it seizes all the excuses it can to shed itself even of the residue of responsibility that the State Government does in fact have.

We have never claimed, nor indeed if the Premier read it did the article in the *Sunday Mail* claim, that we have the total answers and solution to the State's economic problems. We have acknowledged at every point that the management of a small regional economy in Australia is very dependent on interstate and international factors over which we do not have total control. In Opposition, Government members say that the State Government has total control, but in Government they say that the State Government can do nothing. We have never gone that far. We have said that the State Government can be a positive force for economic development, that it can help us get through difficult times and can push us on into better times, provided that it is prepared to take some responsibility, to be constructive in its approaches, and to work in conjunction with the private sector in South Australia.

This Budget, I believe, demonstrates the failure of the present Administration to be able to do that. The responses to questions in the Estimates Committees showed the Government again and again trying to pass off responsibility for the things that are going wrong, and to claim total respon-

sibility for those that are going right. At the end of August, when the House first considered the Appropriation Bills, I described the fourth Tonkin Government Budget as an extraordinary exercise in dishonesty, symptomatic of the things I have been talking about. Nothing has happened to alter that assessment.

The area of economic development to which I wish to devote my remarks specifically sees the Government lacking ideas, without a concept of how to plan the growth of our regional economy, sees it clinging to its discredited policies of transferring much needed capital works funds away from employment creating public works. I want to pay particular attention to the Premier's lines and to the trade and industry section of the Minister of Industrial Affairs portfolio. They are important areas for the future of the State, but they are also areas where the confusion and malaise evident throughout the Government are most marked.

Above all, the rivalry and pointless duplication between the Premier's State Development Department and the Trade and Industry Department of the Minister of Industrial Affairs continues, in spite of the obvious weaknesses of the arrangement and the call by the Premier's own State Development Council for a single focus for economic development. Perhaps the most alarming thing to come from questioning the Premier was his admission that he has little idea of the likely level of economic activity in the coming year. Indeed, he seemed to take pride in the fact that he did not 'have the slightest idea' of the likely unemployment rate over the coming six months, and he seemed to believe that it was irresponsible even to consider such matters.

He also talked hazily about an economic plan, but he was not too sure how that related to the work of the State Development Council or, indeed, within his own department. At the end of last year when the State Development Council produced its first strategy paper, the Premier went out of his way to claim that the council's ideas and his policies were one and the same. He claimed it as some sort of vindication of what his Government was doing. Indeed, in December last year he even went so far as using the Government's numbers in this place to amend a no-confidence motion, which I had moved, to claim that the policies of his Government were now endorsed by the State Development Council. Since then, that council has brought out a further report, and it appears that the Premier does not favour it so strongly. I suspect that that is because in some respects that report has shown quite a sturdy independence of the Government, and it has not been prepared to accept totally, or at face value, some of the ideas or concepts that that council has been promoting. That is as it should be, if the report is to be an objective and considered report of an independent body.

I was pleased to see that a number of things that we have been talking about in terms of our economic policies were included in that State Development Council report, not in specific terms at all times, but certainly in some general directions. I am not claiming that, because that happened; in some way the State Development Council is endorsing the Labor Party's economic plans. I am simply encouraged to see that in large part, an independent group of business men charged with trying to predict the course of economic development in this State, and some of the things that should be done about it, has come in some areas to similar conclusions. That is encouraging, and I think it is important for our community that people in good faith, looking at these things, should come to somewhat similar conclusions about the directions we should be taking. But, that does not mean that we agree on all things, and I would be the last to claim that that represents an endorsement. We will be interested to see just what the Premier's considered response

is to that second-stage plan and a number of its constructive suggestions.

So, we were not able this year to have the Premier saying that what was referred to in the yellow book of Estimates as the corporate strategy for the State represented what the State Development Council was doing. On the contrary, he was at some pains to suggest that his corporate strategy for the State was a different exercise from what had been done by the State Development Council. However, when it came to describing what this corporate plan entailed, the Committee was treated to examples of the Premier's very fuzzy thinking and his magic wand approach to economic management. He was asked to describe the content of the corporate plan, and he said:

Generally speaking, the corporate plan is part of the Government policy in this direction; put broadly and basically, I suppose, it could be that the State Government is determined to advance development and expansion in South Australia because that is a way of creating new and permanent employment, which provide long-term security and faith in the future for the people of South Australia. I suppose that sums up the corporate approach of this office in the plan for the future.

They are all very laudable aims, given the usual somewhat windy rhetoric of the Premier, but we were given nothing that demonstrated that the Premier had any idea of how he would advance towards them. The only tangible element of the corporate plan that he could describe to the Committee (the Committee was not a debating forum or a public political forum: it was a Committee exchanging or seeking information) was the Roxby Downs project. His words were:

We tend to centre our thinking on projects like Roxby Downs and their development and establishment costs.

It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that for three years this Government has done nothing but pin its hopes politically and economically on the Roxby Downs project, and in the uncertain world markets at the moment for uranium and copper it is a very dangerous thing to do. It is not only market considerations that could cause that plan to come unstuck. A report in the *Australian* dated 2 October states:

Australian trade officials in Washington are fighting a last-ditch battle against proposed United States legislation that could be the death knell to further development of Australia's uranium industry.

If the legislation is passed, the effect on Australia's uranium industry would be catastrophic. The report concludes:

Plans for expanded development from deposits such as Yeleerie and Jabiluka would be dashed, while such previously exciting prospects as the giant Roxby Downs project would fade into irrelevance.

It also seems to be the case that the corporate plan is not backed up with any detailed information or specific economic forecasts, and this is one of the most disturbing aspects of the Premier's response. I find it hard to believe that the Public Service is not providing the Premier with economic advice and economic forecasts. It was done for the former Government and it is inconceivable that over the past three years it could have been discontinued and that that apparatus could have been dismantled. I ask the Premier who, in fact, does the research on which he bases his assessment of the economy. Why are they not, for instance, attempting to analyse the predicted rise in unemployment and looking at the employment figures, which affect not only the State's economic development but also the revenue that the State receives? The Premier's reply admitted:

That work is being done as it has always been done by successive Governments and there is no change in the amount of effort being put into it.

Later, referring to statistics being made available to the previous Government, he made the further admission:

They are still available to the Government.

In answer to my question whether he was confident that he was getting the same quality and depth of information as had always been provided, he said:

There is no reason to doubt it.

So, we can only conclude either that the Premier, having been given the information, simply does not understand it, or that it demonstrates all too clearly the failure of his three years in Government and is therefore being suppressed or ignored by him for political purposes. It is not surprising that the Premier does not want to face facts, particularly so close to an election and when one remembers that the last election was won by him on the basis of the state of our economy. The voters might well recall what the Premier and his supporters were saying three years ago.

I have dealt with the question of responsibility for the position. Let me say that, as I go through these indicators, I am not suggesting that, at all times and in all respects, the State Government has been responsible for or is capable of completely transforming the scene. However, it can do a lot. In the absence of accurate detailed assessments from the Premier on the state of our economy, we should examine a number of the indicators. It is important in the context in which this Budget comes before us. I will deal with a series of them, taking population first.

As at 31 December 1981, the population of this State exceeded that of Western Australia by 8 300. As has been so for over a century, we were the fourth State in the Commonwealth in terms of population. Estimates contained in the Federal Budget show that South Australia will have 9 800 fewer people than Western Australia by the end of this year, placing this State as the least populous mainland State. In fact, if one attempts to plot the graph, that change probably occurred around August/September of this year. The major factor holding down population growth in this State continues to be the net loss of population to other States. During 1980-81, the largest net loss in a financial year was reported—over 7 700 people. Since the election of this Government we have lost a net total of 15 600 persons to other States. Population loss was something on which the previous Opposition played to the greatest extent possible. It has been worse under the present Administration, and it has resulted in what I suggest is a fairly sharp psychological blow to South Australia, apart from revenue implications, namely, the blow of falling behind Western Australia. For the first time, the State has changed its comparative placing since the 1890s.

In its 1982 report, the Indicative Planning Council for the Housing Industry forecast a continuing net interstate population loss from this State. The council made forecasts for the 1982-83 to 1984-85 triennium. On the basis of information available to it, it found that there would be a 6 000 net population loss annually from South Australia. What about jobs and employment—something made much of by the then Opposition? As at August 1982, a total of 549 200 persons were employed in South Australia. In the corresponding month of 1981, 556 300 persons were employed. Over a 12-month period 7 100 jobs were lost in South Australia. Job losses have been greatest among full-time workers. For the 12 months ended August 1982, a total of 12 000 full-time jobs were lost in this State. There was a rise in part-time employment which has resulted in the net loss of 7 100 jobs. Contrary to the Government's claim, South Australia's employment performance over the past 12 months has been worse than that of all States except Tasmania. The downward trend in the total number of jobs in this State can be quite clearly seen if one analyses the month-by-month average throughout the year.

We have never seen figures like that from the Premier. On the contrary, any time the figures show some increase, the Premier takes great credit for them and makes grandiose statements. The resulting down-turn is not talked about by him, but it is noted by people out in the community who wonder why the silence and why he is no longer responsible.

Over the past two or three years people have been crying out for a Government that will take them into their confidence and let them know the position so that we can realistically plan the revival of this State and its economy. So, all the grandiose job and employment promises so far have not come to fruition. Indeed, I would suggest that when the September-to-September figures are published from 1979 to 1982 they will show a considerable down-turn.

I refer now to unemployment. As at August 1982, a total of 50 400 persons was unemployed in South Australia. The unemployment rate was 8.4 per cent compared with a 6.7 per cent national rate. Our jobless rate was the equal highest measured by the A.B.S. for any month in SA. For 32 consecutive months we have had the highest unemployment rate of any mainland State. In the Adelaide metropolitan area the jobless rate in August was 9 per cent, while it was 6 per cent in Melbourne and 6.1 per cent in Sydney. Our position has deteriorated seriously since 1979. At that time we were told we had a major job rot. In the period since August 1979 the jobless total in South Australia has increased by 5 100. The unemployment rate has increased significantly over that period.

Let us look at job vacancies. There were only 1 000 vacancies for new jobs in this State in August—the equivalent of 4.7 per cent of the national total of vacancies or approximately half our 9 per cent share of the national labour force. Another indicator of the position in the labour market can be obtained by relating job vacancies to the unemployment totals. Here we find that the number of unemployed persons for every job vacancy in South Australia has increased from 20 in 1979 to 50 in 1982, while in Australia the level for August 1982 was 21. That is an appalling record and a depressing indicator.

In retail sales I have quarterly information until the end of the March quarter for 1982. For the 12 months to March, total retail sales in South Australia increased (which is good) by 10.6 per cent (which is not so good, because the national growth rate was 11.4 per cent). As consumer prices increased in Adelaide by 10.4 per cent, there was barely any sales growth or any growth in sales volume in South Australia. So, consumer spending at the moment is not any source of satisfaction or economic recovery in South Australia.

I refer also to new dwellings, and I have two sets of figures—approvals and commencements. Commencements are a firmer indicator of what is happening but must be looked at in conjunction with the approvals, which are some form of forward indicator. We will deal with approvals for the three months to August 1982. New dwelling approvals in South Australia totalled 1 901, compared to 2 078 in the corresponding period last year, indicating a decline of 8.5 per cent. For private sector houses, approvals fell by 10.5 per cent, no doubt reflecting the impact of higher interest rates under the present Federal and State Governments.

Preliminary estimates of new dwelling commencements are available for the June quarter. Whilst 1 700 new dwellings were commenced in the June quarter of 1981, 2 000 were commenced in the corresponding quarter of 1982. That is an increase, and that is certainly welcome: it could foreshadow extra building work. But the rise in commencements in the June quarter appears to have followed the rise of approvals in the March quarter compared with March 1981, so the fall that appears to be apparent in that August period may indeed flow on into commencements. So there is nothing at the moment that we should jump up and down about in terms of commencements.

It is also worth noting that the new dwelling commencements represented 7 per cent of national commencements, again, significantly below our population share. Building costs, despite the low level of activity, rose in Adelaide by 13.7 per cent in 12 months, which was the largest increase

in any capital city and well in excess of the average 11.6 per cent rise for all State capital cities. August was the third successive month in which Adelaide recorded the highest annual rise in home building costs of any State capital. New motor vehicle registrations totalled 13 105 in South Australia, a welcome 11.7 per cent increase over the corresponding period of 1981, which was a fairly dismal year for us. However, compared with national trends, we still have a share well below our population. In fact, in 1979 that share was 8.22 per cent below our population share, but at the moment it is 7.65 per cent, still below. There has been some recovery, but it is only equivalent to half the loss in our share after 1979.

They are indicators, and there are others, none of which shows much support in the short term for some of the Premier's more extravagant claims, and it is as well that we have them clearly set out, because the Government will not do it; somebody has to put that position clearly so that we understand the magnitude of the problem we face and we can tackle the answer to it realistically. A number of those indicators I quoted were used in the 1979 job-rot campaign as a reason for the Government to be dismissed, as a reason for us to be voted out of office, and a look through the wall at the employment figures, with which I have dealt, the question of unemployment, new vehicle registrations, and all of these things which were picked out as specific indicators, including population loss, show South Australia being worse off.

That picture is countered in part by investment claims being made by the Government which also were explored in Committee. These economic indicators demand, I believe, that the Government take people into its confidence and explain the situation to business men. The Government's response is not to dwell on them, but to say, 'Don't worry, for the future we are going to do well because of the way in which investment has improved.' During consideration of the Estimates, the Premier referred to a sum of \$1.1 billion backed up, he said, by figures from the Department of Trade and Industry in Canberra. One can only assume that he is referring to the survey of major mining and investment projects produced by the Federal Government. That survey is not exactly regarded as definitive. Indeed, it has been criticised by no less a person than the head of the Treasury, Mr Stone. I dealt with that in an earlier part of the Budget debate, but I might just quote a part of that letter from the head of Treasury to his opposite number in the department that produced the survey which said, in part:

I believe that publication of the schedule would give any estimates therein a degree of credibility and prominence they could not possibly warrant and should not be assisted in attaining.

Here again, in the last week or so this survey has been trotted out as proof of committed investment in the State. If the Premier insists on using the survey, one could at least have expected him to know what the survey contained. One of the committed investment projects listed is the \$52 000 000 thermo-mechanical pulp mill plant by the Cellulose company in the South-East. The Premier, however, simply refused to believe that that was the case. Let me read to the House the following exchange:

**Mr BANNON:** So the Premier confidently sees that sum [the \$52 000 000] as committed investment [that is the \$1 000 000 000]?

**The Hon. D. O. Tonkin:** The Commonwealth Minister does.

**Mr BANNON:** Projects such as the thermo-mechanical plant for Cellulose costing \$52 000 000?

**The Hon. D. O. Tonkin:** I do not think that is included.

**Mr BANNON:** I think it is.

**The Hon. D. O. Tonkin:** I do not think it is, and the Leader's statement is the sort of assertion which he has been guilty of making previously for his own purposes and which causes mischief. On this occasion, I want to put that to rest here and now before it gets out and causes trouble.

Let me put the matter to rest and refer the Premier to the survey by the Department of Industry and Commerce, in particular to project No. 413 on page 229, which he will find is the proposed mill in the South-East which even he would have to admit is now looking very shaky. We had another classic example of that sort of performance when discussing the level of investment by B.H.P. The Premier was expanding at some length on what was happening there, and I will quote again from the record of debate:

The situation is far better, for all of the Leader's niggling, in Whyalla in relation to the general community than anywhere else where B.H.P. operates. Currently that company is undergoing enormous difficulties. The lay-offs which have occurred are to be regretted, but they are minute compared with the massive lay-offs interstate, at Newcastle and Port Kembla, for instance. The reason for this is that since coming to office we have encouraged development and investment of funds in the upgrading of the blast furnace and the settling of a new rail-rolling mill which will be supplying rails to all Australian railway systems and is supplying rails internationally. That rail-rolling mill will be competitive for some considerable time to come with anything that Nippon Steel can manufacture, and it is getting shares of markets which are very valuable.

He goes on to say:

... we are now in a position where, in the restructuring operation B.H.P. is currently going through, we are in the most favourable position of any State in the B.H.P. total operation ... I personally think that we have to build on what we have, because we have that new investment, the new blast furnace facilities and the milling operation. Quite frankly, since we have come to office the prospects in this State have changed enormously, and I think that the South Australian people have come to realise that.

There are his claims about B.H.P. Whyalla, and there is substance in what he says, with one exception. If we turn to just one example, the *News* of 5 March 1979, under the headline '\$90 000 000 lift for Whyalla', states:

B.H.P. has announced plans of massive expenditure at Whyalla plant over the next two years. The company is planning to spend at least \$90 000 000 on modifications to machinery and plant. The projects include No. 2 blast furnace modifications and the basic oxygen steel-making plant fume collection system modification. This development would entrust the Whyalla works the responsibility for producing Australia's requirements in two major steel products—structural steel sections and rails.

Then it went on to talk about the consequences this would have and continued:

More importantly there would be an increase in permanent employment opportunities to operate the rail finishing facilities as well as security of employment for those in the works.

That was March 1979, some six months before the election which brought the present Government to power, and yet the Premier last week sat in this House and took total credit on behalf of his Government for that announced investment taking place. That is just one of so many examples that we have had of such dishonesty over the past few years. The question of the rivalry between the Premier and the Minister of Industrial Affairs is something to which I have referred on each occasion in these Estimates. Recently, as I reminded the Estimates Committee, the State Development Council suggested in its report that there should be a single focus for economic development. Page 27 of the yellow book, under the programme title 'Strategic Planning and Policy Formulation for Economic Development' describes the need being addressed as:

... co-ordination necessary to ensure that policies and programmes are directed to a common goal but also to avoid wasteful duplication of effort involving the financial and manpower resources of the Government.

So it seems that the Government's advisers and its public servants are aware of the problem, even though the Ministers concerned will not admit it. During the Committees we had two further examples of the confusion that exists between these two sections of the Government. The first concerned the incident earlier this year, when two identical advertisements were published in a national newspaper. The Premier,

in explaining how he had contrived to make South Australia look foolish in an important investment supplement, stated:

It was a misunderstanding whereby one department thought that the other suggested that it should put the advertisement in.

In other words, it was a bungle, but the point is that this is a very different explanation to what was given by the Deputy Premier when the matter was first raised in Parliament on 30 March 1982. His explanation was simply that the mistake was totally and solely the responsibility of the newspaper concerned. He stated:

We cannot accept responsibility for mistakes made by people outside Government control.

He later stated:

The mistake was made by the newspaper.

That is an example of both the style of the Deputy Premier and the inability of this Government to face up to its responsibilities. We now have an admission from the Premier that there was a problem of departmental confusion. The Minister of Industrial Affairs, incidentally, after being asked that specific question, in a very long answer failed to shed any light on the matter. Obviously, that is one example of the confusion that can occur. It is symptomatic not of an isolated example, as the Minister would suggest, but of the problems that can arise.

A more serious problem concerns the incentives being offered to companies, in particular, the Fletcher Jones company in the South-East. In the *Advertiser* on 21 September, the Premier announced that an interest-free loan of up to \$120 000 was to be offered to the company. But before Estimates Committee B, the Minister of Industrial Affairs said, in reference to that press report:

The part that concerned me a little is that it was suggested that we just gave the company a \$120 000 interest-free loan. However, that was not the case at all.

What was the case? Who was right and who was wrong? I suggest that the Government's classic recourse of blaming anyone but itself will see it trying to rest the blame there. The fact is that the Premier was probably not fully aware of the details, if the Minister of Industrial Affairs was correct or, alternatively, the Minister of Industrial Affairs did not realise what the Minister of State Development had promised. That is the sort of confusion that we come across constantly.

Once again, the Premier refused to explain his policy of transferring huge sums from the capital works programme to recurrent expenditure. This has been the hall-mark of his term as Treasurer. It is symptomatic of his approach to economic and financial management in the State that in the one area where a State Government can take definite steps to stimulate the regional economy, the Premier has chosen to cut back activity and stifle growth in building and construction. When questioned about his economic strategies, the Premier claimed that the course of action he was following (that is, of using capital works funds to pay day-to-day expenses) was one being followed by Premiers of all persuasions throughout Australia. This new discovery for which the Premier was under criticism was being followed elsewhere.

Only last week the Western Australian Premier, Mr O'Connor, brought down that State's Budget which increased expenditure on housing to provide significant new work for the building industry. Capital works expenditure was also up. The Western Australian Liberal Premier described his Budget as follows:

The Government has taken the view that the basic thrust throughout the whole expenditure programme this year must be to provide the strongest possible support to job creating activities and to provide the means for orders to be placed as much as possible with local industry ... What the Budget is about is people, jobs and housing.

Also, in Victoria, the Cain Government has budgeted for a 35 per cent rise in capital spending and an 82 per cent rise in welfare housing expenditure. In Queensland, similar increases in public expenditure and, indeed, public employment have been announced. Meanwhile the Premier in this State claims that he has a three-year plan for the allocation of capital works funds, but will not tell us what it is. All that the Premier's Budgets show is a continuing cut-back in budgeted and, presumably, planned capital works expenditure.

So, in 1982, in the dying stages of this Government, we see a dishonest Budget that aims to hide three years of failure and incompetence, containing a number of records—record deficits, record tax collections—and an apparent increase in building activity, which resulted only because for two years activity has been kept so low but, when one analyses the actual increase, it is not much but has been inflated by items such as the transfer of expenditure on motor vehicles into the capital works programme. There are no plans, no long-term strategies for the development of South Australia, and the Premier in Committee is unable to lay those plans before us. He promises only more of the same—more unemployment, more stagnation and more failure. To top it off, the Premier cheerfully admits that he does not have the slightest idea of the state of the State's economy next year. He does not know the predicted rate of unemployment, he has no estimates and no understanding of the indicators that we have before us. A Premier in that position, going into an election, certainly does not deserve to hold office. The Estimates confirm that this Government has long since lost any momentum that it might have had since its election, and the time is long overdue for it to lose office. The sooner we have the election, the better.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Baudin):** I have previously suggested to the House that there are two contrasting ways in which a Government can approach a Budget. One is, if you like, a response to the needs of the community, and the second is what we might call fiscal control. Perhaps I can explain the first by setting out the obvious, that a Budget for any year is very much like the Budget for the previous year, but with variations, in that it does not differ significantly from a lot of other phenomena that are studied in our community. For example, the weather next summer will be very much like the weather last summer, but with variations. In regard to the outcome of an election, despite the fact that from time to time the effect of an election is a change of Government, despite the fact that from time to time members lose their seats in Parliament and are replaced by other people, if one looks at the totality, one sees that for the most part similarities rather than dissimilarities exist; despite the fact that the media from time to time talk about land slides, nonetheless the general situation from election to election is very much the same.

We know in advance that the non-Labor forces will not win the safe Labor seats and that the Labor forces will not win the safe non-Labor seats. We know that any changes will occur because of the shift of the balance of a fraction of seats in the middle. Therefore, one can usually get a fair idea of what will happen in regard to the weather next summer by looking at the weather last summer, and one can usually predict what will happen in an election (except, of course, for the one thing that counts) by looking at the previous election. As well, one can get some idea of what a Budget will be like by looking at the previous Budget. It is very difficult in a short span of time for any Government, however radical, either to the left or to the right, drastically to change budgeting procedures, particularly if, as in regard to most Governments, the Government's commitment is to a no-retrenchment policy. A certain number of people are

on the pay-roll, and they must continue on the pay-roll. That largely determines the outline of the recurrent Budget.

Of course, this Government has embarked on a deliberate policy in many departments and authorities of running down the labour force by not replacing people who retire or resign to go to other employment. Personally, I regard that as one of the major factors in the unfortunate unemployment situation in which we find ourselves, because one cannot ignore the multiplier effect of those 4 500 jobs that have been lost as a direct result of Government policy. However, I will now leave that lengthy circumlocution to illustrate the fact that one way of looking at the Budget is to look at what happened last time and look at the perceived needs of departments in the coming year and to budget accordingly.

The perceived needs of departments, of course, should not be a response to the empire building of public servants, or the ambition of politicians, but rather to how effectively and how humanely Government services are being delivered to the general public. There is a tendency for us to think of Government services purely in terms of the health, education and welfare areas perhaps. We must remember that, when Government exercises its control function, it is providing a service to the public. Its control function through law and order is to ensure, Sir, that you and I can walk safely in the streets. Its control function in relation to fisheries, in part, is in the interests of those people who in 100 years time will want to enter the industry, and we have got to ensure that there are still some fish there to be caught.

We can go on multiplying these examples. What the Government does is in terms of services to the community, and should be measured in those particular terms. We can at one extreme look at what are seen as the perceived needs of the community, the resources, labour and contingencies to meet those needs through the various Government departments, and to order our budgeting accordingly. At the other extreme, of course, there is the concept of fiscal control. The Government decides how much money it believes it will have available to it and its departments simply have to work within that Budget.

I believe that any sensible Government, any humane Government, and in the final analysis any efficient Government, walks between those two extremes. It is not, of course, possible in any one State Budget for Government effectively to deliver all of the services for all of the needs that have been identified in the local community. To do so would be to blow out the Budget enormously. At the same time, however, to deal purely with fiscal matters and to ignore many of these needs is to produce an administration which is inhumane in the extreme. So, the Treasurer, in consultation with his Ministers and in consultation with whatever other consultation or budgetary procedures his Government may set up, should sensibly attempt to marry the two approaches. It does not necessarily follow that from year to year all departments have to have an increase in their allocation. From time to time, there will be a decline in the demand for certain sorts of services and that should be reflected in Government budgeting and Governments have to be alive to the opportunities that are available there.

On the one hand, the Government looks at the needs and the capacity of its departments to service those needs; on the other hand the Government looks at what it reasonably believes it can raise by way of revenue, and attempts to marry the two. In relation to departments that I carefully looked at (I was involved on two Committees): one involved examining the lines of the Minister of Lands; the other involved the line of Minister of Environment and Planning. In relation to the former, the fiscal aspect seems to be very much predominant. One need only read the yellow booklet to see a very frank admission of reduction of effort, of

reduction of service to the community, including other Government departments, which has been forced upon the Department of Lands as a result of fiscal controls this year. I first illustrate this by quoting what the Minister said on the Committee:

It was necessary to reduce the Lands Department staff by 28.9 full-time equivalent positions. So far as the redeployment of staff is concerned, that will occur as a result of attrition and voluntary transfers. It has been decided that there will not be any compulsory redeployment.

If I have got time, I will return to the specific context in which that statement was uttered because it relates to a matter which will be of grave disappointment to the Minister's servants in that particular department.

When looking at the wider context of that, why was it necessary to reduce the Lands Department staff by 28.9 full-time equivalent positions? In terms of the model of budgeting that I just set up, there are two possible reasons why 28.9 full-time equivalent positions should be lost from the Lands Department. The first could be that the demands being made on that department are being reduced with the passage of time. One might, in a very simplistic manner and very simplistic approach, think that that might be the case. The State has now been settled for a long, long time. Much of the fundamental baseline data which is necessary was established a long time ago. Therefore, one might well come to the conclusion that the staffing figure, which has been arrived at in previous years, is no longer realistic and can be reduced. No, that is not the case at all, as is established both by what is in the yellow book and by what came out of the mouth of the Minister himself. As I said to that Committee, I regard the statement that was made in the yellow booklet in relation to the impact of this Budget on the department's programming as being frank in the extreme. I will quote what it says:

To retain staff levels of June 1982 it is not possible within the proposed expenditure limits even though part of the contingency reduction has been allocated to salary expenditure it will still be necessary to lower manpower usage by 15 f.t.e. positions.

This is in relation to a portion of the overall department, the Survey Branch; the higher figure I quoted previously was in relation to the whole of the department. I continue with the quotation, as follows:

Resulting in a reduction of \$224 000 salary expenditure in order to achieve the overall reduction in recurrent expenditure.

Then it goes on to point out how services to the community from that branch of the department will be reduced. It states:

Production will naturally be reduced by 30 per cent and the cyclic photographic coverage of the State extended from five to six years reducing contingency expenditure generally by \$155 000 and manpower levels to 7½. Extension of the primary geodetic network into the northern area of the State and the tertiary network into rural area will cease, and the cyclic maintenance programme for geodetic bench marks will increase from five to seven years reducing contingency expenditure generally by \$119 000 and manpower levels by 7½.

Other details, of course, could be made available. I would remind this Government that it has had a lot to say in its three years about resource development. No resource development is possible without accurate mapping information. Accurate mapping information is only available through the Department of Lands. I have just quoted to the House a statement written by somebody in that department which has been accepted by the people who compiled the yellow booklets to the effect that there will be a considerable reduction of effort in this particular area. How are we to find the minerals in the North of the State, or offshore, or wherever, if we have not got the necessary information available to us? Of course, there is an information explosion. I referred earlier to the fact that surveys had been carried out in the early history of this State.

For the most part, those surveys are woefully inadequate to sustain programmes of mineral exploration in the 1980s or, indeed, to sustain programmes of freeholding leasehold land such as that in which the Government is interested at present. One can refer to some of these matters of higher Government policy down to what some would see as being essentially trivial matters, such as a matter about which I have been pressing the Government for some time concerning the provision of a walking path to Tunkalilla Beach, on the south coast of Fleurieu Peninsula. It is noted that a survey is necessary before a fiddling little walking path can be provided for those who want to enjoy the beauty of that part of the State.

Our tourist effort could well be compromised by the lack of proper cadastral or geodetic information from the Department of Lands and from the various bodies which feed it additional information. Indeed, as I have said, if the information is there but the people to process it are not, the information may as well not be there. There is LANDSAT imagery; we now have satellites that can accurately measure the size and shape of the earth to such an extent that we know that it has hips; we know that the bulge of the earth is slightly south of the equator. We also know that the earth has corners, that there are certain parts of the earth by which it deviates from the normal spheroid shape, such as that I have just mentioned. We can use magnetic and gravimetric techniques. Further, we have all these things available to us to map very accurately. Indeed, of course, we have mapped the surface of the moon, the satellites of Jupiter and Saturn, as well as the surface of Mars and, even through its obscuring clouds, the surface of the planet Venus. All this information is available to us provided that Governments make the necessary funds and labour available for the proper processing of the information.

I suggest that the Department of Lands is running into the same sort of difficulties that NASA (if that is what it is still called) is encountering in the United States. It has a space probe heading for Uranus, but it is not even sure that the funds will be available to activate the probe once it gets so close to that planet that accurate photographs can be relayed back.

The Committee investigated this matter a little more closely. I asked the Minister about the survey aircraft with which the department was provided some time ago. The Minister reminded me that the book value of the aircraft is \$765 700, which is hardly peanuts. Referring for a moment to my previous portfolio, the one in which the Minister on the front bench luxuriates at present, that represents half a primary school. We find that as a result of reductions this highly expensive (although I guess, in late twentieth century terms, not particularly sophisticated) piece of machinery will suffer a reduction of 28 per cent in its operational time. It will be sitting there in a hangar somewhere not used because fiscal considerations dictate that that should be the case.

I refer to another part of the Minister of Lands' empire. I am afraid that I am still not convinced by reassurances concerning the processing of titles in the Lands Titles Office, because I know that from time to time information that was once readily available to people on a very short-term basis has not been available. There have been times when people have been asked to come back later. I was told that there is a rule of thumb that the maximum time ever for the processing of information should be 4½ hours. I have pointed out to the Minister that that means that if a person came from the electorate of Chaffey, which the Minister represents, to obtain that information he would have to put up over night, because it is most unlikely that the information would be forthcoming during the time that that office is open. On the other hand, the Minister has suggested that

there are no problems and that inquiries are being handled more expeditiously now than ever before, as of course they should be because of computerisation. I know of people who have had very happy experiences in getting information or documents from the department, but still the stories come flocking in about problems being experienced in that office.

That is what I mean when I talk about the unfortunate effects of fiscal control. No Government can ever expect, through its budgeting or any other procedure, to be able to service all the needs of the community all the time. However, when one is looking at a situation where in one financial year a department (which is by no means a large one in comparison with, say, the Education Department, the Health Commission and other large departments) sustains a loss of 28.9 full-time equivalent positions, and it is clear that there has been no real assessment about the way in which the needs being serviced by that department will continue to be assessed, all one can say is that that demonstrates not very imaginative thinking on the part of the Government. Also, probably in the long run it is false economy.

Let us follow through the logic of the Government: mineral exploration eventually leads to mineral development, which in turn leads to royalties which lead to revenue which enables more services to be provided. A lack of information as to what there is at least on the surface must inhibit research as to what is below the surface, that is, the exploration effort and hence the mineral outcome of that exploration, the royalty return to Government and the revenue to fund other things. What I am saying is that the expenditure provided for the department in previous years was an investment in South Australia's future. In a minor way that investment is now being cut back. I would consider that to be very poor economics indeed.

I refer now to other matters raised by my colleagues and me on the Committee involved in investigating the accounts of the Minister of Environment and Planning. My comments do not have a common thread in this regard, except perhaps to pick up one general point at the finish. I refer members to page 110 of *Hansard* where there was some discussion about plans for the development of the Onkaparinga estuary, which is situated in the district that I represent. Time and again the Minister seems to refer to the sum of \$6 000 000 or \$7 000 000, which is the price tag being put on the Hosking, Fargher and Oborn Report delivered to the Government in 1979. As the present Government does not have the capacity to fund the proposal, little or nothing is being done. The Government has fobbed us off by saying that it is trying to obtain some private money. However, I do not think it is necessary to spend \$6 000 000 or \$7 000 000 to get the essentials of that development well under way.

In fact, for a very small capital expenditure, some of that has already been done in relation to extensive tree planting for the so-called urban forest which will, in a few years, grace a portion of the estuary. Many other things can be done. A system of board walks is supposed to be instituted, which will enable people to look at, but not trample upon, the conservation areas in the estuary. I think that that is a programme which could well be instituted without a great deal of delay.

I am happy to see that there is some sort of clean-up or dredging effort to be undertaken in the estuary as a result of a survey which the Government undertook not so very long ago. But it is important, I think, that work proceed on this. The very expensive facilities are really only the icing on the cake. Speaking for the people of Christies Beach, Port Noarlunga and points south and east, I say that we would not mind too much if some of the icing does not come about for a long time, as long as we can get the cake itself, and as long as we can get a significant amount of that

development. I have no doubt that local government is very keen to get into this whole area. It has expressed its desire to do so. But, it is hamstrung because it just does not know which way this Government is prepared to jump. Some sign from the Government of some positive action in this area would assist considerably in getting further commitment from local government.

I again raised with the Minister the matter of funds available for the purchase of national park areas. Last year the Minister indicated that all that the Government had in mind was some funds which would enable some rounding off of national park boundaries, correcting some of the anomalies which existed in some of the parks. On my raising the matter this year, the Minister replied that a sum of \$157 000 had been set aside for national parks, and \$150 000 had been allocated under the Planning and Development Fund which, Sir, you may well know is basically for the urban parks rather than those which somewhat approximate to what we might call wilderness areas.

Although I welcome that first sum of money, it would again seem to be only really enough money to enable some rounding out and correcting of anomalies to occur. It is not clear to me that the Minister will have a significant contingency fund (using contingency other than in a budget sense; they are really capital funds, reserve funds) that would enable him to respond from time to time to a situation where an area of scrub will be lost unless a Government purchase takes place. Of course, it is good to see the success of the Heritage Agreement scheme. I have quoted cases in the past, but there are situations in which that is not appropriate. It is something that will not be embraced by the landowner and, therefore, the problem will continue unless the Government is prepared to set aside more money for acquiring those areas.

For the same reason I am rather disturbed to hear the Minister say, not so much that the various trusts under his control (Cleland Park, General Reserves Trust, Black Hill trust) are being wound down, but rather that the trusts are not borrowing at this stage. It would seem to me that this is one of those pieces of machinery, much beloved of State Treasurers in the past, which enables funds to be raised outside the Loan Council without impinging on the normal mainstream Government capital programmes, the big spenders. It is a little disturbing to see that this piece of machinery is not being used, although it is still there; the Government is sensible enough to realise that the machinery should not be done away with altogether.

I close, because my time is almost completed, by saying that in relation to the Environment Department (and I am conscious of the fact that basically most of my speech has been about land), the main problem I see is not so much a budgetary or financial one, but rather one of credibility. I do not blame the officers of the department in any way for this.

The problem of the Department of Environment and Planning under this Government is that not sufficient account is taken of the advice which it gives to Government. There is a considerable storehouse of ability, expertise and information available to the Government through this department. For the most part that expertise, ability and knowledge, are ignored. The answer lies with the way in which this Minister deals with his Cabinet colleagues. It is important that the Minister of Environment and Planning should assert himself in Cabinet, so that the proper and legitimate concerns of his department on environment and the proper and orderly planning of this State are given proper account in all Government decisions. It is painfully obvious over these past three years that that has not been the case, and that the voice of environment has been muted.



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

**Mr KENEALLY (Stuart):** I was privileged (I expect that is the word) to participate in three Budget Estimate Committee debates, in two of which I led for the Opposition. They were the Minister of Water Resources and Chief Secretary areas. It was my experience on both Committees that there was not enough time in the day to ask adequately questions about all those areas that concerned me in my portfolio responsibility, particularly so far as the Chief Secretary is concerned. As the Chairman of that Committee (the member for Goyder) would understand, when one has to debate areas such as police, prisons, Auditor-General, the Fire Brigade, fisheries, and so on, each of which involves major Government expenditure, each is entitled to a significant amount of time.

The effect of that Committee debate was that we spent some five hours questioning the Minister and Commissioner of Police, which restricted the Committee members' ability to adequately question the Minister about other important areas. To a lesser degree, but nevertheless to an extent, the same problem was apparent in the questioning of water resources, land and Aboriginal affairs lines. We had to draw to an early close that evening the questions on the water resource lines, despite the fact that there was still a number of issues that needed to be raised, so that the land and Aboriginal affairs areas could be adequately covered. I suspect that, even though a voluntary gag was placed on water resources, neither lands nor Aboriginal affairs received the scrutiny to which they were entitled.

Having said that there was a limit on the amount of information that could be derived from questioning within the Committees, I point out that the area that concerned me more than all others, and there were many areas of concern, was one which came within the police lines and which dealt with manpower levels and the resources that this Government is directing towards the Police Department for the forthcoming 12 months.

My concern was raised by the Police Commissioner's Report. The most recent report which the Parliament has available to it is the annual report of the Commissioner of Police for 1980-81, tabled on 1 June 1982. So, in effect, in September 1982 we were relying on information that was current in June 1981 so that the Budget lines could, in a sense, be realistically debated. I do not believe that that is good enough.

The then Commissioner of Police (Mr L. D. Draper) presented the report on 12 March 1982, and the Minister obviously held it for three months before it was tabled in this Parliament. There seems to have been an inordinate delay between the compilation of the report, the presentation of that report to the Minister, the presentation of the report to the Parliament and the printing of the report. I believe that there needs to be a streamlining of the process and that, in any year when the Budget Estimates are to be debated, the Police Commissioner's Report for that year ought to be available to the Committee. There is no argument, I believe, between that viewpoint and the attitude of the Government. I trust that, in future, whichever Party is in Government, we will see the Police Commissioner's Report provided at the appropriate time.

I rely very greatly on what the Police Commissioner had to say in terms of manpower levels. I recall, as would all members, that prior to the 1979 election the then Liberal Opposition promised to increase the resources directed to the Police Department. In fact, it said that there would be greater back-up resources and an energetic campaign of recruitment of suitable young men and women into the Police Force so that the levels could be brought up to meet

community needs. Remembering what this Government promised to do, we should take great heed of what the Commissioner had to say about manpower levels and trends.

I believe this is a matter of considerable concern, because it bears greatly on crime levels and the ability of the Police Force to combat the high levels of crime. On page 11 of his report, under the heading 'Manpower trends', and referring to a graph which shows the strength of the Police Force, the Commissioner states:

The graph appearing as figure 2 in this report depicts the active police strength at 30 June 1981—

I repeat that 30 June 1981 is the latest information we have available to us—

and at the same time in each of the nine preceding years. The active strength does not, for the purpose of this illustration, include cadets, public servants, persons on extended leave without pay or absent from duty for any protracted period for other reasons. In the 10 years since 1 July 1971, the active strength has increased by approximately 56 per cent; an average annual increase of around 5 per cent. This latter statistic is not biased by the choice of a base year as is the prior statistic.

The graph clearly shows that the percentage increase in manpower in recent years, and I refer in particular to the past two years (1979-80 and 1980-81), has been significantly lower than that experienced in earlier years. As presaged in the introduction to my report for the financial year 1978-79 and again addressed in last year's report, the continued maintenance of the current 'no growth' policy in relation to manpower has serious implications for the future mobility and capacity of the Police Force to be an effective law enforcement agency.

That is strong criticism indeed of the level of manpower which this Government believes is appropriate to the Police Force. In his report the Police Commissioner went even further. On page 14, dealing with trends in radio taskings, he states:

When one measures the average annual increase of patrol work load of 12.5 per cent over the 10-year period examined, against the average annual increase of active police personnel of around 5 per cent over the same period, the dangers associated with a 'zero growth' manpower policy, which has restricted the annual growth rate in the past three years, 1978-79, 1979-80, 1980-81 to 0.4 per cent, 1.5 per cent and 0.15 per cent, respectively, can be readily appreciated. It is conceded that capacity to deal with a rising work load commitment may bear no direct correlation with manpower growth. However, if this capacity is not to be severely hampered through lack of adequate human resources, clearly, the continued imposition of unrealistic manpower levels in the area of law enforcement must be viewed with grave concern.

They are the words of the Police Commissioner of South Australia in his annual report to Parliament commenting on the resources that this Government has provided to him to combat an ever-increasing crime rate in South Australia. What he has to say is quite contrary to what the Ministers responsible for the police have been telling this Parliament. It has been customary for the Chief Secretary and his predecessor to claim in this Parliament that the degree of resources both in manpower and in funds has increased under the present Administration. The Police Commissioner himself is not convinced of that. I find it strange, that in October 1982, we do not have the Police Commissioner's Report for the year ending 30 June 1982 to ascertain whether that trend continues. However, we have before us information which the Minister or his department has provided and which clearly shows that there continues to be a downgrading in the resources provided to the Police Department.

I refer to a graph on page 2 of the yellow book under a graph headed 'Actual Full-time Equivalent Staffing Numbers'. It shows that, as at 30 June 1981, under the heading 'Public Service Act', 379 personnel were employed. Under the heading 'Major non-Public Service Act', 3 427 personnel were employed. There were 75 weekly-paid personnel, four others, giving a total work force of 3 885 personnel. As at 30 June 1982, the figure for personnel employed under 'Public Service Act' was 366.6 full-time equivalents. Under 'Major non-Public Service Act' 3 408 full-time equivalents

were employed, together with 75 weekly-paid and 5.3 other personnel, giving a total of 3 846.9 personnel. The figures proposed in this Budget for personnel under the heading 'Public Service Act' is 375 (a reduction of four from 1981); for 'Major non-Public Service Act', 3 323 personnel (a reduction of 104); for weekly paid 77 (an increase of two); for others 5.2 (an increase of 1.2); and, a total of 3 780.2 (a total reduction of 115) in the manpower work force provided for the Police Department.

In the yellow book the Minister (or his department) referred many times to the constraints placed upon the Police Force by manpower levels. The documentation provided to this Parliament by the Police Commissioner in his annual report and the Budget documents that this Government makes available clearly state that the resources directed towards the Police Department in South Australia have been reduced. In fact, page 5 of the yellow book states:

The proposed total expenditure for the 1982-83 financial year is \$114 891 000, which represents an increase of \$10 421 000 or 9.98 per cent on the 1981-82 financial year.

In a Budget which allows for an 11 per cent increase to keep up with inflation, an increase of 9.98 per cent in the allowance for the Police Department—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Stuart has the floor. I ask that the audible level of conversation be reduced.

**Mr KENEALLY:** It clearly indicates that the real increase in funds available to the Police Department has been reduced. Why should that concern me if there was no real problem in relation to crime levels in South Australia? When I raised this matter with the responsible Minister during the Committee debate, he pointed out that the ratio of police to population in South Australia was the highest in Australia, and that is true. That situation this current Government inherited from the previous Government. Nevertheless, it is true. We have, other than the Northern Territory, the highest ratio of police to population.

He also pointed out that the clear-up rate for the Police Department in South Australia was the best in Australia; that is also true, and reflects great credit upon the Police Department. I want to speak about the clear-up rate later on. I asked the Minister whether or not he believed that the resources and manpower levels of the Police Force in South Australia were adequate to meet the needs of the community, and he failed to direct himself to that question, so as yet we do not have the answer from him. If there has been a reduction in Police Force manpower, and in the funds available to the Police Department, there must be a reduction in the ability of the Police Department to do the job for which it is charged: the protection of persons and property in South Australia.

We know that much has been made of crime rates in South Australia. The Police Commissioner's Report shows by and large a reduction in some crimes and an increase in others, with an overall reduction in crime levels from the year 1980 to the year 1981. However, we do not know whether there has been a reduction in levels of crime from 1981 to 1982, and that information ought to be available. At this stage in the debate we have to take the word of the Minister. Frankly, I do not believe that the Minister knows.

The Commissioner's 1980-81 report contains some quite relevant statistics. The incidence of almost every area of major crime was lower in 1981 than in 1980; nevertheless, it was higher than any other year recorded in the report. So, that the level of crime in South Australia in 1981 was higher than it has ever been except in the year 1980. In both years of this Government's residence on the Treasury benches, we have had the highest crime rates ever experienced.

We do not know the number of murders committed in South Australia in the past 12 months, but we do know that it has been considerable, and we know that the bizarre nature of some of them is of considerable concern to the whole community. Rape is a serious crime which is also of great concern and which has had enormous media coverage (and quite rightly so) in recent years. The statistics of the Police Commissioner clearly show a dramatic increase in the incidence of rape; in fact, in 1981 there was a 26 per cent increase in the number of cases of rape reported as compared with the previous year. Serious assault statistics in 1981 showed a slight decrease, although the 1981 figure was much higher than that of any other year prior to 1980. The same applies to robbery per 100 000 population. Whilst the figures in 1981 are lower than in 1980, they are higher than in any other year recorded in the report. For cases of break and enter there was a considerable increase in 1980, but the 1981 figure is lower, although still higher than it has been before.

I could go on and on. The same applies to larceny, although the figures for false pretences are different, the figures being lower in 1980 and 1981 than in 1974. I am presenting to the Parliament a matter of great concern. We have very high crime rates in South Australia, higher over the past two or three years than ever before. The number of drug offences in 1981 was similar to that recorded in 1980, and far higher than in any other year recorded in the Police Commissioner's Report.

So, the picture available to this Government, through the Police Commissioner's Report, ought to have convinced the Cabinet that greater resources should have been directed towards that department, but we have a reduction in the resources available to the police in South Australia to enable them to carry out their very difficult task of protecting not only members who sit in this Chamber, but the community at large in South Australia. Whilst I questioned the Minister during the Committee stages as often as I was able to do before the Chair ruled repetition (and I do not argue with that ruling, of course; I accept it), the Minister apparently was not going to provide the Committee with the information to which it was entitled. He kept referring to the clear-up rate and to the ratio of police per population. Neither of those statistics, as good as they are, satisfactorily answers the question of whether we in South Australia have provided sufficient resources to the very best Police Force in Australia to enable it to provide the protection that the community in South Australia rightfully requires.

These comments are not in any way a criticism of our Police Department, which has the best clear-up rate in Australia. Nevertheless these statistics should be made available to the Parliament and to anyone who might be interested in what I am saying. The question I raise is whether or not our clear-up rates are satisfactory. The clear-up rate for the 12 months from 1980 to 1981 in murder and attempted murder is 96 per cent.

The clear-up rate for rape and attempted rape was 61 per cent, which means, of course, that 39 per cent of reported rape was not cleared up. The rate of serious assault was 65.7 per cent, and 31.7 per cent in regard to robbery. Largely, those figures refer to crimes against the person. In regard to crimes against property, 14.5 per cent of breaking and entering crimes were cleared up, and 22.4 per cent of larcenies were cleared up. The clear-up rate for vehicle theft was 19 per cent and 60.9 per cent for false pretences, fraud and misappropriation.

This Parliament must try to determine whether those clear-up rates are satisfactory. On average, 54 per cent of violent offences and 22 per cent of property offences are cleared up. I for one am pleased that the resources of the Police Department are directed at clearing up the more

violent offences against people rather than the less violent offences against property. Nevertheless, a 22 per cent clear-up rate for offences against property may not be considered satisfactory by the community, despite the fact that it is the best clear-up rate of all Police Forces in Australia.

I do not know, and the Minister was unable to tell us (I suspect that he did not allow the Police Commissioner to tell the Committee), whether additional resources would result in a better clear-up rate. All citizens of South Australia are concerned, rightly, about that matter, particularly at a time of very high crime levels. I suspect that the crime levels have increased over the past 12 months, but we do not have evidence before us to say whether or not my estimate is correct, and that is a pity.

The Opposition can give a quite clear undertaking to the people of South Australia that, in Government, it would stop this decline in resources provided to the Police Department and would investigate the need to return police levels in appropriate areas to those which meet community demand, so that once again the South Australian community can be satisfied that its Police Department has the support of the Government. Quite frankly, despite the many claims made by the present Government, the information provided to Parliament from both the Police Commissioner's Report and the Treasury documents that we are now debating clearly shows that the importance of the Police Department and its task of protecting people and property has been downgraded.

That is quite contrary to the clear undertaking given to the people of South Australia by the Liberal Party prior to the 1979 election. I for one want a clear statement from the Government on what it intends to do during the forthcoming 12 months because, although the Minister claims that the active level of police officers in South Australia is being maintained, the Police Commissioner stated that the increasing demand being placed on the resources of the department, both manpower and financial, is such that more resources must be provided so that the current performance of the Police Department can be maintained.

Whom are we in this place to believe? Are we to believe the Chief Secretary, the politician, who is representing the Government? Or are we to believe the Police Commissioner, who, after all, is the expert in this field and who can make recommendations to Parliament? I would suggest that in this area we should believe the Police Commissioner, because he is not likely to produce a report for Parliament that clearly shows that, in his view, his department is not able to carry out its appropriate task because it has been starved of funds, unless he believes that to be the case. The statistical information shows quite clearly that that is the case.

This Government stands condemned. The Government made great play, as it always does, of the issue of law and order. It has conned the people of South Australia. The Government undertook a despicable pre-election campaign and stated, 'If you want your daughter to walk free on the street, vote for the Liberal Party'. One can recall the stockinged faces, suggesting that a vote for the Labor Party was a vote for the criminals, in a sense. Yet, having promoted that sort of pre-election campaign, and having been elected to office, the Government has failed to carry out the undertaking it gave to the people of South Australia. This Government inherited the best Police Force in Australia, and I believe that the performance of the force—

**Mr Mathwin:** So did you.

**Mr KENEALLY:** I agree with the honourable member: in 1970 we inherited the best Police Force in Australia, but I take no credit for that. However, at present we are under the threat that the performance of our police will deteriorate, because the resources are not being made available to them. Because of lack of manpower, the police will not be able to

combat the ever-increasing crime rate which society is forcing upon them and about which we as a Parliament should be concerned. We should do something to combat the situation.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury):** We must deal with both Estimates Committees together, as there has been a slight change to the Standing Orders. Therefore, I will try to give some attention to both matters, because the education lines come under the Minister of Education in regard to recurrent expenditure and under the Minister of Public Works in regard to capital works and maintenance of school buildings. Last Thursday week, the Minister of Education, in handling the education debate, started off very much on the wrong foot, with an attitude that he would try to block members of the Opposition in obtaining information about education. The Minister adopted a deliberately provocative manner in regard to our inquiries. Fortunately, his attitude changed: during the rest of the day he took a more positive approach and I felt that we were obtaining some real information about the education lines.

Because I have not yet had a response to the questions I raised in the Committee about the figures analysis on spending in recent years, I will reiterate the points I made. Members will recall that in the second reading debate I incorporated tabular information in *Hansard*. I repeated that information in the Estimates Committee, and I asked the Minister to comment on it. The Minister immediately stated that I had made the same mistake as everyone has made in every year since kingdom come (seemingly so) and that I had compared the vote with actual spending. That was an inaccurate statement in regard to my analysis last year (because I did not do that) and this year the tables compared actual with actual and vote with vote.

I took on board one point from the criticism made last year that, in fact, I had incorporated payments unauthorised under special Acts. While one would normally expect that to be a reasonably stable proportion of the total Budget, it is possible that there might have been some variation as a result. So in this year's analysis I took up that point, and the figures still showed the same trend—that an increasing proportion of the State Budget went towards education until 1980-81. Other conclusions could be reached.

The first is that the Minister has paid much attention to the supposedly rapacious attitude of certain people in the education sector constantly wanting more. Great play has been made by the Minister and his colleague the Premier, indicating that the teachers almost single-handedly will be responsible for any financial calamity that may or may not befall this State. Much has been said about wage claims that have been submitted. Very little has been said about the nature of ambit claims and the particular way in which they are organised. The figures I tabled on 23 September indicate that perhaps things were not as bad as the Government had been saying.

We know that the amount actually spent in all lines is greater than the amount voted because of what is called round-sum allowances which takes into account wages increases granted during the year. Indeed, the actual expenditure that takes place in any line by the end of the year is normally 7 to 8 per cent greater than the voted expenditure. The interesting thing is that if education were getting more of the round-sum allowances because of any particular rapacious move on the part of its employees one would expect that when the final end-of-the-year figures came through a greater proportion was being allocated towards education than had been provided for in the Budget papers. If education were getting exactly the same as everyone else in the Public Service or in Government employ, one would expect that the proportion of the money spent would remain the same

as it was in the Budget papers. In fact, the situation is different.

In 1980-81 the Government budgeted for 31.26 per cent of its payments authorised by the Appropriation Acts to go to education, or the Minister of Education's lines which, of course, include the Education Department, technical and further education and miscellaneous (which incorporates pre-schools among other things). By the end of that year when the actual moneys had been paid out, only 30.74 per cent of the actual money spent had been spent by education, less than had been provided for at the start of the year; 0.5 per cent less. When dealing with a Budget (as it was in 1980-81) of some \$400 000 000, 0.5 per cent still amounts to \$2 000 000.

The same thing happened again last year. In 1981-82, the Government said, in its Budget papers, that 30.66 per cent of the payments authorised by Appropriation Acts would be spent by the Minister of Education lines. Again, if those employed under those lines, had been more rapacious than anyone else, the final end-of-year figure should have been greater than that. In fact, the end-of-year figure was 29.44 per cent. The difference there is 1.22 per cent, a difference of some \$6 000 000. In other words, if the allocation of round-sum allowances to education had been exactly the same proportion as it had been in every other department, there should have been some \$6 000 000 extra actually spent by the Education Department than proved to have been the case.

I have made the point for a long time that the attitude of the Premier and the Minister of Education towards those involved in education has been deliberately provocative and inflammatory. Any Government naturally wishes to seriously examine all wage claims put before it by its employees and the associations representing those employees, but there is an appropriate forum where that should be done. In the case of people in the Education Department, of course, it is the Teachers' Salaries Board and, in certain circumstances, the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Court. That is where arguments should be made.

Naturally, a Labor Government, as much as any other sort of Government, argues cases of public interest before such tribunals; it argues the case of money that the Government believes it can afford; it argues the case of the state of the economy as it believes to be the case; and it argues what it believes to be an interpretation of competing interests. It then awaits the decision of the arbiter to determine whether the Government's proposed case or the union's proposed case has greater merit, or whether the best solution lies somewhere between the two. It has not been found necessary by Labor governments to beat the drum on the front page of the press. It has not been found necessary by Labor Governments to use the form of this place to aggravate and inflame situations when clearly that is not the best course of action.

I am waiting for the Minister's response to the figures I gave; I never got a response on the day and we may have to wait until January next year. That is how long it took last year for the Minister to give some analysis of my figures—January of the year after. The other figures concerned which I do wait for his analysis are my estimates of how education expenditure has kept pace with inflation and that strange term known as incremental creep—

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** What are you on about?

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:**—incremental creep not being a strange bug which is really in the purview of the Minister of Agriculture and which he would have his pest inspectors investigate.

**Mr Slater:** It's the incremental creep in salary.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** Incremental creep, my colleague the member for Gilles says, is a salary-related point, and

the Minister well knows about incremental creep in salaries, because it takes place every time you get paid 13 months in one year. If I can just refer to the agriculture lines, the Minister was talking about Samcor last year and indicated how well the meatworks at Gepps Cross was doing. He made the point that they worked eight days a week saying that it was seven full days plus two half shifts. This is really intriguing. This Department of Agriculture and this Minister really are something. The meatworks work eight days a week, and the Minister works 13 months a year and, of course, is paid for it. I suggest that the Auditor-General would do very well to take a close look at all aspects of agriculture when meatworks are working eight days a week and Ministers are being paid 13 months a year.

Returning to education now, I am seriously expecting answers from the Minister on these matters, because they do need some explanation as to why these changes are taking place. I add here the direction of resources away from primary education to secondary education, acknowledging the point made by the Schools Commission that there should be a relative redistribution of resources to the primary area as such resources become available, given the fact that in relative terms it has not fared as well as has secondary education.

As I said before, the morning was quite inauspicious on the education debate, particularly so when the Minister at one stage seemed to be trying to refuse me leave to incorporate the figures about which I have just spoken. He made a rather unnecessary statement, and I quote the Minister here:

I would suggest that this Committee is dealing with Government records which are answerable to the public, to the Auditor-General, and that to have indiscriminately inserted into a debate of this kind documents which I find are unsubstantiated would be improper.

My first objection to that was that I thought it an attempt to gag the Committee by limiting the information put before it and, secondly, the information which he was calling unsubstantiated and improper was none other than the information tabled by his own colleague the Treasurer.

He may know more than we do; he may know that the Premier's assertions were improper and unsubstantiated, but, nevertheless, I still feel that it was quite appropriate for the Premier's information to be tabled before the Estimates Committee. Standing Orders may change at a later time to prevent the Premier's information being put before the Estimates Committees, but I hope that that will not be the case. Therefore, after a very inauspicious start, by the time the afternoon arrived the Minister had controlled his intemperate nature to the extent that we began getting more information, very ably assisted, I must say, by the member for Brighton, who, as Acting Chairman, advised that shorter answers to questions might substantially help the proceedings, as indeed it did.

**Mr Trainer:** He will be in trouble.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** In very serious trouble, yes. However, it was still not possible to cover all the areas that one wished to cover even though the Committee sat for nine hours. Even if all answers had been remarkably concise, I acknowledge that it would not have been possible to cover all of the ground. Therefore, I must raise some of those matters now. I apologise for the miscellany of ideas that might be a little disjointed, as they are all quite independent areas of concern. Honourable members might know of a decision to replace or restructure the advisory staff for Asian languages in the Education Department. At the moment there is one full-time adviser for Indonesian and three part-time advisers for respectively, Vietnamese, Chinese and Japanese. That provision has been replaced with the maintaining of one full-time Indonesian adviser and the amal-

gamation of the other language areas to be under the control of one language adviser. The suggestion has been put by those in the department who have done such remarkable planning that Vietnamese, Chinese and Japanese are all from one origin and that therefore it is quite reasonable to have one adviser dealing with the lot.

Heaven forbid if, in our State system, we end up with the decision that one adviser must deal with such disparate languages as Basque, Hungarian and Swedish, because those three languages are as similar as are the three to which I first referred, and have the same diversity of linguistic origins as have the three Asian languages mentioned. The comment has been made to me that it is not possible for one person to do justice to those three languages in each case. Naturally, the person responsible would turn out to be a specialist in one area and less of a specialist in the other two areas, which must mean that the promotion of the other two languages in this State will suffer as a result. That is not the best example of planning, and I hope that the Minister will see fit to respond to that comment.

Another matter concerns the Regency Park School of Food and Catering, where students are learning food preparation and catering, and are doing it very well I might say. It is a very impressive college. Any member who might have the chance to dine at its restaurant (in other words to be experimented upon by the students) would have found that that is one situation where one is experimented upon that one finds thoroughly enjoyable. I offer myself to again be experimented upon at any time.

**Mr Trainer:** But definitely not where there is any vivisection!

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** No. I would probably stay away from the plumbing course, for example. The teacher trainees at the college are using machines that have a risk factor associated with them, such as sausage machines, various powered knives and cutting implements. I understand that the students are not covered by insurance or entitled to workers compensation cover. There are two problems involved: first, students would be forced into the situation of having to sue the Government which would be a very difficult and complex task and which would uncover a number of probably previously undefined legal areas; secondly, some of the students might come off much worse financially because of that.

The other matter is that the Government could end up coming off worse, too, if it was found that it had not adequately provided for insurance in those areas. I know that the department self-insures itself in regard to building damage, but I will be most intrigued to hear from the Minister whether or not the department also self-insures itself in regard to apprentices in its colleges for any damage that they might do to themselves. That is just one example; apprentices in other areas are also facing quite hazardous situations.

Another point made by the Minister before the Estimates Committee was that this year the Government would maintain in real terms the allocation to schools, the payments to schools in school grants. I applauded that, and would do so now if it were the case. However, the Minister was forced to acknowledge that in fact payments to schools have not been maintained in real terms, that there has been a slight erosion. During the Estimates Committee, I asked the Minister whether the extra \$800 000 that is being paid for the relevant lines represented a maintenance of the grant according to inflation proportionate to the previous year. In reply the Minister stated:

There is a 9 per cent increase on last year's vote, so that is very slightly behind the inflation rate for the last financial year.

I wanted to clarify the point; I said, 'So there is a very slight decline?', to which the Minister replied 'Yes, but

nowhere near the decline in 1979 of 50 per cent.' I accept that, but the point should be made that the Minister should be very careful in his promotion of this in that he should not attempt to suggest that the grant has totally matched inflation, because in fact it has not absolutely kept pace with the c.p.i. I do not want to nit-pick, but I hope that the Minister chooses his words carefully when selling this message, especially in the light of the fact that he would have received, as I have received, suggestions from many school councils that the cost of materials very often exceeds the c.p.i.

I do not know exactly how one goes about organising a basket of resources index which officially takes account of the way in which different items increase in price at different rates. I know of one example put to me by a staff member of an area school who provided me with very convincing data about the cost of books for its students. Those involved considered the basic areas, the three Rs, and were able to prove, by taking the 1982 cost against the 1981 cost, that the increase in those basic reading, spelling and mathematics materials for primary school students had increased by 29 per cent when in that same year the allowance for books and materials grants for students had risen by only 10.6 per cent: that does not totally let school councils off the financial hook, even by simply indexing the c.p.i.

It could still result in cost pressures on school councils. That is not to say that there will be the chance of a foolproof way of designing a foolproof formula that will take account of all that so that school councils do not end up on the financial hook. At least it raises the question which needs a lot of further research so that we can come up with something that could be quite satisfactory.

Now that the Minister has returned to the Chamber I repeat for the third time my question on the furnishing of the converted metal work shop at Daws Road High School. I have asked the Minister previously why the furniture has not yet been supplied or why there has been a change of policy so that apparently it will not be supplied? I do hope that, on this occasion (third time lucky!), he will take the question on board and come back with an answer at the start of the next session.

Another matter that I wished to raise in the Estimates Committee (and did not have the chance because of the many questions asked) concerned a finding about student population changes within the education system. Members will know that, on 20 August last year, a report was issued titled 'Enrolment Changes—Planning and Management of Facilities—a Synopsis'. That report, which others thought had found its way into the bowels of the building to be filed with many other reports has, in fact, resurfaced on page 61 of the yellow book for education. Under the heading '1982-83 Specific Targets/Objectives (Significant Initiatives/Improvements/Achievements)', it states:

A major report 'Enrolment Changes—Planning and Management of Facilities' was produced in August 1981, and a number of subsidiary reports concerned with specific areas have also been produced.

First, I remind the House of my review of this report shortly after it was released and, secondly, to wonder what subsidiary reports were produced and what areas they covered. Members may not see the purpose of that question but it becomes more obvious when one analyses what is in the report.

The report consists of 41 pages of verbiage. Of that 41 pages, much is an analysis of the situation, the means used to analyse figures and some comments on the way in which enrolment changes are effected. It is interesting information. About nine pages relate to a financial analysis of the whole situation of the higher costs facing small schools and the greater costs of educating students at small schools. One line is given to another important consideration: the edu-

cational needs of children served by the school. After that one liner that topic never appears again in the report. I would be interested to know whether or not one of those subsidiary reports referred to in the yellow book covers that area. If it does, I hope the Minister gives the House the benefit of being able to peruse the information.

Another matter touched upon briefly at the end of the day, at the close of the debate on the Department of Technical and Further Education, was in regard to contract appointments. Unfortunately, we had a time table to adhere to and we did our best to adhere to those set times. The Government indicated that it is committed to increasing the rate of contract appointments and is looking at a rate of about 7.5 per cent. My Party has clear and strong views on the use of contract appointments in the education sector. We believe that in many cases contract appointees have been given totally inadequate protection and compensatory rights to set against their vulnerable employment situation. That is a matter that we would like to follow up. The other matter of concern relates to pre-schools under the Budget's operating grants allowance. We want to ensure that there is not increasing pressure on pre-schools. We made the point previously that we acknowledge that South Australia, as a result of the previous State and Federal Labor Governments has an excellent pre-school system. We acknowledge that there has been real cost pressures on the pre-schools since 1977. The burden of the Budget that has to be met by fees and parents' contributions through fund raising activities has increased markedly over the years. At some stage that situation must be resolved. It cannot be allowed to continue along the same line which the Kindergarten Union showed so conclusively in one of its annual reports to be the case.

I refer also to the Teacher Housing Authority. I make the point again that, even though the subsidy to the T.H.A. from the Education Department and TAFE has been increased, it has not kept pace with the result of increasing interest rates on the authority. That means that the T.H.A., in real terms, is going backwards and not forwards. It is now having to pay over 25 per cent of its income in interest compared with 1976-77 when only 8.8 per cent of its income was paid in interest.

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

**Mr SLATER (Gilles):** I was a member of three Estimates Committees: namely, those considering the Department of Transport, Recreation and Sport, Environment, and Tourism. The Estimates Committees were a rather dull and pedantic exercise. My Leader hit the nail on the head this afternoon in his address in this debate when he made the point that, because of the attitude of some Ministers who gave rather obscure and pedantic replies rather than clear and precise answers which were often supplemented by their officers and advisers, it obscured rather than enlightened the Committee. In the course of my remarks I will refer to specific examples where limited information was given in reply to questions. Indeed, in a number of cases replies were not given at all. I will refer to one or two matters later but some matters would be accepted as being taken on notice and hopefully we will receive written replies later.

I was rather disappointed that the real purpose of the Budget Estimates Committees, which is to examine and obtain information, was negated somewhat because, in addition to the matters to which I have referred about the length of answers, obscurity and so on, there was a lack of time. I refer particularly to the Estimates Committee which dealt with tourism and which was allocated only two hours to examine that vote. This is nothing new, because in previous years a similar situation has arisen. The fact is that the health and the tourism portfolios fall under the one Minister.

Consequently, the examination on the tourism vote was restricted to very limited time.

I was reminded by the Chairman of the Committee at one stage of the proceedings that an agreement was made by the members of the health committee in respect of the time table and that my colleagues were a party to that agreement. However that may be, I remind the House that my colleagues had no option in this matter. Health is a very important portfolio, taking up a substantial part of the Budget. I have no argument with that except that, as tourism is part of that Minister's portfolio, it limits the opportunity for members of the tourism committee to examine the Minister closely in regard to tourism. We had two hours in which to examine that matter. If we could make some improvements to the Estimates Committee system to give members of the Committee a better opportunity to seek further information and to examine further the Budget Estimates, particularly in the area of tourism, then there ought to be some way in which we could afford greater time to that matter. It seems rather odd that a Government, which professes to give priority and particular attention to tourism, can afford only a limited questioning of this portfolio in the Budget Committee examination.

In addition to the limited time, I believe that a great deal of stonewalling occurred in those two hours. I voiced my objection and was upbraided by the Chairman on one occasion because I felt somewhat indignant that Government members were asking questions of the Minister (doubtless, in some cases they were pre-arranged questions) to allow her to indulge in what I believe was a Government propaganda spiel. Much of this we had heard previously but, in addition, the Minister asked each officer to supplement her answer, one after another.

I was indignant because of the limited time that was afforded to tourism and because the time of the Committee was taken up by an answer that was given by the Minister and then by the Minister's requesting her officers to supplement her answers. I do not believe that that is the purpose of the Estimates Committees. I believe that the opportunity should be given for the Minister to answer the question and, if it is necessary and if the Minister is not aware of the information, the opportunity should be made for the Committee to be provided with the additional information of which the Minister is not aware.

However, there were a number of cases in which the Minister answered the question and then endeavoured to prolong the proceedings by asking one, two or three of her advisers to supplement the answer. That happened particularly in consideration of the tourism Estimates, whereas it did not happen at all in the consideration of transport or the Department of the Environment.

I was critical and indignant, and I am still critical of the Minister of Tourism, for trying to protract her answers when there was such a limited time available for the tourism votes. This is not in the best interests of Parliament or the present system of Budget Estimates. If this system is going to work effectively then Parliament, particularly the Opposition, must be given an opportunity to question the Minister as effectively as possible. I do not believe that the Estimates Committees should be used as a propaganda exercise.

One interesting aspect of the tourism budget Estimates was the change of emphasis in relocating resources in the Department of Tourism from the promotion of interstate and intrastate tourism to international promotion. While I agree that it is important to promote international visitors to South Australia (it may be said that international visitors spend in excess of interstate and local travellers), members will find, without doubt, that the basis of our tourism industry will still be from within Australia, either interstate or people travelling within our own State.

It is worth remembering that tourism should not be assessed only on the monetary rewards to airlines or hotel chains, but it ought to provide real benefits and economic advantages to all South Australians. I believe that the change of direction indicated in the Budget for this coming year from local and interstate promotion to international promotion, whilst I do not criticise it, is not an increase in itself, but a reallocation of funds.

I view that with some degree of suspicion. In South Australia in the next few months we will witness the utilisation of this particular allocation for a political promotion campaign, and we will find the Premier huffing and puffing around the State. It is a political ploy to associate with a few openings which will occur in the near future; I refer specifically to the Adelaide International Airport and the Hilton International Hotel.

The Premier will claim strongly that this was one of his Government's major achievements. Everyone in the industry has known for many years that the Labor Party, when in Government, tried very hard to overcome the difficulties regarding the promotion of an international hotel in Victoria Square. The former Premier (Hon. D. A. Dunstan) was very active in endeavouring to promote that particular project. No doubt the scene was set long before that. In this State we will find, in association with this international promotion, that it will be used as a political ploy.

In the next month or so we will see a campaign which will no doubt be based on political opportunities. Although the airport will provide South Australians with an opportunity to travel directly from Adelaide to other parts of the world, it must be seen in its reality and it should not be used to direct the attention of people away from the real issues that face us in this State. The change of emphasis from interstate and intrastate tourism to international tourism is rather surprising. Members will recall the raptures in which the Minister of Tourism indulged regarding the interstate VISA campaign.

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

#### **PUBLIC FINANCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

Returned from the Legislative Council with a suggested amendment.

#### **ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)**

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

#### **APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)**

Debate on motion resumed.

**Mr SLATER (Gilles):** Before the dinner adjournment I was referring to the Government's change of emphasis away from interstate and local tourist promotion to international tourist promotion, as revealed in the Estimates Committees. The Budget Estimates Committees also revealed (and the Minister stated this publicly prior to the Estimates Committees) that the department's previous advertising agency, which was responsible for the VISA and 'Hit the Trail' campaigns, namely, Wearne and Associates, was not successful in retaining its advertising contract.

From 1 July this year the new advertising agency has been Clemenger Adelaide Pty Ltd. Some of the comments

made by the Minister and her departmental officers in relation to the decision to award the advertising contract to this agency were interesting. During the Estimates Committees I asked the Minister how many tenders were received for the advertising agency position, who were the successful tenderers, and who were the unsuccessful tenderers. The Minister revealed that 26 organisations tendered. The Minister also said that it was not the policy of any Minister to provide details in relation to tenders. I accept that. The member for Hanson then asked about the criteria used in renegotiating the contract for the advertising agency. The Minister's answer was supplemented by an officer from her department, clearly indicating that priority was given to a larger advertising agency with more power in relation to obtaining radio and television coverage.

I refer to the supplementary reply by Mr Noblet to the Minister's reply, which indicates some of the reasons why this advertising agency was chosen ahead of the other tenderers. Mr Noblet said:

I do not think it is appropriate for me to make comparisons between the purchasing power of the two agencies, but to speak about the purchasing power of Clemenger Adelaide or Martin, Kinnear, Clemenger, as it was at the time of the appointment. It is normal for advertising agencies to use their purchasing power to block book or bulk buy time, particularly on radio and television stations, in their own name, and allocate it to their clients later, as required.

Television and radio air time involves quite significant discounts in relation to the amount of time bought and the unit cost of any particular radio or television commercial is reduced quite considerably. Clemenger, because of its range of clients who spend quite considerable sums in South Australia, has very high purchasing power, probably the second highest of any agency in South Australia.

It was revealed that Clemenger handles not only the South Australian Department of Tourism's account but also tourism accounts for Western Australia, TAA, and the 'SA Great' or 'Mates of the State' Campaign. The agency operates the account for that campaign on a voluntary no charge basis. It appears from the reply received that the successful tenderers for the Department of Tourism account were chosen because they are a large agency and able to obtain certain discounts because of the agency size and its ability to take advantage of the method of operation. However, the biggest is not always the best.

I believe that it is this agency, along with the Government, which has changed the direction of emphasis on tourism in the forthcoming year from local and interstate promotion to international promotion. I believe that the reason for this is that this advertising agency is able to more effectively utilise the opportunity to advertise and obtain media time because of its size and larger number of clients. I do not object to that happening because I believe it is necessary to advertise and promote tourism as much as possible, but I was disappointed that the smaller advertising agency, Wearne and Associates, did not get an opportunity to continue this work on behalf of the South Australian Department of Tourism. The Minister had praised this firm publicly, saying that it had done a good job. I was surprised that the advertising contract went to this new company, which, although it may be Adelaide based, is a large advertising agency which covers all the States, and which may have international connections. I turn now to the references to recreation and sport during the Budget Estimates Committees. One of the interesting revelations that came from those Committees was the admission from the Minister of Recreation and Sport that the proposal by the T.A.B. to introduce commission agencies in South Australia would be deferred indefinitely. I am pleased that that decision was made as I believe it was a correct one. I have been critical of that proposal since I first learnt of it.

I was rather surprised that that proposal was being contemplated. I opposed the scheme publicly and I asked the Minister questions in this House about it. It appeared to me that the T.A.B. staff and the agency managers would be considerably disadvantaged and, if the proposal was a cost saving exercise, it was never clearly stated where the cost savings would be made. No doubt, it would have been at the expense of T.A.B. employees and agency managers. The T.A.B. put the proposition to the agency managers and I understand that some, or all, of them were interviewed.

It was proposed that the agencies would become commission agents. The suggestion met with a very negative response from agency managers: the proposed contract certainly was not satisfactory to the managers or the P.S.A., which represents them industrially. Because of the negative response, and because it was never clearly stated where costs would be saved, the T.A.B. backed off, and I was pleased to learn that. I was advised by the Minister that the proposal to introduce commission agencies for the T.A.B. has been deferred indefinitely.

I refer now to another matter that arose from the Estimates Committees. I asked the Minister a question about capital assistance grants to recreation and sport. Applications for capital assistance grants are received from the early part of the year to the end of the financial year. The Minister revealed that \$16 000 000 worth of applications for various types of assistance had been received from recreation and sporting bodies, but only \$1 130 000 worth of assistance was granted, so that only between 12 per cent and 13 per cent of the applications could be acknowledged and capital assistance grants made.

I asked the Minister how many applications had been made, whether he could supply a list of individual applications, the sums that were approved, and which bodies received assistance. The Minister seemed to be quite tentative about supplying that information, and he stated:

I am quite happy if sporting associations or any body for that matter would like to supply the honourable member, but we have had a lot of requests over the past few weeks for the total list of applications for recreation and sport grants from organisations that are dissatisfied because they did not get a grant.

I do not accept that: I believe it should be public knowledge and that the sporting and recreation bodies that made application should be able to determine why and where the grants were made. The Minister has not yet said which bodies received assistance. All applicants should be able to determine exactly where the grants applied.

I am hoping that the Minister, within a few days, will provide at least, as he promised in the Estimates Committee, a list of the approvals given in regard to capital assistance grants to recreation and sport. I appreciate that the problem arises, of course, in that not enough is money devoted to recreation and sport. I refer not only to the State situation; certainly the Federal Government gives recreation and sport a very low priority. I do not want to go into detail on that matter.

In the time left to me, I propose to mention the aquatic centre, a matter on which I asked a question of the Minister in the Estimates Committee. I was seeking to ascertain the cost to the State in regard to the project. We recall that \$3 700 000, a tied amount, was to be given by the Federal Government on a 50/50 basis. That was a 50/50 basis some 2½ years ago, but since that time costs have escalated to the point where the total cost is about \$9 600 000. The State funding of the project on today's figures will be in the vicinity of \$6 000 000. One wonders, of course, where this \$6 000 000 will be achieved. Originally, it was intended that the State would finance part of this project from the proceeds of the soccer pools. However, the soccer pools have not

done nearly as well as was anticipated, as the Minister admitted in his reply to me on this matter.

In the few weeks prior to the introduction of the new system, the proceeds were down to a rate of about \$400 000 per year. That would not pay the \$650 000 set aside specifically for the aquatic centre, nor would it assist the grants made to other organisations from soccer pools funding the year before. I refer specifically to the administration grants to sport and recreation and opportunities that should have been given to other projects. If that is the case, I want to know from the Minister exactly how the project is to be financed. I want to know, and the public of South Australia also desires to know.

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

**Mr TRAINER (Ascot Park):** In the three years since I have been a member in this House, I have come to the conclusion that a lot of our procedures are rather time-wasting and futile, and I tend to suspect that the procedure we are engaged in at the moment falls into that category. I spoke earlier on what a futile exercise the Address in Reply can be, consisting as it does of a series of 20 or 30 or more one-hour speeches, made up basically of grievance debates padded out to last an hour. I suspect that a substantial number of the 30-minute speeches that will accompany the noting of the Estimates Committee reports will fall within that category. Members are expected to make these lengthy 30-minute or 60-minute speeches in observance with time honoured tradition, and it is especially incumbent upon Opposition members to do so, as members opposite will discover next year.

*Mr Slater interjecting:*

**Mr TRAINER:** They are not particularly eager to take part in defending this Budget, although that may be because the Budget could be considered to be somewhat indefensible. In the not too distant future, some members opposite will discover what is involved in being in Opposition; for some it will be a rediscovery and for others it will be a new discovery. For quite a substantial number of those members opposite there will be no discovery at all, because they will not be here. The member for Morphett, who is interjecting out of his place at the moment, is probably in the category of members who may not be here this time next year.

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Randall):** Order! Interjections are out of order.

**Mr TRAINER:** Thank you, Sir. I am not sure whether I need your protection from that member, but I appreciate it, nevertheless, as it was most gentlemanly. I note that during this part of this debate the House is, as usual, well attended: there are three members on the Opposition side and three on the Government benches, plus the Acting Deputy Speaker.

**Mr Oswald:** If I did not have to do so much work for that constituent in Ascot Park, I could work harder for the constituents in my area.

**Mr TRAINER:** Indeed, so the honourable member is looking for Liebensraum as part of his expansionist policy?

**Mr Oswald:** No, I am referring to the people who come across the boundary.

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

**Mr TRAINER:** As I sardonically commented, this debate is well attended: there are three members on this side of the House (although there could be considered to be four members on this side at present, as the Chief Secretary is over here getting practice for his time on these benches in the not too distant future). There are also three policemen here guarding us from the crowds who are just bursting to



get into this Chamber to listen to all the exciting speeches, plus one solitary person in the Press Gallery, as well as the unfortunate Hansard Reporters who must listen to every word. As honourable members would have guessed, I am not terribly impressed with this procedure.

**Mr Slater:** Why don't you have your speech incorporated into *Hansard* without your speaking?

**Mr TRAINER:** I think that all members could take that advice. I do not like to speak for 30 minutes or 60 minutes when I do not particularly have anything significant to say, especially as one may find a week or so later that one has a significant matter that one would like to raise urgently in this Chamber but cannot find the opportunity, through the procedures of the House, to do so.

Grievance debates are conducted prior to the adjournment of the House in the evening, provided, of course, that the adjournment of the House is not carried beyond 10 p.m. on Tuesday and Wednesday or beyond 5.30 p.m. on Thursday. Unfortunately, often a member who may have been particularly keen to raise a matter finds, as the clock ticks by, that the hour of adjournment passes and his expectation of being able to raise that matter cannot be fulfilled. It would not be a bad idea if the procedures of the House could be adjusted so that back-benchers could be given an opportunity to raise important matters during what might perhaps be termed prime time, shortly after Question Time, when the galleries are fairly well attended.

I see no reason why the number of speakers for the adjournment grievance debates could not be reduced from three members to two members. At the moment two Opposition members and one Government member (or vice versa) are allowed to speak in a grievance debate. However, often the business before the House proceeds past the time that those debates take place, on which occasions there is no grievance debate. The present number of three speakers could be reduced to two speakers, one from each side. But an additional debate involving one speaker from either side could be brought on in the afternoon while the press is still in attendance in the gallery. This would give members an opportunity to raise grievances when comments will actually have some impact, in the sense that it will be at a time when the House might be full and when there would be people, including the press, in the galleries.

I said earlier that I am not terribly enthusiastic about having to speak for 30 minutes when I have nothing urgent to say. However, I will refer to one or two relevant subjects which I have been considering for some time. First, I refer, as many other speakers have done, to the Estimates Committees procedure. I cannot help but agree wholeheartedly with the Leader's comments earlier today that it is not an enlightening process. The Committees tend, because of the procedures followed, to obscure rather than reveal. It is very difficult to get an opportunity to put a question on a certain matter. If one is fortunate enough to be able to put a question on a matter that one considers to be of some significance, the replies tend to obscure rather than illuminate.

I personally prefer the procedure that was still being followed with the Budget with which we dealt when I first came into this House in 1979 and which involved the examination of the lines by a Committee of the Whole. Under the procedures now followed, each member, in effect, can participate (and I use that word loosely) in the examination of only two or three Ministers' portfolios. I was involved in the Estimates Committees which dealt with the Premier, the Deputy Premier and the Minister of Education. I would like to have had the opportunity to ask other Ministers questions on several matters, but I was not able to have that opportunity.

Each Committee is limited to four Opposition members.

For someone not directly involved with that Committee, it is difficult to take part, unless one goes through a complicated musical chairs procedure at certain specified change-over times in order to become officially part of a Committee. In theory, every member has an opportunity to participate in the Estimates Committees, but I am sure that the members for Semaphore, Flinders and Mitcham could assure us that that is not as easy in practice as it is supposed to be in theory. If one is not officially part of an Estimates Committee, one has to sit behind the Committee all day in order to be there at the right time in the hope of being able to pop the question on the matter that one wishes to raise.

As I mentioned earlier, even if one is fully involved in the Estimates Committee, one is not guaranteed of being able to ask a certain question. I waited all morning for the opportunity to ask why the Government Printer was so slow in returning to the Chamber the excellent work done by *Hansard*. After two hours, it was obvious that the Estimates Committee wished to proceed to the next vote, because everything had to be conducted within a certain time span. So, I did not press the point, and I did not get an opportunity to follow the line of questioning that I wished to follow. In that respect, a great deal of the fault lies with the Deputy Premier.

The remarks that I am about to make can be backed up by looking at the *Hansard* transcript for that day. The Deputy Premier took every opportunity to give the most long-winded answers he possibly could. Not being satisfied with making long-winded answers himself, he would then ask a departmental head to expand on the answer that he had just given, and then ask yet another less senior departmental officer to expand even further on the long-winded answer and the expansion of the long-winded answer. The process of filibustering, aided by Dorothy Dix questions from Government back-benchers, tends to stretch out and slow down the procedures that have basically constituted an expanded and slowed down two weeks of Question Time.

A definite time span is allocated to each Minister, regardless of whether it is a significant Ministry or one of the less significant. For example, the education portfolio covers about one-third, in dollar terms, of the entire State Budget. Yet, the Minister of Education is allocated only the same amount of time as a Minister who may be responsible for the expenditure of only one tiny fraction of that amount.

It is difficult for the Opposition to concentrate its questioning on one Minister as we have only a limited time span within which to operate. Under the old system, one could concentrate on a particular Minister and give that Minister a greater proportion of the total time in order to find out exactly what was going on in that portfolio. However, the system as it operates at the moment is obviously quite good for governments. It can operate to cover up a weak Minister, as has been seen in previous years. It is good for Ministers, also, in the sense that during the two weeks during which the Estimates Committees operate only two Ministers on any particular day are required to be in the building. In addition, the system allows for the presence of Ministerial advisers who can assist Ministers who have a great deal of difficulty in answering questions.

It is of much more limited use to Opposition members, as members opposite will discover in the not too distant future. There was a whole series of questions that I wanted to ask Ministers other than those I was able to get to, but I could not. I wanted to raise with the Minister of Transport for example, the problem of a constituent who is at present regularly kept awake by the operation of a rail grinding machine on the railway lines in the Woodlands Park area immediately adjacent to her property. Mrs Patricia Nagle, of 17 Adelaide Terrace, Edwardstown, has expressed much disappointment that this rail-grinding operation should have to be carried on at 2 a.m. The machine that grinds the rails

down to remove the rough edges from them creates all sorts of resonance effects up and down the railway line. The vibrations spread through loose sections of the ballast under the line, and vibrate the house. She suspects that that vibration might be responsible for cracking the walls. It is responsible, certainly, for disturbing her sleep and that of her child. Her child is not keen even to be in the house any more because of this noise. I understand that she may even find it necessary to claim some form of compensation from the S.T.A. for the physical damage to the house. The mental harm that is being done through lack of sleep could be reduced if the S.T.A. took the step of at least advising people when action such as this is likely to be taken. I would have liked to ask the Minister about that but because of the operations of these Estimates Committees I did not have the opportunity.

I would like to have asked the Minister of Transport what steps were to be taken to try to rectify the problem of the small children from St Anthony's School, Edwardstown, who find it very difficult to cross the railway line at the Castle Street crossing. This is a pedestrian only crossing and is not accompanied by flashing lights or ding-dong audible signals. At that point, south-bound trains coming around a bend from the Emerson crossing are concealed from view until they are almost right on the crossing. Because the drivers apparently are not in the habit of using their horns as they are supposed to at that point, there is very little audible indication of the trains bearing down on the crossing. In the case of the more modern ones, referred to as 'super trains', which are particularly quiet, even adults can be caught unawares quite easily with trains bearing down on them before they are aware of it. The member for Gilles informs me that he nearly was caught on the crossing once.

Two or three weeks ago, a little further south a seven-year-old child was killed at about 8.15 one morning. When I heard that news broadcast I had a horrible sinking feeling in anticipation that it was one of the children at this crossing. I approached the Minister, but have not heard anything about it since. I would like to know what the Minister could do to remedy the hazard before a child is killed at the Castle Street crossing in the same way one was killed a couple of crossings further south, at the Angus Avenue crossing. There is a subway underneath the Edwardstown Railway Station immediately adjacent to that Castle Street crossing, but it is a little out of the way, and one of the difficulties with such subways is that many of the children are almost as much at risk in using the subway as they are in using the level crossing.

One of the reasons for this is the danger of being assaulted in the pedestrian subway. Another is that, where the subway emerges on the eastern side of the railway line, the children then have to walk 150 metres or so alongside the line with nothing, not even a wire fence, separating them from the actual railway line. Recently a group of mothers from the school banded together to organise some sort of protection arrangement to escort the children through that area. Such vigilante action should not be necessary. I would have liked the opportunity to raise that matter with the Minister, but I could not do so.

I would also like to have raised with the Minister of Transport an offer made to him which is too good to refuse. This offer refers to an area farther west in my electorate where the tram line crosses Marion Road and where there is a fairly well patronised tram stop. On the eastern side of the road there is a small amount of parking space in Pleasant Avenue that can be used for parking the cars of patrons, but there is nothing on the western side, which is where people coming from the south wanting to park their vehicles in order to use the tram would wish to park.

By good fortune, one of the very few vacant blocks of land between Adelaide and Glenelg has recently been offered to the Minister. Most of South Plympton was at one time part of the old Ryan Estate—Ryans being a family of farmers who settled in the area some time ago. Gradually, of course, this area has become settled. However, Mr Ryan, in a rather public spirited way, offered the last section of that 1 000 acres to the Minister for use as a car park for patrons of the Glenelg tram.

I have a carbon copy of the letter sent by Mr Ryan to the Minister dated 28 September, and I would have liked to have the opportunity to discuss it with him. The offer is for the Government to purchase lot 158 at 432 Marion Road, Plympton, for a public car park. The title number is CT 2450/053. Mr C. J. Ryan, of 61 Delamere Avenue, Springfield, refers in his letter to the land as follows:

Dear Minister, This allotment is the last portion of 1 000 acres farmed by my family along Marion Road in years gone by. I have no further use for this land and would like to see it used as a public car park. It is hard against the Glenelg tram stop on Marion Road.

Mr Ryan then states that the assessed Government land value is \$37 600 and that his asking price is only \$35 000. The letter continues:

Your support of this project is sought before it becomes involved in a commercial venture.

That sounds like too good an offer to refuse unless there are some very good technical reasons that officers of the department might care to offer for not accepting it. As I said before, I would like to have raised that with the Minister, but I did not have the opportunity.

I would have liked to ask questions of the Attorney-General about matters relating to the Electoral Act, in particular, subjects such as the recent decision to no longer provide free postage to electors wishing to submit postal votes. I would like to have discussed the way in which electoral rolls apparently are occasionally misused and the way in which occupations way out of date may still remain on the roll. Personally, in a small way, I was inadvertently involved in the use of electoral rolls for other than electoral purposes. I expect that was as a result of still not having changed my occupation on the electoral roll from that of teacher, which was what was listed in 1979 when I was elected to this Chamber. As most members would be aware, the occupations listed in the roll are not always accurate. Unless a person changes residence fairly often, the occupation is not always up to date on the electoral roll.

On about 27 July, I received a letter from the A.M.P. asking me whether I was contemplating a change in my present career. The letter was sent to my home address and stated:

Dear Mr Trainer, Are you contemplating a change in your present career? This letter has been sent to you with little knowledge of your present circumstances or if a change of career is being contemplated.

**Mr McRae:** It didn't ask you whether you were despondent—

**Mr TRAINER:** No. The letter from the agency manager of the Australian Mutual Provident Society, Mr Brian Smith, continues:

I am currently seeking two people to fill sales positions within the A.M.P. I have experienced greatest success in the past by appointing people to such positions when they have had a background in sales or management perhaps of a similar nature to your own. Most people, at some stage in their lives, reach a vocational turning point . . .

The letter continues in great detail to describe how the A.M.P. Society may uncover a whole new way of life, personal satisfaction, monetary rewards, and so on. Mr Smith concludes his letter by saying that he looked forward to hearing from me. I replied on 29 July to the State Manager, as follows:

Dear Mr Dingle, On 27 July I received correspondence (a copy of which is enclosed) from one 'Brian Smith, Agency Manager, 1130 South Road, Clovelly Park', soliciting an application by me for a sales position with the A.M.P. and inquiring whether I am contemplating a change in my present career. I can assure you that my role as a member of Parliament is not one for which I believe myself to be 'temperamentally unsuited'—

which is one of the phrases that had been used in the correspondence—

nor one which I find 'unrewarding and unsatisfying'. My current job satisfaction is such that I would not give the slightest consideration to applying for any job with the A.M.P. other than, perhaps, your own personal position or that of the National Manager. Indeed, my interest even at that level would be minimal as I suspect that my present satisfaction in working on behalf of my electorate (particularly the battlers and strugglers) would be far greater than I could ever achieve in your company, no matter what the material rewards might be.

Your company's glowing offer that 'a marketing career with A.M.P. may uncover a whole new way of life, personal satisfaction and monetary rewards' is, accordingly, quite irrelevant. Indeed, I find it mildly offensive. My being a recipient of such correspondence raises several possibilities. One is that the A.M.P. is working from mailing lists which you may not be fully authorised to use or which you are using injudiciously.

I should have guessed at the time that they were working from the electoral roll. The letter continues:

Another possibility is that your office is politically naive and did not recognise my name as belonging to one of the more active Opposition Parliamentarians in this State.

**Mr McRae:** Hear, hear!

**Mr TRAINER:** I appreciate that mark of approbation from the member for Playford. The letter continues:

Another possibility is that you were not only aware of my position, but that you must be privy to some new political facts relating to the probable outcome of the State election which is due in the very near future. If this is the case, these previously secret political facts must point in a direction which goes against all the trends shown in every survey taken over the last couple of years, as these surveys all indicate that the current State Government is in a parlous position, and that victory for the Australian Labor Party, (and hence for my continuation as the member for Ascot Park) is, although not assured, nevertheless highly probable.

Could you, as a matter of urgency, advise me of any apocalyptic revelations which may have led you to a contrary conclusion regarding my prospects for continuing in my current position?

I attached a P.S., as follows:

In view of the current political climate, your prospects of arranging job applications with the A.M.P. might be more promising if you were to approach Messrs. Ashenden, Billard, Glazbrook, Gunn, Lewis, Oswald, Randall or Schmidt on the basis of their likelihood of losing their seats, or Cabinet Ministers Tonkin, Goldsworthy, D. Brown, Allison, Chapman, Wotton, Wilson, Adamson, P. Arnold, J. Olsen, Griffin, Burdett and Hill on the basis of losing their portfolios or in some cases their seats.

I then received a somewhat apologetic letter of 9 August from Mr Dingle, as follows:

Dear Mr Trainer, May I say how much I enjoyed your letter of 29 July 1982 and the good spirit in which you have taken what is, obviously, some unsuitable correspondence from the A.M.P. Society. While we believe that the career to which Mr Brian Smith was referring does offer considerable potential for a number of people, and hence we are keen to acquaint suitable people with that fact, I appreciate that it was not appropriate in your case.

As a matter of interest, your name was not obtained from any special mailing list but, in fact, from the electoral roll where your occupation is shown as 'teacher' . . .

Thank you again for the good spirit in which you have taken our correspondence. I am sorry that you have been put to this trouble, but at least I have welcomed the opportunity of setting your mind at ease on the basis of the original letter. With kind regards . . .

**Mr McRae:** From where did he write that, Adelaide or Sydney?

**Mr TRAINER:** It was written in Adelaide, No. 1 King William Street, just over the road from here.

**Dr Billard:** He's the South Australian Manager.

**Mr TRAINER:** That is quite correct. The member's observation is 100 per cent correct. It would have been interesting to ask to what use electoral rolls are entitled to

be put. As I said, I would have liked to also ask the Attorney-General for a few details about the new procedures in relation to the abolition of free postage for postal votes.

There are apparently two reasons for this happening. One is to reduce the expenditure involved in providing free postage for postal votes, and the other, I understand, is that we then come into line with the other States where this procedure is no longer followed. It is true that South Australia is more advanced than most States in the provision of electoral visitors to institutions such as hospitals, nursing homes and the like. Nevertheless, I would have liked to ask the Attorney-General, as the person responsible for electoral matters, an interesting legal question. Under one Act it is against the law for any postal vote to be opened by any person other than an authorised person from the Electoral Department. However, if a postal vote were posted without a stamp then presumably, at some stage, it would have to be opened by Australia Post in order for the letter to be returned to the sender for correct postage to be applied.

**Mr McRae:** Section 109 of the Constitution covers that happening.

**Mr TRAINER:** If that happened, I would be interested to know which legislation would apply.

**Mr McRae:** The Commonwealth law, obviously.

**Mr TRAINER:** Would the Postal Act overrule the Electoral Act in that case?

**Mr McRae:** Yes.

**Mr TRAINER:** That would be a messy situation and I would have liked an opportunity to raise that matter with the Attorney-General.

*Mr Max Brown interjecting:*

**Mr TRAINER:** The honourable member probably did not get much out of the Attorney even though he was on the Committee because, as I mentioned earlier, one gains nothing if one is not on an Estimates Committee and not much if you are. One can sit back if not a member waiting for an opportunity to join in but it is frustrating and a waste of time. However, if one is on a Committee one still does not get much of an opportunity to raise questions of concern and, if a member does get that opportunity, one gets long winded answers from Ministers who filibuster to waste as much time as possible and then have that filibustering further padded out by getting additional remarks from departmental heads and the various officers assisting. In conclusion I say once again that a great many of the procedures adopted by this House are quite futile and a complete waste of time.

**Mr McRAE (Playford):** I congratulate the member for Ascot Park on his remarks. The picture he painted was a fairly bleak one; perhaps a trifle too bleak, because we are gradually, I suppose, developing a tradition in relation to Estimates Committees.

He is perfectly correct when he says that some Ministers (and thankfully the present Chief Secretary is not one of them, but I will be dealing with the Minister of Health at some length in a moment) most certainly not only pad out the question but also hand it to a series of departmental advisers who do not assist in clarifying matters but help to fudge the whole issue.

We are not going to have our vision clouded by that sort of tactic. Over the past three years the Estimates Committee procedure has improved year by year, but the view one takes would be determined by the particular Committee that one attended. I take as an example the Premier's Committee which I must say was reasonably well handled.

There were some strange and peculiar results from the Estimates Committee before which the Premier appeared. We found that for no known reason we are to have a new State emblem, but we were told that it was a State secret what that new emblem would be. However, the Piping

Shrike which I now wear proudly and which, I notice, the Minister on the front bench opposite wears proudly, is to be struck off the record. We are to have a very expensive emblem for which we must pay \$4 526 to the Garter of Arms, somewhere in the United Kingdom.

We do not know precisely what this thing will look like, but we know that we will be looking at it because it will be part of the election build-up, and somewhere between 13 October and 27 November there will be a ceremonial unveiling of the new State flag. It is too bad that we have just finished distributing to all schools the latest new flag that bears our Piping Shrike. Presumably, we will have to go through the whole exercise again.

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

**Mr McRAE:** There may be a requiem for the Piping Shrike in one sense, although I am assisted by my colleague from Mitchell in thinking, somewhat cynically, that the Premier is really thinking of a new State emblem, striking down the existing legislation, and then handing out to his mates the right to stamp on their products the Piping Shrike, because that was what the argument was all about. It will become almost treason not to buy from those who exhibit the Piping Shrike.

In like vein, we discovered that we were to have not one but two portraits of Her Majesty the Queen. It is a prime consideration of constitutional law that the monarch must not be involved in political matters. Unfortunately, the monarch will be involved, because the election will be held on 27 November or 4 December (and we all know that—that fact is well spread throughout the Public Service and the Electoral Office, and the whole machinery is geared up ready to go), and as a result of assiduous questioning, we now know that there will be a ceremonial unveiling of one portrait of Her Majesty at the Art Gallery (and it will be treason not to attend) and a copy will be put somewhere in the environs of Parliament House (and it will be treason not to attend that). In fact, it will be treason not to attend anything else.

As the Premier went on, we found that the carnival of clowns was indeed with us. As and from 13 October until election day, the razamatuzz will be there, and it will be geared up *a la* Rex Jory, in a kind of second rate imitation of what a New York Mayor of the 1940s might have undertaken. Jumbo jets will fly in from Singapore and will circle the skies of South Australia, over the Riverland and back again, carrying so-called V.I.P.s, presumably sampling South Australian wines, as 100 000 people, the payers on the Premier's campaign committee, are at the new international airport.

In the meantime, the Premier will be up and down the railway track. First, he will be at Crystal Brook to drive in the golden spike that should have been driven in 10 years ago if the Commonwealth Government had kept to its agreement. Indeed, some would argue that the spike should have been driven in 70 years ago if the Commonwealth Government had kept to its agreement. Having done that, the Premier will go back to Cavan, to the marshalling yards to drive in tamps and ballast; then, back to Islington and then down to Keswick, where the new passenger terminal is. Mark you, this is all Commonwealth money, all A.N.R., all signed, sealed and delivered 10 years ago. In the meantime day in day out the electors of this State will be plagued by this monstrous carnival. If the Premier thinks the people of this State will be amused by circuses he is quite wrong—absolutely and totally wrong.

**Mr Trainer:** They want bread—not circuses.

**Mr McRAE:** As my colleague from Ascot Park said, the Romans were pretty shrewd: they did not provide just the circuses; they also gave bread. There is not too much bread

being distributed but an awful lot of circus performances are being distributed.

That was the first Estimates Committee and I may say, with your protection, Mr Acting Deputy Speaker, that in hard economic terms when one tried to question the Premier, one found it very difficult, because in fact he agrees with his Federal colleagues, who are monetarists to a man; he is a monetarist, too. He agrees by some extraordinary logic that somehow it is right that the Federal Government has expanded its own expenditure by 19 per cent while we have been slashed by 5 per cent. He agrees that our health situation should be as it is, and I am now going to devote my attention to our health situation because it is about time that somebody did.

Last year, at the point of a gun (I do not blame the Premier or the Minister of Health for this, because they had no other option—they were battling for so many other options for the State) the Government was forced to sign the Commonwealth/State health agreement, under which we have been faced with an absolute tragedy. Tragedy No. 1: the entire State Budget deficit is about \$40 000 000. Of that, \$36 500 000 is directly related to health. Why is that so? The answer is quite simple: the Health Commission has no budget; none whatsoever. After 15 months of puzzling, I tried terribly hard by talking with Treasury officials (under the correct guide lines, I might add), seeking the approval of the Premier in advance and having the Treasury officials down here—

**Mr Mathwin:** You tried to get them on the wrong Committee last week.

**Mr McRAE:** I am not referring to any wrong Committee: I am talking about a very proper committee of this Parliament and when the Treasury officials came down here, they could not answer one question. Why not? It was simply because to answer one question would involve them in a matter of policy or Government ideology. In a flash it occurred to me that all you really had to do was to look at page 6 and page 7 of the famous yellow book 'Programme Estimates 1982-83 Vol. 2, Book 11' and there it was all set out for you.

The Health Commission, with all its gigantic resources, has reached the stage where George Orwell described Non-speak: a policy of self congratulation and anticipated self defence. That is all one can say about the Health budget. When one questioned that unfortunate man, the Chairman of the Health Commission (Mr Bernie McKay), one found that his hands were wired behind his back. The fact is that the Commonwealth Government and its State colleagues in South Australia have agreed to the ruthless abandonment of Medibank, putting in its place a series of programmes that can only lead the health care of our State deeper and deeper into the mire.

Last year's deficit of \$36 500 000 will become minus \$50 000 000 this year. Goodness knows where we will go from there. There are three categories of people involved: those who can afford to pay the funds, those who are pensioners or who are lucky enough to fall within the Commonwealth guidelines of those eligible for benefits, and those who are stranded in the middle and who have no defence whatsoever. As the Public Actuary pointed out, the debt recovery system of the hospitals is in a very poor state indeed. It cannot improve for the simple reason that one cannot get blood out of a stone. Fred and Freda, out at Pooraka, or at Mitchell Park, simply cannot afford to pay (if they are not in category one or two) the money that the hospital demands from them. What is to be done with such people; are they to be slung into gaol? Obviously that will not be done; that would cost even more money. They would be brought before a law court which would very properly declare that there would be no order against them. Therefore,

we would be right back where we started, and losing as we go.

This is all the result of what I can only describe as a non-policy of the Commonwealth Government and a non-policy on the part of the State Government. As to the State Government, one point must be made perfectly clear: it was always said there would be no staff cuts, but there have been real staff cuts in health. We were once proud of our hospitals. I am proud of them still in so far as those who still work in our hospitals manage to keep them functional. They should be congratulated to the nth degree, but those who manage to retain their positions are exhausted. They cannot carry out the duties assigned to them; that is the reality of the matter. Staffing resources are going backwards; we are not picking them up in new trainees, which is terribly sad. That is a problem that the incoming Labor Government will have to wrestle with very hard indeed. It is a matter that requires a Federal Labor Government to find a solution. Neither of those two contingencies is far from becoming a reality in the future.

I refer now to the Committee which I attended and which examined the Chief Secretary's lines. The Chief Secretary had a very difficult task. He had already read the speech given by the Minister of Industrial Affairs concerning the conciliation and arbitration legislation now before the House.

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Russack):** Order! The honourable member for Playford has the call.

**Mr McRAE:** The Chief Secretary had already read the second reading explanation of his colleague the Minister of Industrial Affairs, and well knew that it was absolutely desirable from his and his Government's viewpoint that a wedge be driven between two sections of the community. In the incredible second reading explanation, which the Minister of Industrial Affairs gave on 14 September, it was enunciated that the authorities of this State were worried about the illegal activities of unions in South Australia. One would imagine that we were like the peninsula of South Melbourne. If we were I could understand his legitimate worry. I could well understand the thought that 15 machine-gunned bodies had been dropped into the bottom of the Yarra. I could well understand that bundles of documents had been dropped into the harbor all over Australia. However, in South Australia we are assured that there are 22 painters and dockers. I am also told that, in many cases, their jobs are part time.

It rather staggered me that the basis of the far-reaching industrial legislation should be on record, from no less a person than the Minister of Industrial Affairs himself, suggesting that there was a nexus between the two. I commenced questioning him. It took about half an hour to grind information out of him; it was like drawing the proverbial back teeth. The member for Glenelg was present and knew what an agonising performance it was. The Minister wanted to muddy the reputation of unions in this State so that he could use that as a basis for his legislation. However, the Acting Commissioner of Police was there and told us that no evidence existed of any Costigan behaviour, any builders labourers Royal Commission behaviour or any illegal behaviour by any union in this State. Indeed, were there evidence of that criminal behaviour, my Party and I would be the first to say 'Prosecute them criminally and have them before a criminal court'. That is what I would say—make no bones about it. Criminal behaviour will not be tolerated by the Labor Party or any member of it. We will not have, on the basis of a smear campaign, a repeat of the Evatt performance of the 1950s. In no way will we accept that sort of performance.

So, overall, the Estimates Committees were a patchy performance. I have taken a more optimistic view than has

the member for Ascot Park. In summary, it seems that, with great respect to you, Sir, the chairmanship cannot be quibbled with in any way at all; in fact, the Chairmen would have to be congratulated. That includes not only yourself, Mr Acting Deputy Speaker, and the Deputy Speaker, but also people such as the member for Glenelg who happened to be involved in a very difficult situation on the last night that we sat. It was a tricky situation. I refer also to the other Deputy Chairmen. A fair go was given to everyone.

**The Hon. R. G. Payne:** They comported themselves admirably.

**Mr McRAE:** I agree with my colleague: they comported themselves admirably. Next, I would say that there has been definitely an improvement as the years have gone by, but we need a definite consensus. Otherwise, we will jeopardise the whole situation, particularly in relation to some Ministers, lest they handball everything. If one envisages a football field—and I will not refer to the member for Glenelg because, as a follower of Central Districts, I feel rather like him at the moment and rather sad about the whole season, but he will appreciate the general setting that I give him—one does not handball every ball on. Sometimes you just kick the ball. Some Ministers handballed everything, and sometimes they did so three times. That is going a little bit too far, and that is where I draw the line.

I hope that, as time goes on, these Estimates Committees will improve. I am sure that they will. With the change of Government in December or late November, the performance will be far more outstanding, and we will not have to worry as much as we do at the moment. Nonetheless, it behoves all Ministers or prospective Ministers to think about what they are doing and not just say, 'Oh, well, we were critical of so and so in opposition, but now we are in Government we will do exactly the same thing ourselves.' However, I am sure that that will not happen. Basically, with those minor procedural carpings, I support the motion.

As to the substantive matters that I brought up, I warn the House that every member of the community should look very seriously at the financial statement of the Premier and Treasurer, the Estimates of Payments and the Health Commission overview, the agency overview, and ask themselves whether this State can much longer tolerate the mess that it is in, because we may well reach the situation where we cannot do so.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Mitchell):** I rise to support the motion. It was interesting to listen to my colleague who proceeded me in this matter, particularly in relation to the remarks that he made regarding the usefulness and the efficacy or otherwise of the Estimates Committees themselves and the system under which they operate. The success of such a system depends entirely on the attitude of the Minister whose portfolio or group of portfolios is being examined (that is the aim of the Estimates Committee system) at the time that the committee is sitting.

I can best illustrate how a Minister ought not to operate by referring to the happenings on the committee that related to the Minister of Mines and Energy, and that was on one of Committee B's sitting days. I had asked the Minister what the current position was, in simple terms, in relation to gas reserves in the Cooper Basin area. This is what transpired, and I ask you, Sir, to refresh your memory because at that time, if I recall correctly, you were in the Chair and functioning in that capacity. My questions were pretty simple: I asked what are the reserves? Has there been any improvement? Is there any expected improvement? This is the answer that we received:

In relation to reserves, from time to time I receive reports from South Australian Oil and Gas, particularly in relation to reserves and the company's assessment of them. The company undertook

some exploratory work, soul risking work (as the honourable member would know), with the prime purpose of finding gas. That is a statement of the obvious. Presumably the Minister thought that it was needed, and I accept it to that point. He went on to say:

In summary, the advice I have received from time to time—already we have gone back to that phrase within five lines—from that source and from the department indicates that the overall reserve level has not increased since about 1973.

Fair enough. If we called a halt at that point we may have been able to probe further and see in detail what changes had occurred. But, no, the Minister was just warming up. He continued:

When I became Minister of Mines and Energy, I was told that about 700 billion cubic feet of gas had to be found to satisfy the Sydney contract before South Australia could receive any further entitlement. That advice has not changed significantly in the three years that I have been Minister. That has been the story since 1973.

So, the Minister has already referred back to 1973, and we have only gone down about 1½ paragraphs. Not content with that, the Minister continued:

Some new finds have been made, but existing reservoirs have been downgraded. Therefore, there has been no effective increase in the reserves.

We had not received one quantifying figure to that point, other than for the Minister's saying that he had been told when he got the job that 700 billion cubic feet of gas was required. The Minister went on to say:

We have sought to obtain the best possible advice about the position in relation to the reserves. Independent consultants have been engaged, and I believe that A.G.L. [Australian Gas Light, the New South Wales end] has engaged yet another independent consultant to estimate the level of the reserves.

The Minister must then have listened to what he was saying and thought that he had better update that and bring it around to the contemporaneous times, as it were. The Minister then said:

In fact, today I sought further information in relation to this very important question of reserves, because it has been an integral part of any negotiations in relation to gas sharing, and so on.

First, I want to deal with the point of the year 1973. It is nine years since 1973, and for the past three years the present Government has been in office. The Minister says that he is seeking information in relation to reserves. That is the paramount question in relation to the supply of gas, both for South Australia in the future and to New South Wales. Yet, after three years in office, the Minister has decided to give it some consideration, and the Minister said only 'today I sought further information'. Whilst perhaps the Minister thought that he was not telling us something (and I believe that he did not mean to tell us anything), he did at least tell us that: that belatedly he had started to look at the real problem, which is the question of the reserves, what gas has been found and what is available.

The reserve situation is curious in relation to gas for South Australia and New South Wales. Mr Acting Deputy Speaker, with all the words that you had to listen to in your duty as Chairman of the Committee, you probably do not recall accurately what occurred then, and you might have assumed, reasonably, that the Minister had decided that that was enough in answer to my simple question. I regret to inform you, Sir, that you are wrong, because the Minister was only warming up. He went on to say:

As I have said, today I sought further information in relation to reserves. It is true that since I have been Minister, indeed, since the contracts were written—

and I ask all members to note this important information—there have been additions, but there have also been concurrent subtractions. I was informed that we needed 700 billion cubic feet—

so we have gone back to that figure again—

and I do not believe that that situation has changed much since I became Minister.

Then there was an important sensible piece of information. The Minister said:

The price of gas does have a direct bearing on reserves in the sense that it then becomes economic to recover gas from known reserves . . .

I have no quarrel with that statement. It makes sense and applies to minerals, liquids, hydrocarbons, and so on. The material, which is still in the geological structure, may be uneconomic to recover at a certain market price, but if the market price improves obviously the economics of the recovery change and, therefore, reserves, increase. The Minister then bailed out. I point out that this answer relates to the simple question I asked. The Minister said 'Perhaps Mr Webb can provide more detail.' I had already received enough detail, but I was to receive more from Mr Webb, as follows:

I think the Minister has covered the question fairly well. His final point is important: reserves are the economic parameter. As the real price of gas changes, the reserve volume also changes.

I suppose Mr Webb at least confirmed what the Minister had said, although he had a nicer turn of phrase, and he used a much briefer comment to illustrate the same point. The next few lines of Mr Webb's reply simply repeat what the Minister had already said. Mr Webb, the Director-General of the Department of Mines and Energy, then said:

. . . our early estimates have had to be downgraded in some cases, and estimates in other areas have been upgraded.

We were told earlier that there had been some additions and some subtractions; we are now told that there are upgradings and downgradings. However, we have still not heard one quantitative word in relation to the information sought, that is, what is the present position in relation to the reserves. We should have been given billion cubic feet, trillion cubic feet, megajoules, or whatever quantity is involved, because that was the information sought. However, we received the type of answer from the Minister that I have already outlined. Mr Webb continued:

On balance, the recent result has been a fairly static estimate.

Mr Webb used other terminology which was essentially the same as had been used by the Minister, but he did introduce a further point which has some validity, that is, the fact that banks may require a more conservative estimate of reserves of minerals, hydrocarbons, or whatever, that may be in an underground formation, when they are required to lend money for the purpose of extracting same and marketing it. That was a sensible point put forward by Mr Webb. He also mentioned that that can have a bearing on the reserves. However, we still did not get a figure, an approximate or an estimate, but something that we could work on. Mr Webb continued:

The nature of the reserves and their quantity is one of these aspects. That whole matter is receiving close attention at the present time and it will be a factor in the move towards a gas sharing concept. I think it is fair to say that, as a result of the negotiations between the producers and A.G.L., a recognition of the need to develop a gas sharing concept of some form is now agreed by all parties.

I think I would have been forgiven if I had gone home, taken out my trusty 303 and blown my head off. After I had asked the simple question, 'What is the present state of the reserves in relation to gas in the Cooper Basin and has there been an increase in the quantity found?' it took about two pages of the *Hansard* report of the Committee to tell me exactly zilch. Of course, if one endeavoured to persevere, one was given a further serve of the same persiflage.

Mr Mathwin: If you had gone home and blasted your head off you would never have found out the answer, would you?

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** I would not have been able to do that, because whilst I have a 303 I do not keep any ammunition in the house, because I believe that would be an unsafe practice. Nor, for the benefit of the honourable member, will an intruder find the bolt in the weapon. Therefore, if anyone stole that rifle he would have a problem. I try to be sensible, at least in that respect. I refer back to something said by Mr Webb. To be fair to the gentleman, I have no quarrel with him: I think he threw in this comment in relation to reserves as a bit of padding:

It became even more complicated quite recently when the producers adopted a new concept for the definition of 'reserves'. It may be that the producers can adopt a new concept for the definition of 'reserves'. That is their prerogative, I suppose, as leaseholders who are allowed to produce, go on exploring, and so on. However, what happened to the amendments to the relevant Act we passed in this House not long ago incorporating stringent demands for tighter information to be provided to the department about reserves. Those amendments did not dally in the House. They were supported by the Opposition because they were sensible amendments. It is a requirement that companies given a licence provide accurate information to the Department of Mines and Energy so that that department, in the interests of the people of this State, can ensure that plans put forward for the recovery of materials are in the best interests of the State.

I am surprised to find that the comment has been made that that is in effect what the Act says. I invite members to examine this Act, because it is hard to work out what the reserves situation is, as the company (that is, the producers) is adopting a new definition of 'reserves'. Surely the department ought to be in a position to specify that reserves capacity information be provided in a form that it requires so that it can act usefully and sensibly on the basis of that information. It would then have some status and some real standing. I believe that that is the real position, and I do not know why that proposition was put forward, except perhaps possibly as a bit of padding.

I turn now to gas reserves in the Cooper Basin. I forecast that the supposed shortage of gas which now exists will not occur. In case any honourable member feels that I am going out on a limb in saying this, or allowing myself a position I do not have in making such a forecast when not backed up by expertise, I put forward the following supporting facts. Why is it that the previous General Manager of the South Australian Gas Company, Mr Burnside, who has retired recently, stated categorically in a letter to employees of the Gas Company late last year, and again early this year, that there is no shortage of gas now, nor will there be a shortage of gas in 1987? He issued that statement to reassure the employees of the Gas Company and to raise their morale so that they need not be concerned about their future.

It might be said that as Mr Burnside was retiring he felt that he could make a statement which might not need to be supported later. I do not support that theory, as I know Mr Burnside well and, as any member who had contact with him during the time he was Manager of the Gas Company would be, I am impressed by his expertise and integrity. Let me remind members that the new General Manager of the Gas Company apparently holds the same view, because there have been advertisements appearing repeatedly on television exhorting the people of South Australia to use gas.

The advertisements are clever and skilful, and point to the advantages of using gas as a fuel to heat water, for cooking, and so on. They urge people to use gas in their homes. I do not believe that the Gas Company would be so bereft in its understanding of the situation as to try to sell gas that will not be available in a few short years. If

any member believes that the Gas Company is operating in that way, I will be interested to hear from him. I do not believe that the Gas Company would be so derelict in its performance, through the General Manager, as to put forward that sort of sales proposition to the public of South Australia when there is no future assured supply of gas.

The Minister of Mines and Energy has been at some pains over the years since he obtained his position to pretend (and that is the only word that can be used) that, after he became Minister, he found that there was (to use the Minister's words) an appalling set of contracts that placed South Australia in a very invidious situation regarding the supply of gas that will be available from the Cooper Basin *vis-a-vis* the gas that will be available to New South Wales for a much longer period. Day after day in this House the Minister has attempted to suggest that the contractual arrangement was poorly organised by the previous Government, that it had no basis in relation to the terms contained in it, and that it was not commercially sensible.

Members of this place and the public of South Australia have been subjected to a procession of such statements, all based on the fact that the Minister has suggested, at best, and proclaimed, at worst, 'When I found out about this I was appalled—I was horrified.' If that were the true position, perhaps one could forgive the Minister's adopting that stance. What is the true position? The contractual obligation to which the Minister is so wont to refer in disparaging terms, scoring political points, is that which is contained in the Cooper Basin (Ratification) Act and the indenture. The Minister was a member of this House during the passage of the Bill and the indenture, and he was present in this House immediately before the then Minister of Mines and Energy (Hon. Hugh Hudson) obtained leave and introduced the Bill to which I have referred.

The Minister's second reading explanation was made available immediately, in written form. It provided a wealth of information on the true gas scene, at that time and for the future, on all of the contractual arrangements between the partners and other groups in the Cooper Basin interest, and on the arrangements for gas supply. The present Minister of Mines and Energy has been deliberately distorting and attempting to show that in some strange way the previous Government and the previous Minister negotiated an irresponsible contract. Nothing could be further from the truth. The then Minister of Mines and Energy (*Hansard*, page 1466, October 1975), in his second reading explanation, stated:

The exploration resulting from these farm-out agreements brought sufficient new discoveries for the companies concerned—

that is, the producers at that time on the Cooper Basin—to negotiate successfully an agreement dated May 26, 1971, for the supply of the Sydney gas market through the A.G. Company—that is, A.G.L.—

in the face of competition from the Bass Strait producers.

I am pleased to see the Minister for Industrial Affairs in the House, because the Minister of Industrial Affairs played a prominent part in the passage of that Bill. The Minister of Industrial Affairs was concerned about environmental matters; he was concerned about who was to be on the board of PASA; he had concern about procedures in the House and conducted a running fire argument with the Minister of Mines and Energy which led to disagreement to the ruling of Mr Speaker when the select committee report was brought into this House. Never at any time did the Minister of Industrial Affairs say that he was concerned about the contractual arrangements for the sale of gas, except to draw attention (as he should have, I agree) to the fact that there was a need for further exploration to proceed; that there had been insufficient exploration for a period of some two years and that that ought to be proceeded with.

That sort of comment originated partly from the Minister concerned and was incorporated in the select committee report put before this House. If I remember correctly, it was paragraph 4 of the report 'Further Exploration', and the Minister correctly pointed out there was a need to earmark some gas supplies so that the liquids, which are finally coming to fruition now at Stony Point, could be marketed. That was in relation to the petro-chemical plant which everyone in the State has been awaiting ever since.

What are the true facts in this matter? They are beyond dispute: the contractual arrangements in generality were known to the members of the then Opposition (the present Government) and they made no demurrals at all that contracts had been negotiated. They were part of the indenture, they are referred to in the indenture as the sales contract. Never mind whether or not the fine print was there available for them to scan.

The explanation and the meaning of them was there and, if I had more time, I could read other excerpts from the then Minister's second reading explanation on that day, which clearly showed that New South Wales had been promised gas for a longer period so that the competition being offered from Bass Strait producers could be met. That was done in the interests of South Australia, Santos and the other producers who were then involved. There have been some changes in the membership of the group on the field, but that is the salient, factual situation and for the present Minister of Mines and Energy to suggest that the contracts were negotiated in an irresponsible way is absolute humbug.

The Minister, then an Opposition member, was present in this House (as members can ascertain by reference to *Hansard*) and never at any time did he indicate any opposition to the contents of the indenture or the Bill. Members could say he was not a member of the select committee and may not have known all the details.

The select committee's report was brought into this house and was approved. It was passed, and it was done in a hurry; I do not dispute that. The same thing occurred in regard to the Stony Point indenture. The point is that when agreements are signed on an indenture basis there is some pressure to get the legislative backing for them; otherwise, the participants in the contractual arrangements in the indenture get toey and worried, have their bankers on their backs, and cannot raise financing until the agreement is signed, sealed and delivered.

It is an absolute sham for the Minister of Mines and Energy to stand in this House in 1982 and claim that he was appalled when he saw the details of the contract, suggesting that that occurred relatively recently when he became Minister of Mines and Energy. The Minister has known about it all along; he endorsed the contractual arrangements as they existed by not attempting in any way to speak against them. Reference to *Hansard* indicates that the Minister's contribution to the debate was in regard to a procedural argument as to whether a member could speak once or twice on a matter in this House following the moving of a motion to disagree with the ruling of the Speaker at that time.

I ask the Minister of Mines and Energy to do the decent thing and to admit that he knew of the details of the contract, and supported them tacitly, at least at the time they were being considered by this House.

**Mr MAX BROWN (Whyalla):** During the past two weeks we have yet again engaged in a boring and unreal exercise. Before the current Committee procedure was introduced, Ministers did not have the right to have at their beck and call the head officers of their various departments. Under the present system officers of departments are being used for some political ploy, to say the least, which should not

be the case. I believe that that aspect should be seriously explored in depth. I want to refer to only two of the three Committees with which I was involved. First, I want to reiterate that I have doubts about whether the Committee procedure achieves its aim, which presumably, is to probe and question, in depth, Ministers concerning the Budgets of each department and their yearly transactions.

I have some serious doubt whether the fortnight we have just been through serves that purpose. Two of the Committees on which I served were considerably assisted through my participation. Secondly, and more important, there is no doubt that the Opposition Whip, the member for Baudin, was quick to recognise my extreme ability, particularly in the legal field. He placed me on the Committee when it dealt with legal matters. I was also placed on the Committee when it dealt with another of my areas of expertise; namely, agriculture.

**Mr Mathwin:** You have a good garden at Whyalla.

**Mr MAX BROWN:** If the honourable member is patient, I will come to that. No doubt my learned colleague recognised that, in regard to legal matters, I have appeared many times over the years in such matters. However, I had to seek special leave of a learned judge of the Federal Arbitration Court to appear in regard to hearings concerning penalty charges under the penal system of that court. I represented workers who were charged with taking strike action in an endeavour to better their standard of living. I will be truthful about the situation: I did not win a case whilst appearing in those courts. Nevertheless, I am sure that, over the years, the working-class people I represented were successful in obtaining important increases in wage cases.

I could speak about many aspects of the legal matters dealt with by the Committee. I wish to simply refer to the fact that the Government does not seem to want to progressively improve the legal aid facilities to the not so fortunate of our society. In my electorate the previous Dunstan Labor Government was responsible for the establishment of a legal aid office in Whyalla; that establishment has played an important social role in the lives of the underprivileged in Whyalla. However, the establishment has been placed under great strain by the Liberal Government. So far the office has weathered the political storm but it has not made progress, despite the fact that the number of underprivileged people in Whyalla has grown considerably. Let us hope that it will be maintained and fostered over the years to come.

Every endeavour ought to be made to at least increase the number of visits by officers to Whyalla, and even to the cities of Port Pirie and Port Augusta, in the near future. I refer also to the Committee's examination of the Department of Agriculture. I was fortunate to participate because of my expertise in that field.

I have had some dealings with the poultry industry, having some ducks, fowls, and so forth, in my possession. I want to reiterate that my learned colleague, the member for Stuart, quite rightly pointed out a few weeks ago that he, like me, was raised and grew up within the rural industry. I have had some past experience in the rural industry, although some people in this house might think that I specialise in the industrial field.

Out of that Committee one thing concerned me very much, and I think that it concerned us all. I refer to the effects of the drought in this State. There is no doubt that those effects are having a significant impact on the current economic situation of this State; everybody in some way suffers from those effects. Unfortunately, hardly a week goes by when we do not read or see on television further drastic results of the drought. On *Nationwide* tonight we saw that another 133 workers would lose their jobs with the firm of Horwood Bagshaw. I understand what that will mean, par-



ticularly in the small river town of Mannum. The downturn is a down-turn in hope for their future, a down-turn in the economy of the little town, probably on a basis comparable to that of my own city of Whyalla. I could liken it, unfortunately (if that is a word that we should use in this drastic state of affairs), to the down-turn of the steel industry in Whyalla. I regret that such an unfortunate situation has developed in the agricultural industry, and it shows, without any doubt at all, the problems that exist within all phases of our lives and how much each and every one of us is involved.

There is one other regret about which I will speak now. I would like to have been on the Committee that dealt with the Budget lines on housing. I have been involved considerably with the question of housing, particularly through the South Australian Housing Trust, the major housing project in this State. I want to pay some attention to the current policies of the South Australian Housing Trust, particularly with respect to welfare housing. I became very drastically involved in the question of welfare housing, particularly in my own electorate, because of the complete closure of the Whyalla shipyard, which brought in turn a tremendous number of welfare people to the city of Whyalla. Of course, with the dramatic down-turn in the steel industry, that situation is currently intensifying.

The question I raise at this time goes back a considerable number of years. The instances I refer to certainly go back something like two years, but the policy is still there: it has never been altered, despite the fact that I have made submissions to the Housing Trust on several occasions for it to re-examine the policy. The Housing Trust, for some time, has put what I call a second or third means test on people who occupy rental accommodation.

Before I go into the particular cases, I want to remind the House that this Government came into office on a policy of no increase in rental accommodation in the South Australian Housing Trust area. I can say equally that that promise was short-lived, like many other promises. I will refer to the rent formula of the South Australian Housing Trust, with additions for extra family income. In all, there are six points in this rent formula. Part 3 of the formula states:

\$5 to be added to the rent for each person 18 years of age, but below 21 and receiving an income.

Part 4 states:

\$7.50 per week to be added to the rent for each person 21 years of age and over and receiving an income.

Part 5 states:

If an employed member of the family, not a spouse, is 30 years of age and over, his or her income is to be taken as the breadwinner if it is higher than the tenant. If not, the \$7.50 is added to the rent.

That is an interesting situation. I believe that these three parts of that rent formula set up a destructive element as far as the family unit is concerned. I say, with great sincerity, that, as a father, I have always believed in and had strong feelings regarding the family unit.

I have also found that elderly people live by a code of self-respect and self-independence. They wish to keep their family ties and take it as an affront if anyone even remotely suggests that they should in any way be dependent on their sons and daughters for financial assistance. I think that that attitude is pretty general. The other fact is that any money that may have been put aside for a rainy day by those people is kept secretly, as it were, for the family when they are gone.

So, it was on this basis that I have had continuing dialogue with the trust, but no-one has convinced me that a son of 21 years of age or more, employed and earning, say, \$200 a week or more, living with his parents, could be classed as

an additional income to his parents. On the contrary, my personal experience shows me that, if my son is earning \$200 per week and is living with me, it costs me additional expenditure rather than his bringing extra income into the home. I refer to a longstanding case that I have taken from my files, because it is a good example of what I am referring to. I will not mention the person's name, because I do not believe that that is necessary. I was approached by this gentleman, who is a pensioner and a longstanding tenant of the South Australian Housing Trust in the city of Whyalla.

About two years ago (I do not want it to be construed that I am referring to the present situation), the gentleman's house rent rose \$5.50 in eight months. His son lived with him at home. When I approached the Housing Trust about the house rent, I was told that if the son moved out and lived somewhere else the rent would drop by \$7.50 per week. The pension rise in November of that year amounted to \$7.80 per week. The rent rise in the previous September amounted to \$3 per week, which is nearly 50 per cent of his pension increase. The gentleman was then advised that his rent would rise by a further \$2.50 per week from the beginning of the following year. That gentleman would have been \$7.50 per week better off in relation to rental accommodation if he had told his son to get out. I think that is ridiculous, to say the least.

I refer to another case that occurred a couple of years ago. This gentleman's rent was reduced in September and he retired at the same time. On his retirement, he received a pension of \$96.50 per week. This man invested the money that he had received from his superannuation fund, and so on, and the interest that he earned from that money amounted to \$28.30 per week. Because of the increase in earning power in relation to the money that he invested, this man's rent was increased at the beginning of the year to \$17.50 per week. In this case the means test that was applied to this gentleman by the trust occurred in a different area.

The first case to which I referred involved the means test being based on a son's earning power. This case is based on the earning power of the money that was invested by the aged pensioner who had just retired. So, the Commonwealth Government places a means test on the earning power of a pensioner so that his pension is decreased, and then the trust effects a double means test by ascertaining how much a person has invested and how much interest he is getting, or by looking at a family's earning power. That is a double standard relating to Housing Trust welfare rental accommodation.

Even though the two cases to which I have referred are two years old, I can cite many other similar instances from my files, because the position has not altered since two years ago. This problem should be examined. I am not sure that either political Party has the whole answer to this question. I know, as does any member of this House, that once the price of rental accommodation in the welfare area is reduced the amount of rental accommodation in some other area must be increased. That does not apply as much now (because of the downturn in the steel industry and closure of the shipbuilding yards) in my district. However, this matter could have been explored by the Trust over many years, because people have been paying cheap rentals for Trust accommodation while holding lucrative weekly income jobs.

I recall pointing out on numerous occasions that well paid staff employees of the B.H.P. Company Limited lived in Housing Trust rental accommodation at what I can only describe as subsidised rentals. They certainly would not have paid the same rental to a private house or flat developer. That avenue could have been explored by the Trust over the years and could have resulted in a much more reasonable

rental being set for those people with an income far higher than that of the people on welfare, about whom I have been speaking. It is well known that in many instances, and particularly in the case of newly married couples, a wife has worked for many years and brought in a higher weekly income than her husband.

Another matter could have been considered over the years but, with the economic down-turn that we are now facing and the increasing unemployment situation, I doubt that any success could be achieved. Nevertheless, over the years those in the most despair have had to fit the bill. If I had been on the Committee, I would have raised this matter with the Minister of Housing.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN (Minister of Industrial Affairs):** I move:

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

Motion carried.

**Mr PLUNKETT (Peake):** I hope that this debate is not a waste of time as were the two Estimates Committees dealing with welfare and agriculture. In Estimates Committee B, which considered welfare matters, each question asked by members of the Opposition received three very long answers: the Minister answered first, the head of the department commented along the same lines, and one of the other deputies was brought in to give a further answer. Members of the Committee, other than the lead speaker, were lucky to be able to ask one or two questions during the day. It was a complete waste of time.

But who wasted time? Not only did we get answers from three people but also back-benchers of the Liberal Party asked stupid questions. I see that those members are not entering the debate tonight. They do not want to hold up the Budget any longer. They held up the Estimates Committees, but they have been told to shut their mouths tonight, to keep out and not enter the debate. Not one back-bencher opposite has spoken in this debate, and that is a disgrace. However, it is in line with what the Government is doing. I believe that everyone is aware when the election will be held, and the Government wants the Budget out of the road.

**The Hon. H. Allison:** You tell us.

**Mr PLUNKETT:** The member for Mount Gambier may be back school teaching in three months, because it is pretty well known that the election will be on 27 November and that the Premier will announce it as soon as he gets the Budget through. That is one reason why the back-benchers opposite have been told to shut their mouths, even though a few of them would love to speak and waste more time, as they have done over the past three years.

*The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:*

**Mr PLUNKETT:** It is all right for the Minister to criticise. I am on my feet: if the Minister wants to say something, why does he not enter the debate? He should shut up if he does not want to enter the debate.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member has been in this Chamber long enough to know that that type of language is not necessary to put forward a point of view. I suggest that he does not tell people to shut up. The honourable member could use other terms that would make the point in a far better way. I also point out that he should not encourage interjections. I suggest to the Minister of Education that the honourable member does not need his assistance.

**Mr PLUNKETT:** I thank the Deputy Speaker, and I might add that I would like to think that I have the protection of the Chair at all times. I am putting forward my point of view, and I apologise if my remarks are not what some

members opposite would like to hear, but if they interject they must expect to be criticised. If anyone on the other side has a point to make, let him stand on his feet and make it. Not one Government member has had the guts to get up and speak; that is what I am saying.

**Mr Ashenden:** Boring!

**Mr PLUNKETT:** Boring! One thing that Government members cannot say is that I am boring. I am one of those who can get something out of members opposite, because I tell them what sort of people they are, but I will not do so now, as I am afraid—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! There are too many interjections. The honourable member for Peake.

**Mr PLUNKETT:** I will not say the word, because I am afraid that the Deputy Speaker will pull me up and say that it is unparliamentary. Yesterday afternoon, in my office on Henley Beach Road, I had a very interesting discussion with some people from the Thebarton Youth Service, including the co-ordinator, a Mr Graham Baker, and eight other people. The meeting, which was arranged to take about three-quarters of an hour, took close to two hours, and I am pleased to say that they were tremendous people to interview. They told me that their programme would be at Thebarton, in my electorate, and said that it was to assist the unemployed so that people, who could not get jobs and were depressed because they had nothing that they could go and turn their hand to, could take classes in, for example, truck driving, dressmaking, typewriting, living on a low income (I might add that there was a fair bit of discussion about that), working with children, job skills, and various other things.

The people I interviewed were in the age bracket of 18 to 35. I think every member of this House is aware that I am considerably older than that: I am 55, and that takes me back to the last depression, which lasted until 1940 (up until the Second World War), when there were still people on sustenance in Victoria. The comment was made that it must have been terrible in the depression, and I said 'Look, I was only a lad, but from what I could find out from my parents, it was not very good.' I explained to them that in actual fact I would rather have been a youth in those days than now, and when they asked why I replied, 'In the depression, interest rates were down, and the price of meals or any foodstuffs was down, whereas now an unemployed person has to pay the full amount for rates and taxes, etc.'

Having explained that to them, they told me that that was really the first time that anyone had pointed out to them that those people unemployed today are probably worse off than those who were unemployed during the depression of the 1930s. This is highlighted to people who travel around, who visit a town such as Broken Hill, where high wages are paid and who find themselves unemployed. I am referring to any time over the past 20 years. It is terribly hard for an unemployed person to exist in a town where high wages are paid, who finds himself at a disadvantage because one must pay high rents and high costs for everything. The present Government has really put South Australia into a depression again, which is a disgrace. Every member opposite should hang his head in shame.

**Mr Ashenden:** Talk sense.

**Mr PLUNKETT:** I am talking sense. It is the reason why not one member opposite has the guts to get up and put his point of view, although I point out that on most occasions, even during Question Time, members opposite waste time religiously every day. However, they are not prepared to waste time tonight; they have been told by the hierarchy of the Liberal Party that it wants an election.

*Mr Ashenden interjecting:*

**Mr PLUNKETT:** The honourable member should keep his mouth shut. Members opposite want to get the election

over with right away. The Fraser Government may decide to hold an election and interrupt things which the State Government does not want to happen; it wants to make certain that the State election is held before the bottom-of-the-harbor issue further develops. It is probably of great benefit to the State Government that the Federal Government has decided not to hold an election now because there is so much floating around below the surface and because there are too many of the Liberal Party's own supporters involved in those things.

In regard to unemployment, the Department of Social Security figures indicate that 25 Adelaide suburbs have recorded a more than 15 per cent increase in people receiving unemployment benefits during the past year. I refer to the following increases: Outer Harbor, 28.8 per cent; Eden Hills, 22.1 per cent; Rostrevor 20.6 per cent; Campbelltown, 19 per cent; Holden Hill, 26.3 per cent; Hope Valley, 14.7 per cent; St Agnes, 32.4 per cent; Ingle Farm, 19.4 per cent; Smithfield, 20.9 per cent; Munno Para, 29.2 per cent; Virginia, 23.6 per cent; Stirling, 19.4 per cent; O'Halloran Hill, 28.9 per cent; Happy Valley, 21 per cent; Morphett Vale, 25.9 per cent; Hackney, 24.2 per cent; and Port Noarlunga, 22.9 per cent. The number of people forced to live on unemployment benefits has risen by more than 25 per cent. However, the real level of unemployment would be much higher than that, because many unemployed people are ineligible for unemployment benefits. I refer to the situation that exists, for example, when either a husband or a wife is retrenched but who is ineligible because of the income of a spouse. They are ineligible.

Those people make up the hidden unemployed—the people who cannot apply for a job. There are so many of these people in Adelaide and in South Australia. They have had to have two jobs because of high interest, electricity, gas and council rates. If they go back to one wage they cannot exist. I do not know whether or not the member for Morphett has a smile on his face, but I do not think it would be, because he would have a lot of those people in his electorate.

**Mr Oswald:** Are you trying to insult me?

**Mr PLUNKETT:** I am not trying to insult the honourable member. However, if he has a grin on his face it would be an insult. I am sure that he would know of many people who have lost one job, leaving only one person in the family earning a living. Such people find they cannot keep up with their interest or car payments. In some cases they are forced to sell their homes and cars. There are many of these people and I know many of them.

The real level of unemployment would be far higher as many unemployed people are ineligible for unemployment benefits. The figures show a major shift in employment in Adelaide metropolitan areas. The bite is in the outer suburbs, particularly in the southern and north-eastern metropolitan areas. Many of those areas showing steep rises in jobless figures were previously low unemployment areas. It now looks as though many outer suburbs are starting to catch up with the western suburbs, where unemployment has been at serious levels for several years. It is not only the Adelaide suburbs that have registered a steep rise in the number of people receiving unemployment benefits: during the past year a 31.8 per cent increase has occurred in unemployment in Port Lincoln and a 30.6 per cent rise in Whyalla, while in Mount Gambier unemployment has risen to 26.2 per cent. It has, unfortunately, risen a little higher since then with the retrenchments at the Cellulose factory at Millicent. The figures are not up to date but they are bad enough. The figures show increases between May 1981 and May 1982 but do not take into account the latest series of retrenchments which have, unfortunately occurred. Unemployment is bad enough, as are low wages which are also bad.

Let us look at what workers, the unemployed and pensioners have had to contend with over the past three years of the Liberal Government. In 1979 under a Labor Government petrol was 25 cents a litre. Under a Liberal Government it rose to 30.2 cents a litre in 1980, 38.1 cents a litre in 1981 and it is now as high as 42 cents a litre in some areas. A petrol war exists in parts of the metropolitan area. In fact, 42 cents a litre is the recommended retail price. It shows a large increase. I refer also to interest rates.

**The Hon. H. Allison:** They are coming down.

**Mr PLUNKETT:** They are coming down! That is a brilliant statement from the Minister of Education who holds the seat of Mount Gambier. 'They are coming down', he said when I mentioned interest rates. Tell me of one person who has received a decrease in interest rates. That is a most ridiculous statement. No wonder that they said he is a librarian; he is the Minister of Education!

**The Hon. H. Allison:** Shut up.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr PLUNKETT:** I think that he should hang his head in shame. No wonder the teachers are not very happy with the way he is managing—

**The Hon. H. Allison:** I have seen better things come out of septic tanks.

**Mr PLUNKETT:**—education. I will ignore the Minister because he made an error. He thought that he had whispered it. I may have a loud voice, but I have also very good ears. I heard what he said. I picked it up. It will be in *Hansard*, and I will make sure that some people know about it.

Bread in 1979 was 60c a loaf. Under the Liberal Government in 1980, 63c; in 1981, 70c; in 1982, 85c. There has been a steep increase in the price of beer—another way of knocking the worker.

**Mr Ashenden:** Who wrote this garbage for you?

**Mr PLUNKETT:** And the car salesman can keep quiet, too. He has had his opportunity and I would like to see—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! If the honourable member is going to refer to any member he must refer to him by his district. The honourable member has been warned enough times that he should be aware of that.

**Mr PLUNKETT:** I apologise. I would like to offer now the opportunity to the member for Todd to get up and put his point, speaking in the debate, but he has not had the guts to put his point, except by interjecting. Anyone on the other side who wants to contribute has half an hour allowed. They should get up and use it, or are they told not to open their mouths?

**Mr Ashenden:** You can do better than that, surely.

**Mr PLUNKETT:** If the honourable member thinks that he can do it better, no-one will stop him. I will sit here and listen to him. Members opposite are embarrassed and are looking at one another and asking, 'What can we say to this bloke?'

I will continue with these prices under the Tonkin Government and the Fraser Federal Government: hospitals: \$40 per day in 1979 under a Labour Government; in 1980, \$50; in 1981, \$85. This has been increased to \$105 in 1982, but you cannot even get in there.

Let us look at what has happened to electricity prices in South Australia. Electricity is now in danger of becoming a luxury under the Tonkin Administration. Only 10 months after the last increases of 18 to 20 per cent, the trust has announced a 16 per cent rise again. That is an average. The trust—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr PLUNKETT:** The Henley Beach people would be very pleased to hear him yawn! The trust made the announcement; the Minister did not have the guts to announce these increases. Under the Labor Government, the Minister responsible (Mr Hugh Hudson) did not shirk

his responsibility; he announced the increases. Under the Liberals, the increases are increasingly seen as handy means of imposing backdoor taxation, since the State Treasury reaps 5 per cent of all ETSA revenue. In 1978-79 the State collected \$9 100 000 from this levy. In 1981-82 Dr Tonkin estimated that he would collect \$14 700 000. For 1982-83 the expectation is about \$17 000 000. It should be fairly obvious that this would be welcomed as a way of bolstering the State Budget since it would apply for the final two months of the previous financial year. The Premier was desperate to end the 1981-82 financial year with as small a deficit as he could, no matter who paid for the 'rescue' operation.

There have been a number of increases in electricity prices since the Liberal Government came to office. In July 1980 there was a 12½ per cent increase; in mid-1981 there was a 20 per cent increase; and in April 1982 there was a 15 per cent increase. If that was not bad enough there has been a further increase of 19 per cent in July this year. The point I am putting is this: how will people on wages, the unemployed or pensioners manage these increases?

**Mr Oswald:** What is your Government going to do?

**Mr PLUNKETT:** We will show the honourable member what we are going to do after the election on 27 November; he will find out then. Members of the Government will not have long to wait and will then be able to put their point. I would like to see the member for Morphett get up tomorrow and put his point, because I am sure that he has a few problems.

**Mr Hemmings:** He has been told not to speak.

**Mr PLUNKETT:** I know; all members on that side have been told that. A leading Australian business journal, *Australian Business*, says that the State Government will present a White Paper which will include a proposal to scrap South Australia's gas pricing policy in favour of world parity pricing. According to *Australian Business*, the Premier has been studying the economic strategy document since 9 June. This has not yet been announced, but it will be. If the *Australian Business* article was correct, then the Government's proposal to introduce world parity pricing for gas would have a devastating impact on the cost of energy to households and industry in South Australia. A move towards so-called world parity pricing could force electricity prices up by 40 per cent as well as massively increasing gas prices.

The Electricity Trust of South Australia uses natural gas as fuel for electricity generation at Torrens Island. If the Government radically alters our gas pricing policy, it will drive industry out of South Australia and force further job losses and add yet another burden on families already trying to cope with higher interest rates and increased State charges.

There is an established arbitration procedure designed to ensure that the gas producers get a fair return for their investment in exploration and development, and that the community receives gas at a reasonable price. In its 1978-79 annual report, ETSA warned that, if the price of gas were to be increased to the world oil price, the cost of electricity in South Australia could rise by 40 per cent. Already electricity tariffs have risen by an average of 69 per cent since the Tonkin Government was elected. Another 40 per cent would be disastrous.

That might keep members opposite quiet for a while, but I would still welcome hearing what they have to say. Half an hour is nowhere near enough time for a person to get up and criticise a Government that has been in office for three years and has run a State down, as this Government has done to South Australia. The only good thing that the Liberal Government has done is introduce free travel on public transport for unemployed people under 18 years of age.

That is the only thing on which I can commend the Government and the Minister. I do not have much time left, but I would like to refer to water rates. I have received many complaints from my constituents about the increase in water rates. In 1979, 24 cents per 1 000 litres was charged; it is now 37 cents per 1 000 litres, with a further increase on the way.

In conclusion, I challenge any member opposite to stand up and enter this debate and put their point of view, instead of yawning, as the member for Brighton is doing. I have referred to things that workers and pensioners have had to put up with, but the member for Brighton thinks that it is all a big yawn—let him get up and put his point. Let us see what he is doing for members of his electorate: he claims that he is doing something for them. The member for Henley Beach and the member for Morphett do the same thing. Those members have not stood up to defend the rights of workers, pensioners or the unemployed. The few members opposite who are present in the Chamber can put their hands up to their ears. I challenge them to put their points forward. Members opposite criticise and interject—

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

**Mr WHITTEN (Price):** I wish to take up where the member for Peake left off and criticise members opposite for their complete lack of intestinal fortitude. They do not have the guts to get up and defend—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I do not think it is necessary for the honourable member to use those words. He can use other adjectives.

**Mr WHITTEN:** I apologise for that, Sir. However, I would have thought that it was a plain, fair dinkum Australian term, but if you object, Sir, I apologise and withdraw.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair did not rule the honourable member out of order; I suggested that there was a better phrase that he could use to describe his view.

**Mr WHITTEN:** Thank you for your guidance, Mr Deputy Speaker. Members opposite do not have the stomach, the thought and the conviction to defend this Budget. Not one of them is game to get up and defend it, because they know, as people outside know, that it is a crook Budget. They know that it will not do a thing for the people of South Australia.

I was a member of Committee B for most of the time, and obtaining information from a Minister was like being a dentist—it was like extracting teeth. One had to drag every little iota of information from the Ministers. I recall that the member for Playford took half an hour to get a Minister to tell the truth. The Minister evaded the issue in every possible way. We were endeavouring to get the Chief Secretary to admit that the Minister of Industrial Affairs had misled this House. Finally, the Acting Commissioner (Mr Hunt), an honest and sincere man, answered the question after 30 minutes of intense questioning in relation to the corruption that the Minister of Industrial Affairs had said that he wanted to prevent in South Australian unions.

The member for Playford wanted to get the Minister to admit that there was no evidence of criminal activities in South Australian unions. However, the Chief Secretary avoided the question and persisted in skirting around the issue. When the Acting Commissioner spoke, he said that he had no evidence of any corruption or criminal activities in any union in South Australia. However, the Minister of Industrial Affairs told Committee B on the first day that it sat that it was necessary to introduce industrial legislation to protect the people of South Australia from the corruption in the unions.

That information took half an hour to extract from the Chief Secretary. That is the sort of farce that the Estimates

Committees represents—two weeks of sittings, from 11 a.m. to 10 p.m., during which to extract the information that we wanted. Honourable members had a fortnight prior to that to debate the Budget and we are now wasting another week on this same debate, instead of the Government's, if it was dinkum, introducing legislation that it wishes to deal with before November, before it is thrown out of office.

I know that you, Mr Acting Deputy Speaker, must be worried about your position in the Brighton District. I believe that many members on the other side of the Chamber could be described as 'oncens'. The only person on the other side of the House at the moment, apart from the Minister, is the member for Henley Beach, who is sitting on the narrowest margin of any member in this House, and who must be extremely worried.

**The Hon. H. Allison:** That is a load of old cobblers.

**Mr WHITTEN:** The Minister of Education wants to push his bib in. If he was dinkum, he would consider the 1977 election and the margin in his district, he would consider the swing that is on at the moment, and admit that he is in the hot seat. A Mr Scott, from that district, has said that if this Liberal Government is re-elected he will leave South Australia. He said that he could not put up any longer with the Minister who represents Mount Gambier. I would not like to be in the Minister's position; he must be extremely worried.

**The Hon. H. Allison:** Not at all, I can assure you. Two Premiers have said that, and they are both in limbo—in fact, one is in Melbourne.

**Mr WHITTEN:** I will ignore the Minister's interjections, and treat them with the contempt they deserve. When my Leader opened his speech he said:

This is the last Budget before the election.

I thought that he was very kind in saying that. If he had been more forceful and put things the way I do, he would have said, 'It is Tonkin's last Budget', because I am sure that, after he is defeated at the next election (whether it is on 20 November, 27 November, or whenever), the Premier will never have an opportunity to lead his Party again, let alone bring down another Budget. It will be a long time after that election before a Liberal Party is returned to the Government benches in South Australia. I return to the matters in the Budget.

**The Hon. H. Allison:** You might as well, you didn't address them during the Estimates period.

**Mr WHITTEN:** I said that I would ignore and treat with contempt the inane interjections from the Minister. However, he has said that I never referred to the Budget or the Estimates Committees. I was talking for most of the time about the difficulty of extracting information from the Minister. He has a short memory and that is why he cannot remember what happened in 1977 and in 1979, when there was a voting swing, and the corruptness of some of the backers of the Liberal Party and the money that they put up. Some of those backers have been paid off and have got their quarter. However, there are not the other people out there now who will put the money up to assist the Liberal Party.

**The Hon. H. Allison:** I hope that you can prove this.

**Mr WHITTEN:** There is plenty of proof in the papers of the corruptness of the campaign run by the Liberal Party in 1979. I will come back to the Estimates Committees and to some of the things said by the Chief Secretary. However, I remind the Minister that his Party said prior to that election that it was not safe for children or wives to walk the streets because the Labor Government had let the Police Force run down.

Let us consider that. I come back to some of the figures presented to the Estimates Committee. The Auditor-Gen-

eral's Report (page 135) refers to police trainees, on which we questioned the Chief Secretary. It was stated that in 1978 there were 478 trainees; in 1979, 264; in 1980, 250; in 1981, 207; and in 1982, 159. What did the Chief Secretary have to say in that regard? When questioned, he stated, 'We have had a crash course of 26 weeks for 56 adults, which made up for the decrease in 1982.' The Minister did not say why the intake was reduced from 478 in 1978 to 159 in 1982.

**Mr Randall:** Yes he did. He stated that he had shortened the course. Read the report of the Committee's proceedings.

**Mr WHITTEN:** The member for Napier has told me to ignore the member from Henley Beach, but I do not intend to take that advice. I put to the member for Henley Beach that he is not being truthful. The Minister might have satisfied a Liberal, but he certainly did not satisfy the four members of the Labor Party when he said that 56 adults undertook training, because that certainly does not make up for the number that was lost and the reduction of money for training cadets.

It is not the Minister's intention to train cadets, and therefore the Police Force will not have sufficient people to service this State adequately. I am not condemning or criticising the Police Force: I believe that the South Australian Police Force is second to none, and I should have thought that every member on the Labor side complimented the Police Force on the job that it is doing. There has been a severe reduction in the number of young people who are trained to keep law and order in South Australia.

The Minister of Industrial Affairs, when introducing the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act Amendment Bill, stated that the Bill was necessary to ensure that South Australia was not subjected to corruption, that the Builders Labourers Federation did not behave in South Australia as it has behaved in other States, that the people of South Australia must be protected, and that a situation should not occur here as occurred in regard to the Painters and Dockers Union. Therefore, this Draconian Bill has been introduced. The Minister avoided direct answers to questions.

I refer now to a matter that I raised on 14 September, and I challenge the Minister to reply, because I believe that a reply should have been given in relation to Ministers being lax in answering, or perhaps avoiding answering, correspondence. I wrote to the Chief Secretary on 9 July, and by 14 September I had received no reply. In that letter I referred to a lady whose husband is in Yatala Labour Prison and who dearly wishes to have a child, because she believes that that will cement the bond between her and her husband. This lady married her husband after he had been sentenced to a life term in Yatala. The then Chief Secretary (the member for Victoria) allowed that man to leave Yatala and marry that lady at the Brompton Uniting Church.

Twenty months ago, the lady and her husband asked the Chief Secretary for permission to have a child by artificial insemination, with the husband as the donor. There had been no reply when the lady came to see me early in July. I wrote to the Minister and asked him to give his sympathetic consideration to this matter. He never replied to me. On 14 September, I raised the matter in this House at the last opportunity that I had to speak on it prior to the Estimates Committee. On 24 September, the Chief Secretary replied to me in a letter that I received on 27 September. The day before I received the letter, there was, on the front page of one edition of the *Sunday Mail* and on page 3 of another edition of the same paper, an article headed, 'I'll Fight on, vows "baby ban" Mum'. The essence of that article was that the Minister had refused permission and that either he or somebody from his office had given various reasons therefor. A section of the report states, 'Olsen: Why I said No'. It continues:

The Chief Secretary, Mr Olsen, today told why he had banned Mrs Hunt—

incidentally, that is not the name of the person; that is her maiden name—

from under-going artificial insemination. Mr Olsen confirmed that Mrs Hunt's request had been denied, claiming she and her husband (serving a life term in Yatala) were not eligible for the programme.

I will read the letter dated 24 September 1982 that the Chief Secretary sent to me and analyse it as I go through it. Addressed to me, the letter states:

Dear George, I refer to your letter of 9 July 1982 on behalf of Mrs ..... regarding her wish to have a child by artificial insemination. This request has received considerable attention from officers of the Department of Correctional Services and the South Australian Health Commission, and I must agree with the advice that I have obtained from the Minister of Health that artificial insemination by donor is a method available from obstetrics units of teaching hospitals for the purpose of infertile couples being able to have children and has not been used to overcome physical barriers such as those confronting Mrs ..... and her husband.

I said that I would analyse this letter as we went through it. That paragraph was not what was requested by the lady whose husband is in gaol. She did not request it because she or her husband were infertile: she requested it because the marriage had not been consummated and because there is no way in which it can be consummated. Hence, a request was made for her husband to go to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, give a donation of his sperm and for that lady to be inseminated by that method. The letter continues:

The fertility clinic at Queen Elizabeth Hospital provides two services: artificial insemination by donor (that is a third party donor) has a current waiting list of some 24 months. This waiting period would place Mrs ..... in an age group in which it is considered that there is some considerable danger either to the mother or to the foetus as a result of the mother's age. Artificial insemination by husband is another service offered, but this is usually only offered to males who have some problem relating to maintaining or achieving a satisfactory erection.

That is not the problem again. The problem concerns allowing a person to go to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital to donate his semen. I have made inquiries of doctors and have been told that there would be no problem, that it would require a person being at the hospital for only 20 minutes. Another way it could be done would be for the semen to be put into a tube, kept at body temperature and taken to the hospital for use in inseminating the woman. The letter further states:

Artificial insemination by husband has a much shorter waiting list but the Fertility Clinic needs proof that the husband has some physiological problem which prevents him from inseminating his wife in the normal fashion.

However, the problem referred to there is not relevant. The next paragraph states:

Under the circumstances that the . . . find themselves in they would not come under the normal criteria that would be accepted by the Fertility Clinic for the adopting of the insemination techniques as have been described. As a result of my investigations and the advice referred to above, I cannot recommend that the request for access to artificial insemination be given. Yours sincerely, (signed) John Olsen.

There are many ways to overcome the problem. First, I want to analyse the letter a little further. The Chief Secretary refers to advice that he received from the Minister of Health. I would suggest that the Minister of Health has not provided the Chief Secretary with the correct advice in relation to the problems that now confront the two people concerned. I do not believe in the relaxation of morals, and I am sure that you, Mr Deputy Speaker, are of the same opinion. However, overcoming the problem in this case does not constitute a relaxation of morals. The couple are married, and if the lady concerned is to have a child it is necessary that she have one soon as she is now 39 or 40 years old. I agree with the Minister's advice concerning the fact that

there may be problems if the person concerned delays things much longer as it may affect her own health or the health of the child that may be conceived as a result of artificial insemination.

In my opinion, it is possible that the Minister of Health might have some objection to artificial insemination on moral grounds, but I do not think that the Chief Secretary would share that view. I have been advised that in Victoria there has been a relaxation in regard to family visits, where members of the family are able to visit a prisoner and go into a private room where they are not under observation. I believe that the Chief Secretary should consider allowing that sort of humane treatment. I am not sure where we go from here, but I appeal to the Minister to be humane and not to be so tied down with the advice he has received from the Minister of Health. I have not consulted with my Party on this matter but the shadow Chief Secretary is certainly a much more humane person and will inquire into all ways and means of assisting people and meeting their needs. An article in the *Sunday Mail*, headed 'Labor backs gaol baby', states:

If Labor wins the next South Australian election, Margaret Hunt will be a happy woman. The new Government will almost certainly let her have a baby.

The article further states:

Yesterday, the shadow Chief Secretary, Mr Gavin Keneally, practically promised a Labor Government would let Margaret have her baby.

In summary, the article stated:

Mr Keneally disputed the Government's reasoning. 'I see no difficulty in allowing this artificial insemination to take place,' he said.

The part of the letter which I did not analyse referred to what the Minister had to say about jumping the queue I do not think that that is a problem. I agree that he is probably right in saying that there is a 24-month delay for a person with fertility problems. That may be the case if there is a problem in obtaining and storing sperm and getting the woman to a stage where she is able to conceive. There may be a short waiting list for husbands who have physiological problems. Something may have to be done in his case so that the sperm can be received and the woman artificially inseminated. That is not the problem in this case, and that is what the Minister has forgotten. Those physiological problems do not exist.

The final point I wish to raise on the matter concerns what Mrs Hunt was told by her husband (and this is general knowledge within the prison)—that another prisoner has been allowed this treatment. I visited the husband in Yatala Gaol and, although he cannot confirm that another person has had this treatment, the information is widespread within the gaol. I asked the Minister to examine this case and ascertain whether he can help. When we come to Government, as we most surely will, it will take some time before this procedure can take place. I therefore appeal to the Minister to make a decision now and not be stood over by the Minister of Health. He should make his own decision in relation to taking that person from Yatala to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

The person concerned has been let out of Yatala on two or three occasions; he has never been handcuffed and has been accompanied by only one warder. He has had no dogs to guard him, because he is not a violent person. I have asked the deputy gaoler whether the man is a violent person: he said that he is not violent and is trusted. I do not therefore see a problem in allowing him to give a donation of his sperm so that the lady can be inseminated and can have a child. They want a child to cement their marriage and to give him something to come out of gaol to.

It will be something that will help him through those difficult times that he will have in Yatala. If he has a child to come out to he has the incentive to behave himself and be good, so that he can be paroled early and get back to his family. There will be no problem as far as the lady is concerned. She has a home of her own, three daughters who are really lovely people and those daughters are most enthusiastic. They want their mother to have a child by her husband who is in gaol. I do not know whether the Minister is going to agree, but I earnestly appeal to him to take up this matter, and review it again so that he can say, 'Yes, you can go down to—'

**The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Glazbrook):** Order! The honourable member's time has expired. Before calling on the member for Florey, I remind honourable members that this speech is regarded as the member for Florey's maiden speech and I ask members to accord the usual custom to the member for Florey.

**Mr GREGORY (Florey):** It is a pity that a few more members are not present to hear it. In this Budget a strategy has emerged clearly and is shown throughout the papers and the Estimates, and it is a strategy to do away with work. This Government has said that it will not retrench workers. Indeed, in my occupation prior to coming to this place I had numerous meetings with Government Ministers about the employment opportunities of Government employees. The Ministers and the Premier assured me on each occasion that there would be no retrenchments, but the Government, over the period of its office, has ensured systematically that people who have retired have not been replaced in their employment. At one count early this year about 3 700 jobs had disappeared from the public sector. It was estimated at another time not long ago that 4 200 jobs had disappeared. I do not know what the real estimate is, but, frankly, 3 700 or 4 200 jobs represents a lot of work for a lot of people. If people have been displaced from these positions and no-one has replaced them it means that 3 700 or 4 200 young people, middle-aged people or people who are approaching retirement and looking for work have been denied job opportunities.

The Government has operated on the basis of saying that it would reduce the Government sector in order to encourage the private sector. One can only look at employment statistics as they apply to South Australia. During the tenure of the Government's office it has seen the rate of unemployment increase dramatically to such a level now that it is the highest that it has been since the war. I suppose that if one reversed the logic of the current Government and provided work we would have less unemployment at a greater rate. That is something to which the Government, the Premier and the Ministers should address themselves when they are responding to questions from this side of the House and when preparing the Budgets and a work programme for the forthcoming 12 months.

Early retirement has been touted as a worthwhile scheme by the Government as providing a way and means of displacing people over the age of 55 from employment with the Government. That is what it really is. It is early retirement—people being transferred from full-time employment to full-time unemployment. They are given a golden handshake so that they can exist for a short period, but then they are on the dole. If they are aged over 55 they are on the dole and unable to seek employment or to have the rewards of employment.

Members on the other side of the Chamber fail to appreciate that work and the earning of an income has a certain amount of dignity about it, and that that dignity gives people a sense of importance, a sense of living and a sense of reality. If one takes work away from those people, one

takes away their dignity, their self respect and the respect of their family.

The policies of this Government have seen the burden of austerity being thrust upon those who are least equipped to handle it, that is, the people who have very little wealth, who have few skills and are without privilege, whilst its policies have benefited the wealthy, the privileged and those with skills. It does not seem to matter to our friends on the other side of the House that the people who are being disadvantaged are those less able to look after themselves.

In the Estimates Committees in which I was involved, there was always this cut-back in work for people. One area where there was a cut-back in work was in road construction. From time to time great play is made when talking about roads being built and one can be excused for thinking that many roads are being built: that kilometre after kilometre of asphalt is being laid. But in reality each year, under this Government, fewer new roads have been put down, which means that there is more congestion and traffic delays and more frustration and accidents. All the Government can do is get a breathalizer outfit on the road to see whether accidents can be reduced. It would be put to better use if there was more construction of new roads: construction which fixed up poor intersections, dangerous bends in roads and dangerous stretches so that people could drive with greater safety.

Regarding the allocation for the O'Bahn system, this much vaunted dodgem car outfit that is to operate between Tea Tree Gully and Adelaide, the Government has yet to make up its mind where it will terminate or turn around, although Grenfell Street and Light Square is a favoured spot. In this current financial year the Government has allocated only a small sum of money, when the original plan called for \$29 000 000. This shows how little money is being allocated for work in this area.

When one looks at what is being done, it is a great show of putting down track to create the situation where the project cannot be reversed and a system where South Australia will be the State experimenting to see whether or not it works. People have seen the system as it is operating in Essen on only a short piece of track, where it is only an experimental thing. Whilst they may be enthusiastic about it, it has not been tried on a proper commercial basis as we are trying here. In reality, the Budget allocation for this year means the commencement of the O'Bahn system will be further set-back. It will arrive later than when it was planned.

In regard to industrial relations and employment, the House will find that expenditure has been reduced in real terms and that the ability of inspectors to move about and inspect what they are supposed to inspect has been reduced. I believe that the current economic trouble we are experiencing is a period when there should be more inspectors, and for very good reasons. The area of industrial and commercial training provides the basis for the revival of this State's economy.

It depends upon skilled, trained and competent people. If that area is not properly policed and if employers are not properly supervised and encouraged to provide proper and adequate training, we will find that the people being trained are not being trained adequately.

We will find that they will not be able to use those skills when we work our way out of the economic crisis that we are facing. It is important that employers who do the right thing in relation to training apprentices and other workers are encouraged to continue to do it. That encouragement includes the detection of sharp practices in the training area and, if necessary, the prosecution of employers who do not do the right thing.

I refer to hairdressers who instruct their apprentice hairdressers to take their annual leave when they attend block

release training. There are hairdressers who dismiss out of hand apprentices simply because they do not like them; those hairdressers reject the advice of inspectors to reinstate the apprentices. It is not possible for the department, because of a lack of knowledge or because of the poor drafting of the Act or the poor training of inspectors, or because they are so overworked, to secure the proper prosecution of these offenders. In fact, it is argued by some people that that should not happen.

Hairdressing is one of the most competitive industries in this State. Those hairdressers who believe in providing skilled people for the industry need to be protected from the sharp operators, because apprentice hairdressers are a very important economic part of that industry. That also applies in relation to the training of apprentices in other industries.

It also means that, if the Industrial Commercial Training Commission is to live up to the requirements of the Act (which means that it will have wider powers than those relating to apprentice training and will include other training areas, resulting in all workers in this State becoming skilled in one way or another) more of these people will be required to move around more often. Inspectors are restricted in their movements at the moment.

I refer to occupational safety and health. I suppose one advantage or by-product from high unemployment in this State is that fewer people will be injured at work. However, that is not really the point of the exercise. More inspectors are required, because in times of an economic downturn, there is less competition, particularly in the building industry where many workers and contractors work for less than award wages. They are working for such low contracts that they are unable to replace their capital equipment. They are gradually going broke and using all the shortcuts in the world. If more inspectors were available there would be better safety on the job and fewer people would be injured.

There is also another area where less work is being done; that is, in relation to compliance with awards made by the State Industrial Commission. Some people might think that that is not very necessary. However, it is very important. Many employers do the right thing in the work situation, pay the award wages and ensure that their workers are looked after properly, and they compete with unscrupulous exploiters of workers who try to pay below the award, who try to provide less than the minimum conditions, who take all the shortcuts and use all the tricks they can to oppress workers. These employers should be prosecuted for non-compliance.

Inspectors should be provided to go around and inspect the books and provide that protection. The other day the Minister of Industrial Affairs introduced a Bill to amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act. That Bill supports people who do not want to join unions and it supports people who want to stay out of unions.

Penalties have been provided for those people who try to persuade others to join unions. However, at no stage has the Minister provided penalties for people who urge others not to be in unions and who place obstacles in the way of unionists, shop stewards and officials who are trying to recruit workers. Those people do that so that more employers can avoid their responsibility to pay appropriate award wages and to provide appropriate conditions of employment.

I turn now to occupational safety and health. Unfortunately, we have seen in this House the frustration caused by this lack of inspection and enforcement, when a member of the public thought that he might be doing the correct thing by throwing some asbestos around this place. One has merely to think about this matter. The present safe working condition for asbestos is one fibre per cubic centilitre of air. A fibre has to be more than 5 microns long before it is measured. If the level was kept at that minimum in a

normal working atmosphere for eight hours, a worker breathing normally would be expected to breathe in between 5 000 000 and 8 000 000 fibres during an eight-hour shift. One can only imagine if someone breaths in between 5 000 000 and 8 000 000 fibres, not all those fibres will be expelled and that quite a few will stay in that person's lungs. This means that such a worker will suffer from inhaling those fibres, eventually get asbestosis, possibly get cancer and suffer an early death. That is inexcusable.

In the position that I held prior to coming to this place, I had occasion to inspect factories and demolition sites where asbestos was being removed. The gentleman who painted the old West End brewery in the Norwood Football Club colours before the grand final, and his servants, were a bit blase about the asbestos around the South Australian Brewing Company's West End building. If any member of this House was there at that time he would have wondered what all the fuss was about. One must realise that asbestos fibres were laying there inert, not doing anybody any harm. I suppose the natural reaction was to ask what harm it would do, because it was just a little bit.

One must realise that that little bit can be damn dangerous. We have found asbestos contaminated material from that site was improperly carted and dumped, and that it had to be excavated from the dumping site and redumped in an approved and proper place. We are confronted with a situation where this Government has no apparent remedy to ensure that, when asbestos is moved from a site to a dump, it is done safely. So many Acts and regulations must be considered that if, in the confusion, people decide not to comply with the rules and regulations the penalties involved are so small that they do not matter. There needs to be inspectors to ensure compliance with these rules. The Minister has said that when anybody starts dismantling anything with asbestos in it the department must be involved. What happens if the department is not advised? What happens if it does not know what is happening? The trade union people find out about it, and they are usually the first on the site. In an area where death can be caused so easily, the departmental representative should be on site first.

Reading *Hansard* prior to coming into this place, I noticed that, in response to a question from the member for Mitcham, the Minister referred to the high workers compensation premiums and indicated that it had occurred because of the defeat of certain proposals put forward by the Government. The Minister implied that, if those proposals had been accepted, the premiums would not have been so high. I read it with some amazement, because I would have thought that the Minister would have had a bit more sense than to make those comments.

Workers compensation premiums in South Australia have been kept low because of competition. Employers have hopped from one insurance company to another when the premiums became a bit high and, because of the competition for business, the companies accepted lower premiums. The premiums were therefore kept artificially low, and workers compensation payments have also been kept artificially low since 1974; when they were doubled, in reality, they were still 12 per cent to 15 per cent lower than what they should have been.

The Minister should have acknowledged that there have been problems in regard to premiums and that the companies are increasing premiums to catch up their profitability. Super penalties should have been placed on companies which do not and will not implement safety programmes and which do not seem to care whether people are injured and how many people are hurt. If the premiums were kept up, we would find that sooner or later someone would say to the managers, 'You had better do something about the aspect of the costs of the company, because they are too high.'



Only then would the injury rate decrease and only then would the premiums come down.

As I said earlier in this place, that was never more illustrated than in the timber industry: there was a reduction of premiums in regard to the tree felling industry in the South-East, which is one of the most dangerous industries on a par with British Columbia. It is recognised that tree felling is dangerous, but a proper safety programme reduced injuries and premiums were halved. If it happened in that case, why cannot it happen elsewhere? Why cannot other employers act in regard to safety? This Government, in the interests of economy, has even determined not to introduce regulations in regard to farm tractors, because it would cost too much. We find that, before those regulations are implemented, more people will die, and that is not good enough. At times the price that has to be paid is money well spent if lives are saved.

One other area of Government spending that I criticise is in the provision of funds in relation to women's shelters and the work undertaken to protect women's rights. If ever there was an oppressed group in our community in our work force, it is female workers. They occupy the six lowest paid and lowest skilled classifications in the industry; they are the last to be put on and the first to be put off; and they are looked upon as dispensable. At one time women were blamed for youth unemployment and unemployment generally. However, women perform a very valuable service in our society. If women are ill treated at home, they seek refuge in a shelter, but the Government is reducing the funds in that area.

A very small amount of money is involved in the overall Budget, but we find also that the Working Women's Centre funding has been cut in real terms. People seem to wonder why we need this? We need it for a very simple reason. The working side of our life is dominated by males: male managers, male employers, male supervisors and male union officials. Females will not talk to strange males or people who to them are strangers about problems that concern them. Indeed, many of them will not even talk to their husbands about problems they are having at work. It is only when one has some understanding of these problems and when one is very blunt and very direct with questions that one understands what are their problems.

The Working Women's Centre has to fill a very real need in this area, and one of its current campaigns relates to tenosynovitis, which some doctors seem to say does not exist. For people who work in any industry which requires repetitive action with very little change in the work they

do, it becomes very real. I can give an example. In Melbourne an organiser of the Metal Workers Union was talking to women at the Ericsson factory about the problems that they were having with tenosynovitis. A Southern European woman with large breasts was told by the organiser that she should loosen her brassiere so that the restriction around her shoulders and chest would lessen, and that would ease her problem. That night the organiser was confronted by a rather angry husband, who claimed that he was trying to feel his wife's breasts. That was because of the inability of the woman to understand the English language being used by the organiser, and his inability to communicate in Italian.

The Working Women's Centre if properly staffed would be able to overcome those problems, such embarrassing situations would not arise, and people could be told without any embarrassment the best way to work and the best way to approach their working life so that they would not be maimed for ever. This seems to miss some people when we talk about tenosynovitis. Properly managed factories do not have that problem to the degree that others have. Caring managers ensure that duties are rotated; people do not have these repetitious jobs for hours on end so these injuries do not occur. They go out of their way to ensure that people who do suffer from these injuries are able to recover properly before they go back to work: others could not care less, do not understand, and do not want to understand.

It is my belief that there should be more education in this area and one of the ways for education to happen is for the Working Women's Centre to be provided with more funds so that it can assist workers and employers to have a better understanding of the problems of women at work, so that they can take their proper place in our community. One has only to look at the study done by Professor Emery into women at work entitled, 'I would not want my wife to work'. I think it is very real. None of us would want our wives or female friends to work in the areas where thousands of South Australian women are now working. I am of the view that the Government should be providing more assistance than it is providing. This Budget fails to provide for that.

Mr LANGLEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 11.10 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 6 October at 2 p.m.

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 5 October 1982

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

## VEHICLE SAFETY CHECKS

79. Mr LYNN ARNOLD (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Is the Government considering legislation for compulsory annual vehicle safety checks (as occurs in New Zealand) and, if so, is it anticipated that the service arrangements will be handled by Government depots or private operators?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: No.

## CAR REGISTRATION CONCESSIONS

80. Mr LYNN ARNOLD (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Will the Minister consider giving concessions on car registrations to unemployed persons who live in areas not serviced by public transport so that they may more easily seek work and, if not, why not?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The Department for community Welfare issues travel concession cards for unemployed persons and dependent spouses. An unemployed person whom is referred to an employer, by the Commonwealth Employment Service, can be supplied with a travel warrant, for travel on public transport, to attend a specific interview or interviews. No assistance is available, for an unemployed person, for travel in areas not served by public transport. A relocation assistance scheme, operated by the Commonwealth Government, can assist an unemployed person to relocate to another area, where he can be gainfully employed, by reimbursing the costs of transferring to the new employment.

Concessions are only granted to the registered owner of a motor vehicle where that motor vehicle would be used wholly or mainly for a specified purpose for which the concession is granted. Motor vehicles owned by unemployed persons would probably be used for a variety of purposes other than seeking employment. Below are listed sample costs of running a small motor vehicle without taking into consideration repayments, loss of interest, depreciation, etc.:

Registration . . . . .	65 cents per week
Third Party Insurance . . . . .	\$1.92 per week (country premium)
Comprehensive Insurance . . . . .	\$2.85 per week (based on \$200 premium)
Petrol . . . . .	\$7.90 per week (39.5c x 20 litres)

Reducing the registration content by 50 per cent would have little effect on the running costs of a small motor vehicle.

## SHOPPING CENTRE PARKING AREAS

95. Mr TRAINER (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment and Planning:

1. What specifications are laid down for the planning of shopping centre parking lots to ensure—

- the smooth flow from the individual parking bays into the various 'feeder' laneways within the car park;
- the smooth flow from these 'feeder' laneways into the main lane leading to the car park exit; and
- the flow of traffic out from the car park exit into the nearest road,

and what equivalent specifications exist for entrance into such car parks?

2. Do those specifications have in mind the non-existence of any personnel located in the car park to direct traffic when the car park is particularly congested?

3. Do the planning regulations for such car parks require consultation to take place with the appropriate authorities so as to ensure that traffic emerging from a car park on to a minor road has the opportunity to then move forward on to an appropriate major road without creating further local congestion?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1. There are no specifications in planning regulations for governing the design and operational management of parking lots in those shopping centre proposals which require the planning consent of the local authority. In such cases the council may refuse the proposal altogether or may specify any layout requirements it considers appropriate; but its decision is subject to an appeal by the applicant or by affected neighbours.

A different situation applies where a shopping centre proposal is a 'permitted use', e.g. if it is located in a shopping zone and if it meets the general layout requirements listed in regulation 18 of the council's zoning regulations. In these cases a minimum provision of seven accessible car parking spaces is required for each 100 square metres of total floor area in the centre. However, this specified parking provision is subject to the council giving a certificate that it is satisfied that:

- a suitable area has been provided for the loading and unloading of service and commercial vehicles and for the storage and collection of refuse; and
- the number, location and design of access points to a road and the design, layout and pavement of the parking area have been established so as best to ensure the safety of the public and the free flow of traffic in the locality.

2. There is no requirement under the regulations for personnel to be stationed in car parks to direct the movement of traffic within or out of those car parks. The requirement for all car parking spaces to be accessible is intended to ensure smooth flow from individual parking bays into the feeder laneways within the parking area.

3. Where an application involves access from a parking area onto a main road, councils are required to consult with the Commissioner of Highways and to take his requirements into consideration before a certificate of access is issued to the developer. For other categories of road, councils are not required to consult with the Commissioner, but must still furnish a certificate of access before the development can proceed. The certificate of access is issued only when councils are satisfied that proposed access arrangements will ensure the free flow of traffic in the locality.

## SHOPPING CENTRE CAR PARKS

96. Mr TRAINER (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What consultation takes place with the relevant planning authorities and with the persons constructing and operating shopping centre car parks, to ensure that the exits and entrances, the internal roadways and the roads in the vicinity of the car park, are capable of handling the amounts of traffic likely to be generated by those shopping centres or, in the case of West Lakes, by adjacent sporting venues?

2. What special arrangements are put into effect to cater for traffic in the West Lakes area for minor round matches and special events (such as the 17 May interstate match), respectively?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Regulations under the Planning and Development Act, 1966-1981, require a council to certify its satisfaction that the access points and parking layout associated with certain classes of development, including shopping centres and sporting facilities, will ensure the safety of the public and the free flow of traffic in the locality.

2. Because of the increased traffic concentration attracted to the location on such occasions, a master traffic control plan has been devised to ensure a speedy return to normal traffic flow at the conclusion of a particular event. This plan incorporates a variety of contingency measures geared to cope with the size of the crowd on a particular occasion. When the crowd is in excess of 20 000, the State Rescue Helicopter is used for aerial observations of traffic flow and to provide directions to traffic police on the ground.

As a general rule, the plan has been successful in effecting clearance of traffic in the area within half an hour to one hour of the conclusion of an event, depending on vehicular traffic density. Continuing dialogue is maintained between the relevant authorities, viz. Football Park Management, the State Transport Authority, the Highways Department and the police, with a view to maintaining control of the situation.

#### MINISTERIAL STAFF

125. **Mr PLUNKETT** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. Has Mr Bruce Edwards, formerly of the staff of the Minister of Transport, been transferred to another Minister and, if so, is he now a public servant or a Ministerial employee, what were his duties and what are they now, and has there been an alteration in his salary?

2. Has Mr David Phelps, formerly of the staff of the Minister of Health, been transferred to another Minister and, if so, is he now a public servant or a Ministerial employee, what were his duties and what are they now, and has there been an alteration in his salary?

3. Has Mr Robert Nicholls, formerly of the staff of the Premier, been transferred to another Minister and, if so, is he now a public servant or a Ministerial employee, what were his duties and what are they now, and has there been an alteration in his salary?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The replies are as follows:

1. Yes, as a Ministerial employee. His former duties were to carry out the instructions of the Minister. His present duties are as above. He is paid at the rate for a Ministerial officer.

2. No. His services as a Ministerial employee were terminated on 2 July 1982. He has been appointed to a temporary part-time position under the Public Service Act following a general call on the Public Service Board Weekly Notice. His former duties were to carry out the instructions of the Minister. He is presently employed as a part-time projects research officer. There has been a substantial decrease in Mr Phelps' salary.

3. No.

#### PORT AUGUSTA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

128. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What plans are in hand or proposed for the reconstruction of parts of the Port Augusta Community College involved with metal work, when will such plans be put into effect, and what will be the cost?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The Department of Technical and Further Education as part of its Triennial Planning Submission for 1982-84 to the Federal Technical and Further

Education Council (TAFEC) submitted a proposal to upgrade and expand college accommodation and in particular the metal trades facilities. The proposal envisaged a concentrated redevelopment on the existing site. TAFEC did not approve the original proposal because of the existing site constraints and compactness of the scheme and suggested that adjoining land be acquired for college redevelopment purposes. In effect, TAFEC indicated that the land question must first be resolved before an amended project is submitted for approval.

Subsequently, investigations were undertaken by the Department of Technical and Further Education and the Port Augusta College Council into options relating to college redevelopment and acquisition of land. The most effective and economic solution was to acquire the adjoining site occupied by the Port Augusta Netball Association and relocate their facilities elsewhere in Port Augusta at the department's expense. Negotiations to purchase Australian National (rail) land for the relocation exercise are currently in progress. Provision has been made for the land purchase during the 1982-83 Loan Works Programme. This land will be given to the Port Augusta City Council and it is expected that it will be leased to the Netball Association.

The plans can only be put into effect following the relocation of the Netball Association and a financial commitment from TAFEC can be obtained. The current departmental loan works programme based on expected levels of funding from all sources is fully committed until 1984-85. The total proposal (including metal work) as submitted in the Triennial Planning Submission for 1982-84 was estimated to cost \$5 000 000 (December 1979). This proposal will require revision as to size and, consequently, cost. Revision of the proposal in relation to size and cost is not scheduled to be carried out until December 1982.

#### ABORIGINAL YOUTH SERVICES

132. **Mr ABBOTT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs: Are the discussions between the Minister and the Federal Minister for Aboriginal Affairs on the issue of the Aboriginal youth services programmes finalised and, if so, when does the Minister intend to make a report available to the House as promised?

**The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD:** As stated in the initial response to the honourable member's question asked on 21 July 1982, this matter is still under consideration by the Federal Minister of Aboriginal Affairs after a further written approach was made on this matter on 2 June 1982.

#### ABORIGINAL YOUTH SERVICES

135. **Mr ABBOTT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs: What additional assistance by way of sporting institutions and sporting facilities have been provided in the area of Aboriginal youth services as discussed with the Federal Minister for Aboriginal Affairs?

**The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD:** Refer to reply for Question on Notice No. 132.

#### GLADSTONE RAIL SERVICE

138. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Is it a fact that the Government has withdrawn its objections to the closure of the Adelaide to Gladstone rail passenger services and, if so—

(a) why;

(b) how many district councils have been consulted and what was the attitude of each council;

(c) were the appropriate rail unions consulted and, if so, what were the reactions of each union and, if not, why not; and

(d) what alternative modes of transport are to be utilised to service patrons of the existing rail service, when will such alternative transport come into operation and who will operate it?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows:

(a) The South Australian Government has negotiated a settlement with the Commonwealth Government, which has undertaken that no railway employee would be disadvantaged as a result of changes to passenger services between Adelaide and Gladstone.

(b) Ten Councils were consulted. Five councils lodged a written submission, of which three councils stated that a suitable bus service would be a reasonable alternative to rail service.

(c) The Australian Railways Union assisted in preparing objections.

(d) A licensed bus service will replace the existing rail service. A number of applications have been received from bus companies; no licensee has been selected and no commencement date has been set.

#### BIRDWOOD PRIMARY SCHOOL

148. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. What proposals are in hand concerning the future of the Birdwood Primary School?

2. When are any such proposals to be effected and at what cost?

3. When was the first consideration given by the Department of Public Works or the Education Department to the need for alterations?

**The Hon H. ALLISON:** The replies are as follows:

1. It is proposed to redevelop Birdwood Primary School on the grounds of the Birdwood High School using the existing Pflaum House as part of the new accommodation and sharing some facilities with the high school. It is further proposed that the existing Birdwood Primary School buildings and grounds will be declared surplus to Education Department requirements.

2. Construction is proposed in the 1982-83 and 1983-84 financial years. As of April 1982 the building costs associated with the redevelopment of the primary school are estimated to be \$640 000 with an estimated further \$168 000 to be spent to convert an existing building for joint use library/resource facilities.

3. The Education Department has been considering various proposals relating to the upgrading of Birdwood Primary School since a request for a new site was received from the Secretary of the School Council on 24 February 1974. This request was referred to the Public Buildings Department for investigation on 14 May 1974. The current proposals were presented to the Parliamentary Public Works Standing Committee in July 1982.

#### ITINERANT TEACHERS

157. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Was a commitment given by the Education Department that itinerant teachers employed by the department would be allocated three transfer points per year and, if so, by whom and when is it proposed to be implemented?

2. How many points are presently allocated?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The replies are as follows:

1. No commitment was given by the Education Department that itinerant teachers would be allocated three transfer points per year.

2. Itinerant teachers will gain the transfer points appropriate to the locality of their school.

#### RAIL SERVICES

162. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Is it the intention of the S.T.A. to cease operating any portion of rail passenger services between Glanville and Outer Harbor and, if so—

(a) when;

(b) what services will be reduced and why in each case;

(c) what portion of the track, if any, will be transferred to the A.N.R. and under what conditions; and

(d) what financial benefits will accrue to South Australia?

2. Is it the intention of the S.T.A. to alter the role of public transport on the LeFevre Peninsula and, if so, why and what services (bus and rail) will be affected?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. No.

2. No.

#### S.T.A. BUILDINGS

163. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Does the Government intend to either sell or lease (and which) any S.T.A. buildings or properties within the next 12 months and, if so, which buildings or properties, and to whom in each case?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The State Transport Authority will continue its practice of disposing of its surplus property, giving regard to the possible future requirements for the land and or buildings for transport or other Government or community purposes. If a property is not required, then it is offered for sale by public tender or auction. Houses are generally offered to tenants before offering them to Government departments and instrumentalities.

The authority endeavours to lease its surplus properties at commercial rates until disposal can be finalised. Until such time as a contract for sale has been entered into, the authority is unable to nominate who will purchase its properties. During the 1981-82 financial year, the authority sold 110 properties and it is expected that a similar rate of disposal will continue for the next two years.

#### ENERGY INFORMATION CENTRE

166. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy:

1. How many people are employed in the Energy Information centre?

2. What were the costs of the centre in the year 1981-82 for—

(a) salaries;

(b) rent;

(c) travel;

(d) printing; and

(e) miscellaneous items?

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The replies are as follows:

1. Three.

2. (a) \$60 900.
- (b) \$34 000.
- (c) \$2 567.
- (d) \$3 156.
- (e) \$49 377.

#### NEW ZEALAND RECEPTION

169. Mr SLATER (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism:

1. What was the total cost of the reception given by South Australia at Christchurch, New Zealand, for delegates attending the annual conference of the Australian Federation of Travel Agents?

2. What officers of the Department of Tourism attended the reception and who accompanied them?

3. Was the cost of the trip borne by the Government and, if so, what was the total cost?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Approximately \$40 000 funded on a co-operative basis between the Department of Tourism, the South Australian Association of Regional Tourist Organisations and other business interests in South Australia. It is not possible to quote a more precise figure related specifically to this event, as a considerable part of the expenditure was incurred in provision of material with multiple uses during the overall continuing campaign in New Zealand.

2. Mr G. J. Inns, Director of Tourism, Mr A. B. Noblet, Director of Marketing, Mr L. J. Penley, Director, Development and Regional Liaison, and Mr R. J. Bulfield, Public Relations Officer. They were accompanied by the following registered delegates from South Australia:

Mr J. Amer	Mr E. Jones
Mr W. Anthony	Ms R. Keane
Mr P. Benson	Ms S. Mulraney
Ms B. Blackwell	Mr P. Owen
Mr H. Briscoe	Mr S. Pain
Mrs W. Chapman	Ms C. Pickering
Ms S. Clark	Mr D. Rasheed
Mr V. Diletto	Ms C. Schultz
Mr R. Francis	Mrs E. Sharman
Mr B. George	Mr John Williams
Mr G. Ingham	Mrs J. Williams

3. The Government met the costs associated with the attendance by the Minister and the four officers of the Department of Tourism only. Total costs of air fares and accommodation for those five persons was \$6 439.

#### CAR PARKS

170. Mr LYNN ARNOLD (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment and Planning: Has the Department of Environment and Planning ever undertaken any studies on the impact or the amenity of shopping centre car parks and, if so, what recommendations have arisen from such work designed to reduce any negative impact of such car parks and what action has been taken on such recommendations?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The Department of Environment and Planning and the former Department of Urban and Regional Affairs have undertaken several studies on the impact and amenity of shopping centre car parks. In particular, during 1979 studies were undertaken in association with traffic engineering consultant, Shane P. Foley, and planning consultants, Brian Turner and Associates, in relation to traffic generation, access to shopping centres on arterial roads, shopping centre car parking standards and guidelines for the design of shopping centre car parking areas.

Recommendations from these studies included proposals for the amount of car parking required, design and layout to improve efficiency and reduce visual impact and landscaping to improve appearance and provide shade. The results and recommendations for the studies are incorporated in two significant planning documents. The first is the supplementary development plan for metropolitan centres, authorised in December 1980, which includes specific development principles for parking and landscaping in order to reduce any negative impact.

The second is the centre and shopping development guidelines for the metropolitan planning area, prepared by the Department of Environment and Planning in consultation with a retail consultative committee. The booklet was endorsed and released by the State Planning Authority in December 1981 and amongst other things provides written and graphic advice on car park design and layout in order to minimise any adverse impacts. The supplementary development plan and other authorised centres plans for individual council areas have now been consolidated into the Development Plan and are used in the approval process for new shopping centre proposals. The guidelines booklet has had widespread distribution and is available to assist in the better design of car parking arrangements for new and redeveloped centres.

#### FARMING COLLECTIVES

173. Mr LYNN ARNOLD (on notice) asked the Premier: Does the Government support any farming collectives that are designed to assist unemployed people or welfare recipients and, if so, which, through what Ministries and how much is involved in each case?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** It is not understood exactly what is meant by the term 'farming collectives'. However, Minda Incorporated, which is deficit funded by the S.A. Health Commission under the Minister of Health, has for many years conducted a farm, 'Craigburn', at Coromandel Valley to provide activity therapy for approximately 40 persons. Funding is provided on the basis of the total entity, without any specific allocation to Craigburn.

#### NON-SMOKING AREAS

174. Mr LYNN ARNOLD (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: What consideration has been given to requiring the provision of non-smoking areas in waiting rooms at hospitals?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** It is the policy of the South Australian Health Commission to actively encourage hospitals, health centres and other health units to develop by-laws or rules to prevent smoking in any area open to the public, including waiting rooms. The success of the commission's anti-smoking policy is evidenced by the fact that of six major metropolitan general hospitals surveyed, four prohibit smoking in all waiting areas, and one has made provision for non-smokers in some areas, subject to the limitations of space.

The remaining hospital is currently reviewing its policy concerning smoking within the hospital. On the basis of this survey, the commission is satisfied that the needs of non-smokers in hospitals are being adequately attended to.

#### PORT WAKEFIELD ROAD

175. Mr LYNN ARNOLD (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Has consideration been given by the Highways

Department to constructing a cut-through on the Port Wakefield Road median strip to facilitate traffic entering and leaving Burton Road, Burton and, if not, why not and what alternatives are available for minimising difficulties faced by long vehicles transporting materials from Pipeline Engineering Pty Ltd for infrastructure development of the Moomba gasfields?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The Corporation of the City of Salisbury and the Highways Department are presently examining plans for upgrading the Port Wakefield Road/Burton Road junction, including an opening in the Port Wakefield Road median to facilitate the movement of traffic entering and leaving Burton Road. It is anticipated that the work will be carried out this financial year.\*

### ADELAIDE AIRPORT

176. **Mr PLUNKETT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What type of aircraft will be permitted to use the Adelaide Airport runways following the establishment of international facilities?

2. What restrictions will be placed on aircraft with respect to—

- (a) passenger loads;
- (b) cargo loads; and
- (c) fuel loads?

3. What is the length of the runways at Adelaide Airport that will be used for international aircraft and what are to be the proposed maximum take off distances for the various aircraft types subject to the restrictions with respect to passenger, cargo and fuel loads?

4. At the closest point, what distance from houses, workplaces and public thoroughfares will be the international aircraft arriving and departing Adelaide Airport?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. All aircraft whose pavement loading characteristics do not exceed the designed pavement strength may use the main 05/23 runway. In general, aircraft up to B747 category will use Adelaide Airport.

2. The international terminal has been designed to handle one B747 full load of passengers (approximately 430 passengers) to normal levels of service. The main 05/23 runway has a fixed length. It is the airline/pilots responsibility to calculate the aircraft all up weight and ensure that it does not exceed the performance criteria for a safe take off for the available runway length and ambient weather conditions prevailing.

3. The main 05/23 runway at Adelaide Airport is 2 528 metres in length. The maximum runway length will be available to all aircraft.

4. The nearest houses from the International apron will be 400 m to the north-west of Brooklyn Park. The nearest houses east of runway 23 threshold will be approximately 325 m at West Richmond. International aircraft will be no closer to the nearest houses than domestic aircraft have been for a number of years.

### OVERSEAS CONSULTANCIES

179. **Mr SLATER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism:

1. What payments have been made by the Government to the former Director of Tourism, Mr Joselin, regarding his retainment as a consultant in the United Kingdom?

2. What consultancies has Mr Joselin undertaken in the United Kingdom or Europe on behalf of the Government?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. \$9 821.80.

2. (a) investigated the operations of a number of British airports as part of a general review the Department of Transport is making on the economics of airport ownership and operations.

(b) represented the Government and participated in the preparation of promotional material for a number of companies in connection with the introduction of direct flights from the United Kingdom into Adelaide.

(c) attended and assisted with the setting up and maintenance of South Australia's booth at the Internationale Tourismus Borse (I.T.B.) in Berlin.

(d) undertaken an analysis of the tourist market in the United Kingdom, as it applies to South Australia, and prepared recommendations for its servicing.

(e) prepared a report on a possible general sales agent for South Australia in the United Kingdom.

### JETTIES

180. **Mr PETERSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Marine: In relation to the Semaphore and Largs Bay jetties—

(a) what maintenance has been carried out on each jetty in the past five years;

(b) what has been the cost for labour and materials, respectively, for each in that period;

(c) what maintenance is planned for each;

(d) are they considered 'safe';

(e) is the Minister aware of their condition and state of repair; and

(f) what is the Government's policy towards them?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows:

(a) Repairs have been made to decking, handrails, seats and lighting. Fixtures such as handrails and seats have been painted, and lifebuoys and ropes have been replaced.

(b) Prior to 1980 the costs of such minor works at metropolitan jetties were not recorded separately. Costs since that time were:

	1980-81 \$	1981-82 \$
Semaphore . . . . .	1 049	1 876
Largs Bay . . . . .	2 853	995

It is estimated that labour would have accounted for approximately 50 per cent of those costs. Materials and plant hire made up the remainder.

(c) Repairing and painting of handrails and seats, repairing decking where necessary, and repairs to the shelter shed on the Largs Bay jetty.

(d) Yes.

(e) Yes.

(f) The present policy in regard to these jetties is that which applies to all similar recreational jetties, i.e. that local councils should accept some measure of responsibility for administration and day to day responsibility for any major repairs, on an 80/20 basis.

### ABORIGINAL SCHOOLS

183. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Regarding Aboriginal schools, in each of the past five years what were—

(a) the number of such schools;

(b) the F.T.E. teacher numbers in such schools;

(c) the February and September enrolments, respectively; Commonwealth money and by the State Government, respectively?  
 and  
 (d) the F.T.E. ancillary staff numbers paid for by specific **The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The reply is as follows:

Aboriginal Schools

Year	No. of schools	Teacher Nos. F.T.E.	Enrolments		Ancillary Staff Nos. Commonwealth Funded	State Funded
			Feb.	Sept.		
1978	(a) 11	(b) 65.5	978	(c) 941	42.4	(d) 5.9
1979	13	63.7	983	1 014	44.4	5.4
1980	13	66.6	974	978	44.4	5.4
1981	13	67.0	847.8	927.3	38.0	5.3
1982	13	67.3	855	Not available	41.78	6.3

COMMUNITY WELFARE SERVICES

185. **Mr ABBOTT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health representing the Minister of Community Welfare:

1. What specific staff changes have occurred in the Department for Community Welfare that have resulted in the considerable difficulty in maintaining an office duty service at the Hindmarsh branch?

2. Does 'staff changes' mean the recent reduction in staff numbers?

3. Does 'office duty periods' mean the only times when the office will be attended?

4. What services are offered to the residents of Hindmarsh on the other four half-day and one full day periods?

5. What does 'availability of staff from the Woodville District Office to assist in times of need' actually mean?

6. Will there be particular staff allocated to the Hindmarsh area or will all the Woodville staff be used for office duty at various times?

7. Will the staff allocated have special areas of responsibility as in the past, e.g. youth, migrants, etc.?

8. How many Hindmarsh branch office staff have been representatives on local community committees, advisory groups, etc.?

9. Will the system allow for a pool of staff to share the valuable community involvement aspect which has occurred in Hindmarsh to date?

10. Has the use of community aids ceased altogether, or is it likely to be reintroduced from Woodville?

11. Is the population of about 12 000 people currently serviced by Hindmarsh branch office increasing or decreasing?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Two staff transferred over period of six months. Replaced with some minor delay. Difficulties have been experienced during sickness and annual leave absences.

2. No.

3. No.

4. Appointments are made for general services. Urgent matters are referred to the Woodville district office.

5. To maintain staff level.

6. Woodville staff will be requested as required.

7. Community welfare workers are expected to provide general services. Some have particular responsibilities as well.

8. Four.

9. Yes.

10. Has not ceased.

11. Increasing because of changed boundaries.

BIRTHS

189. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Premier: When will the indices for births registered in South Australia between 1842 and 1878 be made available for public perusal?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Copies of the indexes to the birth registrations for 1842-1878 will be available to the public, once they have been microfilmed. It is envisaged that this stage of the microfilming programme will be completed in mid 1983.

ROAD ACCIDENTS

191. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: At each of the following sites—

(a) the junction of the southbound carriageway of Port Wakefield Road and the north-east-bound carriageway feeding Salisbury Highway;

(b) the merging of the southbound carriageway of Salisbury Highway with the southbound carriageway of Port Wakefield Road;

(c) the junction of Port Wakefield Road and Churchill Road extension; and

(d) the junction of Main North Road and Warrendi Road, in each of the past six years—

(i) what were the number of reported accidents;

(ii) what were the number of fatalities resulting from those accidents;

(iii) how many of those injured were hospitalised;

(iv) how many vehicles were involved;

(v) how many times were traffic signal standards damaged; and

(vi) how many times were street light standards damaged?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows:

(a) Port Wakefield Road/Salisbury Highway junction

Year	(i)	(ii)	(iii)	(iv)	(v)	(vi)
1976	15	1	—	31	—	1
1977	14	1	2	27	1	—
1978	16	—	2	34	—	—
1979	12	—	—	23	1	—
1980	21	—	8	40	2	1
1981	11	—	2	18	1	2
1982	7	2	7	16	—	—

(To 30 June)

(b) Port Wakefield Road/Salisbury Highway merging

Year	(i)	(ii)	(iii)	(iv)	(v)	(vi)
1976	28	—	—	56	—	2
1977	20	—	—	45	—	—
1978	10	—	1	20	—	—
1979	18	—	—	38	—	—
1980	2	—	1	5	—	—
1981	6	—	—	13	—	—
1982	3	—	—	7	—	—

(To 30 June)

*(c)* Port Wakefield Road/Churchill Road extension

Year	(i)	(ii)	(iii)	(iv)	(v)	(vi)
1976	8	—	1	16	—	—
1977	20	1	3	42	—	1
1978	15	—	—	30	—	—
1979	25	—	2	51	—	—
1980	12	—	—	24	—	—
1981	10	—	1	21	—	—
1982	6	—	1	13	—	—
(To 30 June)						

*(d)* Main North Road/Warrendi Road junction

Year	(i)	(ii)	(iii)	(iv)	(v)	(vi)
1976	9	1	5	16	—	—
1977	5	—	—	10	—	—
1978	—	—	—	—	—	—
1979	5	—	1	10	—	—
1980	1	—	—	2	—	—
1981	4	1	1	7	—	1
1982	1	—	—	2	—	—
(To 30 June)						

Note: Up until 31.3.80, motorists were required to report property damage only accidents where the estimated cost exceeded \$100. This amount was increased to \$300 as from 1.4.80.

1.	Candidates fees (a)	S.A. Govt. Grant (b)	N.T. Govt Grant (c)	Sundry Receipts (d)
1977-78	\$64 001	\$488 245	*\$11 000 (C/W Govt.)	\$25 314
1978-79	\$61 453	\$529 655	*\$19 200 (C/W Govt.)	\$25 849
1979-80	\$61 323	\$555 309	\$21 000 (N.T. Govt.)	\$26 268
1980-81	\$59 089	\$603 184	\$25 540 (N.T. Govt.)	\$27 920
1981-82	\$55 505	\$660 669	\$23 150 (N.T. Govt.)	\$36 358

## 2. Candidate entry fee \$1.

Subject entry fee \$1.25 i.e. \$7.25 for a five subjects examination.

3. \*Years 1977-78 and 1978-79—Estimated cost to conduct Northern Territory Examinations. Paid by Commonwealth Government.

Years 1979-80—1980-81—1981-82 Budget presented to Northern Territory Government, increased each year by approximately 10 per cent c.o.l.

The budget for the Northern Territory is calculated on the following basis:

- Supervising and making examiners' fees for candidates in the Northern Territory.
- General costs—computing, printing, telephone, postal and freight.
- P.E.B. staff visits to the Education Department and schools. Travel and accommodation.
- Art Moderator's visit to Northern Territory. Travel and accommodation.
- Oral Examiner's and Music Practical Examiner's visit to Northern Territory. Travel and accommodation.
- Marking conferences. Travel and accommodation.
- Syllabus conferences. Travel and accommodation for Northern Territory teachers.

## MENTAL INSTITUTIONS

197. The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. How many persons are permanently in residence in the State's mental institutions?

2. How often are these cases independently reviewed by psychiatrists other than those working at those institutions?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. There are no persons presently classified as permanently resident in the State's mental institutions. Patients are cur-

## EXAMINATIONS

195. Mr LYNN ARNOLD (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. In each of the past five years, what were the respective proportions of the income derived by the Public Examinations Board of South Australia from—

(a) candidates fees;

(b) State Government contributions;

(c) Northern Territory contributions; and

(d) sundry receipts?

2. What was the scale of fees charged to individual candidates in each of those years?

3. How has the Northern Territory contribution been determined in each of those years?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The replies are as follows:

rently classified as either Acute (Short stay) or as Non Acute (Long stay). On 31 August 1982, a census of Glenside Hospital inpatients showed:

Acute patients	246
Non Acute long-stay	255

Total 501

Of the 255 long-stay patients, eight were under extended detention or custody orders, and the remainder were voluntary patients.

A census of Hillcrest Hospital and Enfield Security Hospital on 11 August 1982, showed:

Acute patients	130
Non Acute long-stay patients	227
Forensic patients	34

Total 391

Of the long-stay patients, 10 were under detention orders. The long-stay patient population has reduced markedly in recent years, and many patients who in the past have been considered as 'permanent residents' have, by the process of on-going rehabilitation, been discharged from the hospitals.

2. All non-voluntary patients have the circumstances of their custody or detention reviewed by the Mental Health Review Tribunal at least once every six months. Also either the detained patient or any other person, who has a right and proper interest in them, can appeal to the tribunal from time to time and, if dissatisfied, can appeal to the Supreme Court.

## SCHOOL PROJECTS

199. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What specific projects are to be commenced and/or completed during the year 1982-83 at the following schools:



- (a) Seaton Primary;
- (b) Findon Primary;
- (c) West Lakes Primary;
- (d) Semaphore Park Primary;
- (e) Woodville Primary;
- (f) Woodville Speech and Hearing Centre;
- (g) Hendon Primary;
- (h) Seaton North High; and
- (i) West Lakes High,

and what is the cost of each project?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The following indicates what specific projects are to be commenced and/or completed during the year 1982-83 at the following schools and the cost of each project:

- (a) West Lakes Shore Primary School: Car parking facilities, \$16 250.
- (b) Hendon Primary School: Bituminising and extending car park, \$15 000.
- (c) Seaton High School: Floor tiles, room 30, \$3 000; Provision of dust extractor facilities, \$6 200; Activity hall, \$203 000; Conversion of timber buildings, \$60 000; Removal of trees, \$2 000.
- (d) West Lakes High School: Activity hall, \$186 000.

**TRANSPORT OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN**

202. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Are parents allowed to board buses transporting handicapped children to and from school and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** A parent may board these buses to settle a child down and, if there is room on the bus, may also travel with the child, with the agreement of the school principal and an officer of the Special Education Branch of the Education Department.

**PARAFIELD GARDENS VANDALISM**

203. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment and Planning, representing the Minister of

Housing: Is the Minister aware that in the past 15 months at the Parafield Gardens shopping centre plate glass windows have been broken at least once each at the Post Office and Fabulous Foodstore and on several occasions at the barber shop and delicatessen and, if so, why did the Minister state in answer to Question on Notice number 1 of this Session that the cost of vandalism at that centre amounted to only \$216.13 during 1981-82?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** It is a condition of the South Australian Housing Trust's commercial lease that the lessee is to insure during the term of the lease to the full market value of all glass upon the demised premises. This policy was to be in the joint names of the lessee and the Housing Trust. Consequently, the trust would not be aware always of any breakages of plate glass at the Parafield Gardens Shopping Centre and certainly would not be responsible for any replacement.

**EYRE PENINSULA SCHOOLS**

204. **Mr GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What schools on Eyre Peninsula does the Education Department intend to rebuild and upgrade during the next two financial years?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** Subject to funds being available at the projected level, plans are under way for work to be done on the following schools:

Project	Tender Call	Avail-ability
Miltaburra Area School— new school	November 1982	February 1984
Port Neill Primary School— (Quantum \$150 000)	Let	February 1983
Elliston Special Rural School— (Quantum \$300 000)	1984-85 Financial Year	
Port Lincoln Primary School— (Quantum \$600 000)	1984-85 Financial Year	