

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 4 May 1983

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

PETITION: CLASSROOM OVERCROWDING

A petition signed by 681 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to alleviate the problem of overcrowding of classrooms for pre-school and primary schools in the Hallett Cove area was presented by Ms Lenhan.

Petition received.

QUESTION TIME

BUDGET DEFICIT

Mr OLSEN: Will the Treasurer explain the assumptions underpinning his forecast of an accumulated deficit on the Consolidated Account increasing from an estimated \$70 000 000 at 30 June 1985 to \$400 000 000 by 30 June 1986? In the *Advertiser* of 2 May the Premier referred to a memo from the Under Treasurer dated 26 September 1982 which forecast an accumulated deficit of \$70 000 000 by the end of June 1985, yet one day later in this House the Premier said:

The underlying deficit is such, that if left unchecked, it could result in an accumulated deficit on the Consolidated Account approaching \$400 000 000 by 30 June 1986.

The Premier's economic statement did not attempt to explain how this obvious discrepancy in the projected deficits could occur in one year, or what action he would take to avoid such a situation. The only interpretation that could be put on the—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is debating the matter, as he well knows. He must stick to the facts.

Mr OLSEN: It is incumbent upon the Premier to indicate whether the projected deficit figure related in his statement to the House yesterday of \$400 000 000 includes funding of election promises of the Australian Labor Party at the expense of the taxpayers of South Australia.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The situation of State finances has deteriorated markedly, as my speech yesterday and the detailed figures I produced indicated, as did the December report of the Under Treasurer which was tabled in this House. Forward projections are always chancy because such projections have to be based on assumptions about the rate of inflation over time, the revenue of the State (whether it is rising or falling, which in turn relates to economic activity), the effects of inflation on interest bills (that is interest rates over time), and the public debt that has to be repaid. Obviously, the Treasury works progressively on models that try to extrapolate on the information we have at one time as to what might happen in future. Looking at the present situation, if we make certain assumptions about the level of wages, rate of inflation, interest rates, and so on over the next four years and add to that the recurrent impact of interest in a continuing deficit situation, and no steps are taken to correct it, we arrive at about \$400 000 000. That is the result of a simple mathematical calculation. On the assumptions which one feeds in depends the final result. The crucial fact is that nothing may be done about the position, and the problem has been that those assumptions have been building up over time and nothing was done about it under the previous Government. I understand that

even today the Leader of the Opposition has produced some alternative economic strategy that says there will be no cuts in capital works, but I make clear that we have not announced cuts in capital works; we have announced that certain projects have been terminated because they are not cost effective. We have announced other projects which are under review and the timing of which may have to be deferred. What we are doing is to clear a space in order to ensure that the money is being spent on projects in the public interest. That is not about cuts but is about trying to maintain expenditure, and for someone who was a member of a Government that cut public works by over \$100 000 000 to prop up its Budget in two years to talk about our spending on public works is extraordinary and the type of hypocrisy that we have come to tolerate. What else will the Leader of the Opposition do in relation to his great package? If left unchecked, the deficit will run into \$400 000 000. What other solutions has the Leader of the Opposition? None at all! He is not prepared to grasp the nettle of raising revenue or to face the consequences of the problems of the Commonwealth-State tax-sharing agreement, but is prepared to castigate us because of the position we must tackle, and he suggests that he has a better solution by pulling a rabbit out of the hat and suggesting the continuing reduction of the Public Service by attrition. What that means effectively is a reduction in services that are already at rock bottom at a time of increasing demand for those services. Whether one uses the euphemism of attrition or not, one is effectively reducing the effectiveness of the public sector. It was the policy of attrition that resulted in the previous Government wasting \$4 500 000 of taxpayers' money by not using the Public Buildings Department resources that were available. We have saved in three months \$1 500 000 by properly deploying our resources.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Let them yabber: they have no alternatives.

The SPEAKER: Order! There will be order and no yabbering in the House from the Leader of the Opposition or anyone else.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The consequences of the policy of attrition are waste and extravagance in public sector employment. It costs the taxpayers money. However, if the Leader would be honest, and if he would come clean and admit what his predecessor was going to do and what he would do, then he would in fact not be carrying out a policy of attrition but he would be in fact sacking people. He would be sacking them at a time when the services that are needed are strained to the utmost. That is the only alternative, and I believe that that course of action is totally unacceptable in the present economic climate.

NORTH-EAST BUSWAY

Mr KLUNDER: Can the Minister of Transport inform the House as to the present status of the north-east busway project? Following the statement by the Premier in the Appropriation Bill yesterday, there has been some press comment and some disquiet in the community regarding such issues as projected starting dates and possible delays in construction of the busway, can the Minister clarify the exact status of the project?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I thank the member for Newland for his question. I appreciate his concern in relation to the—

Mr Ashenden: I'll bet he's concerned!

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Todd will come to order.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I am sure that the member for Newland appreciates the financial circumstances with which the Government is faced and there is no doubt had the Opposition still been in Government that it would have been faced with the same problem.

Following a review of the north-east busway project by a Cabinet subcommittee in January 1983, the Government approved the continued construction of the north-east busway in the Park Terrace to Darley Road section. The subcommittee is continuing to review the section from Darley Road to Tea Tree Plaza. This review is awaiting the results of engineering studies that further define construction methods and costs associated with the construction of the busway between Darley Road and Tea Tree Plaza.

Mr Ashenden: After 1986!

The SPEAKER: Order! If the member for Todd interrupts again, I shall have no alternative but to warn him and place him on notice.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The engineering studies will continue until some time in 1984, and no delay will necessarily result from waiting until those studies are completed. A decision on constructing the Darley Road to Tea Tree Plaza section does not need to be made until some time in 1984. Because of the difficult financial situation imposed on the Government, a review has been conducted of the whole capital works programme including the north east busway, one of the most expensive projects in that programme.

The capital works review recommended that the construction programme for the north-east busway project be scheduled to allow the opening of the Darley Road to Park Terrace section by 1986, and also to permit the deferral of any decisions regarding construction east of Darley Road until the end of 1984. As the Premier has said, Cabinet has accepted these recommendations in principle. In fact, what they mean is that the Government is opening up options to allow sound financial management decisions regarding the busway when they are needed towards the end of 1984. The rescheduling that has taken place has concentrated current efforts into the construction of the Park Terrace to Darley Road section, thereby giving the Government the option of looking at the expenditure associated with other sections in the light of the financial climate towards the end of 1984.

Mr Ashenden: Is one of your options not to build it at all?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: That is not an option and we promised that the busway would be built. If it seems necessary at that time to delay construction, that decision can then be taken. However, in the meantime the Government will have been able to complete a usable section of the busway and open it to operation. This will allow residents in the north-east to immediately benefit from works already completed. I repeat, the decision taken by Cabinet is merely to give the Government a full range of options as to the rate of expenditure on the north east busway project in the years following 1984.

We hope, as does everyone, that the financial situation at that time will allow the completion of the busway project through to Tea Tree Plaza, as originally scheduled, but current financial predictions would indicate that this may be difficult. It is our intention at this stage to complete the busway through to Tea Tree Plaza. We are talking about an option to delay or slow down the construction process between Darley Road and Tea Tree Plaza. It is logical, at this stage, to concentrate work on a discreet section of busway that can be used as it stands and that is exactly what we are doing.

The opening of the Park Terrace to Darley Road section should be completed in 1986, the time that was originally

scheduled. If the Liberal Government had proceeded with the light rail option immediately it came into power in 1979, the projected delays may not have been necessary, and the north-east suburbs would have been a lot closer to getting an efficient public transport service that they so obviously deserve.

BUDGET DEFICIT

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I wish to ask the Premier a question which bears upon the earlier question asked by the Leader of the Opposition. What action does the Government intend to take to prevent the State's Budget deficit increasing to almost \$400 000 000 by June 1986? In his Financial Statement yesterday the Premier revealed that the State's accumulated deficit on the Consolidated Account could approach \$400 000 000 by June 1986. The Government has already taken some action to reduce this deficit by slashing major public works, important capital projects, including the Cobdogla Irrigation Scheme, the Finger Point Sewage Treatment Plant, the Aquatic Centre, the O'Bahn Transport System and the Adelaide Museum redevelopment which could save the Government about \$70 000 000 in the next three years.

Before the last election the Premier indicated to the public that the Government intended to increase the size of the Public Service, increase the number of teachers and nurses, increase the size of the Flinders Medical Centre and community hospitals, create a polyclinic at Noarlunga, build a new hospital at Salisbury, and a host of other projects.

The Liberal Government made no secret of the fact that we were in straitened financial times and we sought to reduce the size of the public sector by attrition where there was surplus capacity, as the Premier well knows, particularly in the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the Public Buildings Department. The Premier himself has acknowledged this week that there is a surplus capacity in the Public Buildings Department.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have given the Deputy Leader a mighty fair go but he is now lapsing into the same error as his Leader, and he is debating the question.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: At the same time as the Premier was outlining his Government's programme, if elected, he gave a clear indication that he had accurate financial information which allowed him competently to promise that he would not increase State taxes or introduce any new ones during the life of his Government. In view of these conflicting and contradictory election promises and the savage cuts already made on the capital works programme, will the Premier indicate how he intends to reduce the projected June 1986 deficit of \$400 000 000?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have already made statements on this. It is clear that it will have to be reduced progressively. Let me take up one point again, because the Deputy Leader simply closed his ears when I was replying to his Leader on this matter. We are not on about saving money by slashing public works. I know that that is a familiar theme because his Government slashed public works by over \$100 000 000 in two years. They know all about that. The Tonkin Budget had \$42 000 000 in place in this financial year which was slashing public works. Those projects outlined by the Deputy Leader indicate that projects that we do not believe are cost efficient in the present circumstances should be cancelled, deferred or reviewed. Having done that, the money freed up can be used on the particular projects that were in our election policy that the Deputy Leader outlined. Therefore, let us not pull that red herring across the trail.

In terms of getting on top of the deficit, I have said that we have to grasp the nettle by raising revenue from our

own resources, by attempting to get greater assistance from the Commonwealth Government, by managing our money and our cash balances more efficiently (and a number of steps have been set in train to do that), by looking at some more imaginative financing methods for public sector works and activities (and again, a number of steps are in train on that), by ensuring efficiency and good management in the Public Service and cost effectiveness in anything we do. There is a range of measures. Some of them are going to need fairly tough and concerted action. We need support from the community. We can expect none from the Opposition, but I come back again to the point that is clearly looming right at the forefront of the Opposition's strategy to solve the deficit. That strategy is to ensure that people are sacked.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Oh, come on!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: There can be no alternative, according to the Opposition.

Mr Olsen: You cannot sack a person in the Public Service; you know that.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I wish the Leader would calm down a little bit and try to think soberly. These are sober times and these financial matters are important matters. Tapping the table and carrying on like an idiot will not help the debate at all.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier should resume his seat. There is far too much disorder here this afternoon. It is not going to continue. The honourable the Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I can answer the question, Mr Speaker, and I answered it once and I will answer it again, because members opposite simply refuse to hear it. I am not answering it so much for the Opposition. Their minds have closed, and they have got their secret agenda as to what they might do if we have the misfortune of seeing them on the Government benches again. The fact is a policy of attrition does not work; it creates total dislocation in terms of the workforce and the Public Buildings Department is a classic example of that; millions of dollars were wasted over the past few years when we could ill afford it by that policy of attrition. What is necessary is to ensure those who are employed are being employed productively, that skills are matched to the tasks in hand, and that is precisely what we are doing. We are not going into this ridiculous exercise of saying 'No sackings. We will leave those people sitting down, doing nothing in the depots, and we will pay out that money to somebody else to do the projects'. That defies all logic and we simply will not accept the illogic of that particular argument. The fact is that in most areas our public services are at rock bottom. I would like every member to write to me on this subject. Let us take the field of education. I invite every member to go to the schools in their district and I would like each and every one to write and tell me how many fewer teachers could be used in that school. What the Opposition is doing is to ask us to spend more today, more now. I accept that. There is a need there to which I am trying to respond, but I will not tolerate the Opposition on the one hand saying we need more teachers in our schools, we need better hospitals, I need something else for my district, and then saying cut the public sector; you cannot have that both ways. I issue that challenge to the Opposition, to look at the health centres and at the schools and to write and explain where there is waste, where there are too many people employed, and how many reductions can be made, and we would be very happy to comply.

WASTE MANAGEMENT

Mr MAYES: Will the Minister of Local Government report on what steps the Government is taking to review the current waste disposal monitoring programme in view of suggestions that possible leakages have occurred from licensed waste disposal areas? *Nationwide* last night ran a programme which suggested very clearly there is a problem with waste disposal in South Australia. In addition to that, there was an article in the *Advertiser* this morning in which the Chairman of the South Australian Waste Management Commission, Mr Maddocks, suggested there needs to be a review of the current Waste Management Commission Act.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The matter of waste disposal in South Australia is one that should be of great community concern, and is certainly a matter that should have received greater input by the previous State Government than it did.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: Nonsense!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The suggestion that possible leakages have occurred from licensed disposal waste areas was made in a comprehensive report about the waste disposal industry prepared by the consultants to the Waste Management Commission. That report was commissioned by the previous Government, and we accept that. However, it was commissioned against a background of, at best, Government indifference to, and at worst, Government nobbling of, the Waste Management Commission. I will refer to that matter later.

First, I want to provide a direct answer to the question from the member for Unley: the report suggests that there is a leakage from certain waste disposal sites. However, there is no evidence of significant leakages at present. The Government and I, as Minister, are concerned to ensure that no leakage is occurring. On this basis, the Waste Management Commission needs to investigate the possibility of leaks and, indeed, the commission's officers have informed me that they are doing all that is possible to make a proper conclusion from the suggestions put forward. Therein lies the rub. It takes me back to my original accusation against the previous Government and the previous Minister. It is a sad fact that I tell members of the House that the South Australian Waste Management Commission is woefully understaffed and under-financed. This is mainly due to the previous Government's decision to reduce fees payable by operators from 50c to 25c a tonne on solid waste, and from 75c to 40c a kilolitre on liquid waste.

That decision was a political one—let us make no bones about that. All the evidence that was given to the Waste Management Commission was ignored by the previous Minister and by the previous Government. In addition, the previous Government removed fees payable by country councils and private operators, both of which now pay only a licence fee (which was also reduced).

The original recommendation when the commission was established by my former colleague, Geoff Virgo, in April 1979, was for the commission to have 12 staff members. The previous Government made a decision to reduce the fees payable to the commission right from the start, and the previous Government, in effect, said that there should not be a staff of 12 but a staff of six. However, despite the limitations imposed by this scandalous scenario, I am in the process of instituting two key actions which will go a long way towards solving the matter of possible leakage.

Since coming to office this Government has approved, in consultation with the waste management industry, an increase in fees to 31.25 cents a tonne for solid waste and an increase from 40c to 50c for liquid waste.

The revenue resulting from this much-needed increase will enable the commission to employ another two people. I am also pleased to state that only this morning I signed an authorisation for the commission to employ a chemical engineer. As far back as 1982 the previous Minister had declined to authorise such an appointment. The qualifications and experience of this officer are essential to the proper functioning of the commission and should have been available to it much earlier.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: It is enlightening to see that after last evening's *Nationwide* programme and the report in today's *Advertiser* the Opposition still seems to believe that waste disposal management, especially as it involves liquid waste, is a joke, and I particularly refer to the member for Mount Gambier, who often tends to make glib statements.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Dealing with the appointment of the chemical engineer, I have asked the commission to begin investigating the option of installing monitoring wells outside each land fill and liquid disposal site in this State. Such wells will provide the commission with a quick and ready reference to each site's pollution problems. Finally, I wish to assure the community that this Government intends to provide it with a Waste Management Commission that is fully equipped to carry out its legislative functions, which include preventing or minimising damage to the environment through waste disposal.

DISASTER RELIEF

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Will the Premier as Treasurer state what individual sums are to be recovered from the Commonwealth Government to offset the costs to the State of bushfire and flood relief? In his statement to the House yesterday the Premier advised that the estimated costs to this State for bushfire and flood relief were expected to be \$37 000 000 and \$4 000 000 respectively, but he did not supply us with the individual sums to be recovered from the Commonwealth for those particular categories.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: There are two sources of assistance from the Commonwealth. One is under the natural disasters relief legislation, which provides assistance on a \$3 to \$1 basis once we go beyond the figure of \$3 000 000 in any one financial year. We estimate the total sum payable this financial year to be about \$81 000 000, of which \$58 000 000 will be recovered from the Commonwealth.

I cannot tell the honourable member at this stage what proportion each of the disasters represents in those figures: that information probably will not be available until the end of the financial year, when we know all the applications that are in and what allocation there is between the various disasters. However, the total is \$81 000 000, and the sum to be recovered from the Commonwealth is \$58 000 000.

In addition, as a result of my trip to Canberra and of special representations made to the Prime Minister almost immediately after the election, we were given a special one-off grant of \$10 500 000, which was specifically aimed at providing Budget support in consequence of the bush fires, floods and natural disaster situation. That sum is clearly tagged against the disaster situations, with special Commonwealth one-off grant assistance applied to that.

In addition (and this is not contained in the recurrent accounts because of the way Woods and Forests accounts are drawn), we have a special interest-free loan of \$11 000 000 repayable over three years with a further indication of sup-

port for \$22 000 000 under the normal loan arrangements at the Loan Council in June, specifically for the forest salvage operation. That represents special assistance in the forest area. None of these figures, however, take into account the full consequences of these disasters.

As I said yesterday, they will not be known for some time because there is a carry-over into the next financial year. Before further financial assistance can be given under the financial assistance arrangement, we must spend \$3 000 000 to reach the trigger point at which we can take advantage of the subsidy. We have tried to get the Commonwealth Government to treat this matter as urgent because the disasters flow over into the next year, but we must find that \$3 000 000 before we can get any residue on the damage.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Ms LENEHAN: Can the Minister of Labour say what initiatives the Government has taken in respect of unemployed youth? I ask this question because of the very high level of unemployment in my district and on behalf of the large number of unemployed young people there.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The honourable member was good enough to inform me yesterday that she would ask this question, and that came as no surprise because she has been an intense worker in this area both before and since becoming a member. I compliment her on taking the keen interest she has taken in this subject. Over the past six months, the Government has given priority to implementing the various commitments it made to young unemployed people in its youth policy. An additional \$120 000 has been allocated to the Community Improvement Through Youth project to allow it to employ another five workers. This has increased the services offered to young unemployed people in Elizabeth, Salisbury and the southern suburbs and has also allowed a particular emphasis to be given to the north-eastern suburbs.

The Government also promised to help provide jobs for unemployed youth by taking on an additional 50 apprentices into the Public Service. The Government is spending \$2 000 000 to do this, and selection of the 50 new apprentices is occurring now. Arrangements have been made for approximately 50 out-of-trade or unemployed apprentices to continue their training in off-the-job training centres in both the public and private sectors.

I have also agreed in principle to the formation of a new group apprenticeship scheme for the South Australian tourism and hospitality industry. This will entail the provision of subsidies by the South Australian Government under the terms of the nationally agreed policy. As a result of approaches to the Commonwealth, funds will be provided for an additional 300 trade-based pre-vocational training places in TAFE colleges in South Australia. In addition, funds have been sought and approved for another 150-200 vocationally based training places. This will mean that over 1 100 young unemployed people will be involved in trade-based pre-vocational training in South Australia in 1983, and a further 300 will be involved in other vocationally based training. The South Australian Government will be funding half these places and the Commonwealth Government the balance.

Recent negotiations with the Commonwealth Government have also led to the re-establishment and extension of training opportunities for young unemployed people between the ages of 18 and 30 years who are interested in pursuing self-employment. The South Australian Government has been actively involved in the Commonwealth Government's job creation scheme. This Government has funded and established a unit to administer and support this scheme and is

actively pursuing a policy which will ensure that at least half of the people employed under the job creation scheme will be under 25 years. Under the job creation programme, an additional special youth programme is being developed which will provide employment and skilled supervision for young people who, by virtue of their length of unemployment or other problems, are particularly at risk.

The Government has also demonstrated its concern for young people in employment by producing a pamphlet outlining problems faced by youth and providing information about the remedies and action available to them. This pamphlet will be circulated to schools and be available in Commonwealth Employment Service offices in the second term of this year.

I am committed to involving non-government youth organisations, youth workers and young people themselves in the development of policies and programmes relevant to youth. For this reason, \$20 000 was provided to establish the Youth Affairs Council of South Australia, which is bringing together forums of youth organisations, workers and young people to provide a non-government co-ordinating point in the youth affairs field.

In six months the Government has taken significant action towards implementing our youth policy, demonstrating our continuing commitment to the young people of this State. We shall take an active role in International Youth Year in 1985 and are determined that, with our current and future policies, we will be able to make a contribution of which we can be proud.

DEPARTMENTAL EXPENDITURE

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Will the Treasurer say what measures he has introduced or intends to introduce to review all departmental expenditure and ensure that departmental over-runs of disastrous proportions do not occur again? During the term of the previous Government, the Budget Review Committee assessed the performance of all departments on a monthly basis and initiated corrective action to rectify any apparent over-runs before they got out of hand. I am informed that this practice has been discontinued by the present Government.

In a memo from the Under Treasurer dated 2 February 1983, the Premier was warned of over-runs by departments and agencies and of the need to take corrective action to rectify the Government's financial mismanagement. In his speech yesterday, the Premier revealed that over-runs will cost the State \$26 000 000 by the end of June.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is another of a series of questions which I would have thought could well be covered in the debate to take place, and in fact there is a Bill before the House. It seems to me that some of these queries have been somewhat pointless, but if the Opposition wishes to spend its time asking them, I am certainly—

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Why don't you say from the outset that you don't understand the question and you can't answer it?

Mr Ashenden: Don't you think that it's important?

The SPEAKER: Order! It seems that about 60 per cent of members are like bears with sore heads this afternoon. Perhaps I could recommend a good sleep or some meditation before we start.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The question is what measures have been introduced. First, if this Budget Review Committee had been performing this marvellous task of surveillance that the honourable member suggests, then how on earth did we get into the position of these over-runs

which occurred in the first half of the financial year? Let us remember that from July until 10 November the former Government was in office, and that is almost the whole of that six-month period. During all that time, in some areas those over-runs were taking place. In fact, my impression was that particularly in that period running up to the election all pretence of control was abandoned by the former Government. Things were let rip. It is as simple as that. That is probably the stark truth about what happened. But let us not get too carried away about the nature—

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: What's been going on since November?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Do you want some information or not?

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Yes, but truthfully.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Light to order.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Let us not get too carried away about this question of over-runs. As I suggest, the brakes were off in that period, and we were the people who had to inherit the consequences of that.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: That's absolute nonsense.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Deputy Leader to order, and it is the last time that I shall do so.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Many of those over-runs are related to factors for which I would not blame the former Government (and have not done) and, equally, would not myself accept blame. I would hope that the member for Light would be interested in this, because it illustrates the plight of people in the current economic position: the hospitals and health sector budgeted for a certain income from receipts for the services they offered.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Coles to order.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Not only has there been a great demand for those public sector health services but people are either unable or unwilling to pay their bills, and that has accounted for many hundreds of thousands of dollars. That is just a stark problem of the situation in which we find ourselves, and there is little one can do about it. One cannot get blood out of a stone. I would have thought that the previous Minister would be aware of looming problems in that area. It has certainly been explained to us that those problems have been flagged, and there are millions of dollars involved in that. That is merely one aspect of these so-called over-runs.

As for measures introduced, immediately we were alerted to the situation we took action. In fact, I believe that it is the Leader of the Opposition, who delights in publishing minutes and memos from me or the Under Treasurer, who has already put before the public the sort of action that has been taken. I believe that that action has in fact been accepted in the right sort of spirit by the various Public Service departments and elsewhere. We have managed to make a substantial turnaround in the second half of this year. However, is it not a bit rough for a Government that was in office for three years and from July until 10 November, to turn around and say that a blow-out of the proportions that occurred is something that happened in that brief skurry before Christmas! That is absolute nonsense. Why not have the grace to admit its own part in this, and join us in trying to solve the problem?

RIVERLAND FRUIT PRODUCTS

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Can the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Agriculture, advise what progress has been made on the matter of the Riverland

Fruit Products Steering Committee? I think that that question is sufficiently self-explanatory.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: They are a stropopy lot this afternoon, are they not? As I was saying, the question is self-explanatory, and I ask the Minister to give the House the benefit of any information he may have.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I am advised by the Minister of Agriculture that there has been work attended to by the steering committee about which the honourable member asked. In fact, I have a list of the membership of that committee that I will briefly summarise in a moment. However, I will now summarise the activities. The committee has met twice, that is, once on 13 April and again on 27 April at the cannery, and held one public meeting at Berri on 26 April which was attended by about 400 people. The next meetings will take place on 13 May and 20 May, and it is hoped that an interim report will be ready by 20 May.

The decision to have a steering committee, involving as it does, a wide cross-section of membership, is to provide to the local community an opportunity for involvement for them to examine the cannery's future, and bring about discussions by both Government and the local community to determine what should happen in the future, to analyse what may have happened in the past, and try to learn from any mistakes that there may have been. This should provide a healthy basis for discussion to incorporate further decisions by Government in the future.

The steering committee is considering three options: one is maintaining the present operation, the second is closure, and the third is the development of the cannery's general product line. It must be pointed out, as a matter of great importance, that the purpose of the steering committee is to examine those three options with equity and to examine the three of them as possibilities that could be considered by any Government. It should not be taken that any one of those options is of higher priority than any other. The Government is not predisposed as to what will take place in this matter. It genuinely wants to hear the report of the steering committee based, as it will be, upon its discussions with the local community.

The steering committee is chaired by the member for Florey: it also has on it representatives of the Canning Fruitgrowers' Association, the United Farmers and Stockowners, the Food Preservers' Union, A.M.W.S.U., and the Greek Rural and Social Council. The Berri council has a representative through the District Clerk; Treasury has a representative, as has the State Development Department and the Department of Agriculture, and the Riverland Fruit Products Management and Receiver are also represented. It has an Executive Officer and an officer from the Ministry of Agriculture. As members will see, that is a broad cross-section membership representing, as it does, Government as well as the local community, employees, local councils, and the like. It is believed that that is the best way to determine what could be done for the benefit of the Riverland area and for the State of South Australia.

PUBLIC ASSETS

Mr ASHENDEN: Will the Treasurer advise the House the estimated cost of restoring public assets as a result of the recent natural disasters, and the amount to be recovered from the Commonwealth Government to help defray the cost? In a statement to this House yesterday, the Premier advised that the gross cost to the State for the major disasters, that is drought, fire, and flood, including the restoration of public assets, was likely to be \$81 000 000, yet the Premier

did not qualify or quantify the distribution of the amount as it is related to the restoration of those public assets.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That question is identical to the one asked by the member for Torrens, and I have already answered it.

TECHNOLOGY PARK

Mr GREGORY: Has the Premier any further information concerning the contractual arrangements for the building being constructed by the Technology Park Corporation, and whether the member for Davenport's allegations in the House yesterday have any substance? Yesterday, the member for Davenport made wild and inaccurate allegations regarding the—

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Florey that he, like other members, is transgressing. The honourable member will resume his seat. Members on both sides are continually transgressing by debating in the course of their explanation. That will not be permitted. The member must stick to the facts. The honourable member for Florey.

Mr GREGORY: I will be grateful for any information from the Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: As the member for Florey has reminded the House, the member for Davenport yesterday made those extraordinary allegations that I misled the public, and produced in evidence of this a rather tortuous tale about Hassell and Partners having contracts broken in relation to the multi-tenant building at Technology Park. I answered that by setting out the situation in terms of the legal contractual arrangement. I suggested at the time that Hassells could have been embarrassed by both the manner and timing of the raising of this matter by the honourable member. His claim is that the information did not come from Hassells. Clearly it did not, because if he had spoken to the partnership I think he would have found that not only was the information wrong but they were not in a position of wishing to have it raised in the manner in which the member did. We are used to him blundering. He did it as a Minister, and he has not changed in the Opposition.

On the original proposal the Housing Trust was developing the project, and certain plans and subcontractual arrangements were being set in train in consequence of that Housing Trust action. When this Government subsequently approved the project, the method of finance changed. The project is being financed and managed by the Technology Park Corporation. The Public Buildings Department then made its bid to take over some of the work that was involved, and that was done on the basis of cost effectiveness and the availability of resources in the Public Buildings Department.

The most interesting aspect of the whole thing is that the corporation agreed on an arrangement whereby the Public Buildings Department assumed notional financial and project management responsibility but undertook to utilise the services of the Technology Park's own development co-ordinator as project manager, and appoint Hassell and Partners as project architect, to complete the project in conjunction with the Public Buildings Department professionals, and to have all construction work undertaken by private sector contractors.

Therefore, the position that the member was trying to suggest to the House (now that I have examined the details of the arrangements) goes way beyond the simple situation of the earlier arrangement with the Housing Trust. The fact is that these arrangements were designed to maximise the likelihood of the project being completed within budget and on schedule with maximum private sector involvement, retaining the integrity of Hassell and Partners design, for which, of course, they have been paid. All the contractual

obligations have been discharged. That is exactly what is happening. Tenders will be let shortly for earthworks, and later this month for building construction. The building should be ready to fit out by December and, indeed, the revised cost estimates suggest that the project may be completed for less than the allocated amount.

In other words, it is a very cost efficient project in which all persons involved have been able to take some share. In regard to this extraordinary allegation made yesterday, rebutted again but now given some credence, I simply and firmly place on record the fact that it is totally and utterly false.

TECHNOLOGY PARK BUILDING

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Further to my question asked yesterday concerning the contracts for the Technology Park multi-tenancy building, and subsequent to the question asked by the member for Florey and replied to by the Premier, will the Premier now table all correspondence between Hassell and Partners and the South Australian Housing Trust relating to this contract that was cancelled, and will the Premier explain why the Public Buildings Department has engaged temporary additional staff to help complete the project when a clearly stated objective was to use surplus P.B.D. staff?

Yesterday, the Premier indicated to the House that some financial payment had been made to Hassell and Partners. The fact that some financial payment had been made indicates quite clearly that there was a contract between Hassell and Partners and South Australian Housing Trust. The Premier himself, in reply to a question yesterday, therefore agreed that there was a contract. However, there was only part payment for the full contract as agreed to by the South Australian Housing Trust and Hassell and Partners. Only by tabling all the correspondence will we find out the full extent of that contract, which was to design, to document, and to manage the construction of the project by Hassell and Partners. This afternoon the Premier has indicated that, in fact, certain of those functions are now to be carried out by people other than Hassell and Partners, which clearly establishes a breach of contract. In addition, I understand that additional temporary staff have been taken on by the Public Buildings Department to now complete this project or to help complete this project.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: As I have pointed out already, the object is to maximise private sector involvement in this project. I am amazed that the honourable member finds in that some source of criticism—

The Hon. D.C. Brown: You are employing extra persons—

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Davenport.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: We are talking about commercial arrangements. Rights under the contract can be exercised, if they need to be exercised. I wonder whether the honourable member has authorisation from the parties to that contract to call on documents and contracts to be tabled. I think that would be most unlikely but, nonetheless, he may have.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: Table them.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: If he does, I would like to have evidence of it. Absolutely nothing can be gained by this sort of canvassing of the transactions. The point of the allegation was that first, the contracts were broken and secondly, that in some way something improper had occurred in the production and management of this project. The honourable member sat there listening to the details of the project, about how it was being organised and about the ongoing role that Hassell and Partners would play, yet he

has now carried on in this way. I simply repeat: if there are legal consequences because of a breach of contract and so on, they can be exercised. These matters are not before us, and I would like to see the honourable member's authorisation.

FIXED-TERM PARLIAMENTS

Mr TRAINER: Will the Premier say whether the Government hopes to have the support of the State Opposition for legislative moves towards fixed-term Parliaments, in view of the report in Monday's *Advertiser* that on Friday the 240 members of the State Council of the Liberal Party (which I understand is the governing body of the South Australian Liberal Party, and, as the Minister pointed out that may be the total membership of the entire Party) voted overwhelmingly two to one, according to the report, in favour of a motion calling for fixed terms of Parliament, the day after all five South Australian Liberal delegates to the Constitutional Convention voted against a Labor initiated proposal for fixed terms?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have noticed this difference between those members of the Council of the Liberal Party and their Parliamentary representatives, and that is something for them to try to sort out amongst themselves. I think at the Constitutional Convention last week it was very disappointing indeed to see the way in which the South Australian Liberal Party members lined up so completely with the Bjelke-Petersen line on every single motion that came forward. It was only the Commonwealth and States with Labor Party Governments and the Northern Territory that stuck to the concept of providing a balanced delegation. We, I guess as is often the case, tried to observe the constitutional proprieties. The nose was simply thumbed at the constitutional proprieties by Queensland and, indeed, Tasmania, which has not received as much publicity, but it also stacked its delegation.

It was quite extraordinary that having done that and been in that position we saw the Federal Leader of the Opposition grandstanding in the way he did and, I must admit, confusing some people considerably. The question was often asked how people like Peacock had the numbers at the Convention when five out of the seven Governments in Australia are Labor Party Governments. The answer put simply is that they thwarted the proprieties. The two non-Labor Governments made sure that they did not observe the proprieties as we did. It is something that will have to be examined closely if there are to be more Constitutional Conventions. What I did find to be particularly disappointing as a South Australian was the way in which South Australian delegates simply would not exercise independent judgment from that sort of block.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The seminar at the southern end of the Chamber will cease.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I think it made a very pointed contrast with, for instance, their colleagues in the Liberal Party in Victoria who did in fact at times look at some of these issues on the merits of the debate as it took place. It is a great pity if we are to see the Liberal Party in South Australia locked into the sort of attitudes that are so apparent in States like Queensland. I do not think that that will in fact answer South Australia's needs. It will certainly not help us build any kind of community consensus in this State which is so vital in tackling the problems we have before us.

I think the facts just stand out that if the Liberal Party here is prepared to go along with the Bjelke-Petersen line and treat South Australia as an armed camp in which the

two factions constantly fight and struggle and no quarter is given, if they continue to perform as they did at that national Constitutional Convention as South Australians then I think it is a great pity for the State. There is a South Australian attitude on these matters. It is clear that their colleagues in the rank and file of the Liberal Party support that South Australian attitude. Unfortunately, their Parliamentary delegates did not see fit to do so.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: BUDGET DEFICIT

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr OLSEN: During the course of Question Time in response to a question the Premier misrepresented my position in relation to the Public Service of South Australia when he said my policy, and that of my Party, was sackings of public servants in South Australia to achieve a balanced Budget. Plainly and factually that is not accurate and is a misrepresentation of my position. Repeatedly I have enunciated a policy of reduction in the size of the Public Service from which I do not resile. On each occasion I have said that reduction would take place by attrition, that is, retirement and the like. I put clearly on record the fact that during the past three years whilst that policy was in effect not one public servant in South Australia was sacked as the result of that policy. It is a continuation of that policy. That is factual and quite clear. During that period that policy, which is the same policy that I enunciate and stand by today, reduced the size of the Public Service of South Australia by 4 500 at a saving of \$64 000 000 in wages in a full year.

At 3.5 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

WEST COAST WATER SUPPLY

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I move:

That, in the opinion of the House, the Minister of Water Resources and the Engineering and Water Supply Department immediately take steps to provide reticulated water schemes west of Ceduna to all the communities that are without reticulated service and that such a scheme be phased in over the next three financial years.

This motion brings to the attention of honourable members an area which has been unfortunately sadly neglected for a long time. The people of Eyre Peninsula have unfortunately had to live with being discriminated against for many years. However, this particular area, which does not have any underground water, is not suitable for the construction of dams to catch run-off water. For many years they have made repeated representations to various Governments in an endeavour to be served by a reliable water supply.

I believe it is incumbent upon the House to give this matter its proper consideration. In relation to an area which is a long way from Adelaide it is easy to adopt the attitude of 'Out of sight out of mind.' However, that area plays an important part in continuing to provide income for the people of this State. It includes all the farming and grazing area west of Ceduna and the Aboriginal community at Koonibba and the small township of Denial Bay.

It is quite ridiculous that in 1983 an area only 10 or 12 kilometres beyond Ceduna is not receiving a reticulated water supply. It is an area in which people are building houses and they are not connected to the Tod main. It is hard to understand why such a situation should be allowed to continue. It is beyond the understanding of most of my constituents in that part of the State why they should have to put up any longer with that situation. Some months ago the previous Federal Government announced a scheme under which South Australia was to receive \$150 000 000, which was to be spent on water projects and the Minister of Water Resources, the Hon. Mr Slater, announced the programme on 15 February 1983. He gave details of a number of projects that were to be commenced. In view of the announcement, which I am sure all honourable members were pleased to hear, I took the opportunity of writing on 23 February 1983 about the water supply to the areas west of Ceduna and Coober Pedy. I received a reply dated 22 April 1983, which stated:

Dear Mr Gunn,

I refer to your letters of 7 February 1983, and 23 February 1983, about the extra funds provided by the Commonwealth Government for water conservation and your request that consideration be given to using some of those funds for projects such as extensions of the water supply system to the area west of Ceduna, and the Terowie and Hawker water supply systems.

The additional funds were allocated under the National Water Resources (Financial Assistance) Act 1978. Unfortunately projects such as those you refer to do not qualify for assistance under that Act. Those projects which are eligible are:

- (a) water filtration,
- (b) Murray Valley salinity and drainage,
- (c) flood mitigation,
- (d) water resources assessment programme.

The Engineering and Water Supply Department is currently reviewing the list of projects deferred because they did not provide sufficient revenue return on capital cost and because funds were not available for their construction. Whether or not work proceeds on any or all of them will depend on the level of funding which can be provided; immediate prospects are not very encouraging. In the event that local councils may wish to seek other means of funding and constructing limited water supply schemes, the Engineering and Water Supply Department is available for technical advice and cost estimation. I regret that I cannot be more helpful.

Unfortunately, that whole programme appears to have been set aside by the new, enlightened Hawke Government! If South Australia receives that \$150 000 000 it must be spent on projects within the State. None of us opposes the filtration of water, but my constituents find it difficult to understand why it is necessary to spend so much money on filtering water for people already receiving an adequate supply whereas many people in my district have no reticulated supply in an area where water is essential. It seems that double standards apply in relation to this matter. It seems that 30 projects are at present classified as uneconomic. I now refer to a letter, dated 15 November, which I received from the Minister of Water Resources in which he set out in detail the schemes in my district. The Minister's letter is headed 'Area West of Ceduna', and states:

In 1971, a report entitled 'Minnipa-Thevenard Pipeline Scheme' was prepared by the Engineering and Water Supply Department. This report detailed works required to replace and enlarge the Tod trunk main (which has since been completed), the harnessing of the Kappawanta basin and extensions of water main to the area west of Ceduna as far as Penong. In order to provide a reticulated water supply to the areas west of Ceduna, all of the work mentioned in the report would have to be completed. The cost involved would be in the order of \$40 000 000 (1982 values). In 1971, the scheme was considered to be an economically sound proposition, having regard to the likelihood of increased rural production. However, the scheme constitutes a project for the National Water Resources Development Programme and cannot be undertaken until Federal funds are available.

That was different from what had been said in the previous letter. The Minister's letter of 15 November continues:

A reduced scheme to provide a fully reticulated supply to Koonibba and those graziers between Koonibba and Ceduna,

would cost in the vicinity of \$3 000 000 with a return on capital of only 1.04 per cent. This scheme is not feasible from a State Government point of view and would also constitute a project for the National Water Resources Development Programme. Any scheme to provide a fully reticulated water supply to graziers west of Ceduna is outside the capacity of the State to finance and Federal Government support, via the National Water Resources Development Programme, is therefore essential.

I have been advised that the former Minister visited Ceduna in late May 1982 with the Director-General and Engineer-in-Chief of the Engineering and Water Supply Department and held discussions with the Koonibba-Charra Water Committee and the District Council of Murat Bay, regarding the extension of mains to the areas west of Ceduna and Denial Bay, respectively. I understand that at that time it was suggested that the E. & W.S. Department could provide a water service on the existing main near Ceduna and the District Council of Murat Bay could lay approximately 11 km of polythene pipe to an existing tank at Denial Bay. The local residents could then cart water from this tank, with council being responsible for the payment of water charges. A similar concept was discussed with the Koonibba-Charra Water Committee to supply the farming areas west of Ceduna. The committee has since circulated a questionnaire to property owners to determine water requirements and properties requesting supplies. This information has just come to hand and a scheme to service the properties can now be investigated. In this regard, the department is prepared to offer technical advice in consultation with the council and the committee.

That will give members some of the background to my motion. In relation to the survey to which the Minister referred in his letter, I have a copy of information sent to the E. & W.S. Department by the Secretary of the committee (Mr A.S. Martin), and I shall read this because it is relevant to the matters I am currently debating and will indicate the specific area and the number of livestock involved. That letter states:

I write in reference to the survey which has been undertaken by the above committee to ascertain the anticipated water usage if a water main was constructed west of Ceduna along the Eyre Highway with a spur line leading into the township of Denial Bay. The main would also service the township of Koonibba. The present pipeline to Koonibba is in a bad state of repair and requires immediate attention. The Koonibba council is concerned with the condition and if no answer is forthcoming on the proposed main along Eyre Highway, Koonibba council, understandably, will seek funding to renew the pipeline from Kalambi to Koonibba. It is therefore essential for rural landowners west of Ceduna, the landowners of Denial Bay and the Koonibba township, that all efforts are made for the construction of a water main west of Ceduna. Judging from the response of the survey, it is apparent that there is a definite need for the proposed main. The main would service an area of 169 040 hectares which would support 73 500 sheep, 481 cattle and 515 pigs. The sheep equivalent of water usage based on 5 litres per day per sheep in the area, amounts to 147 615 kl. It is estimated that normal household usage would be 454.6 kl which calculated on 212 households, the usage would amount to 96 375 kl.

It can therefore be seen that estimated stock consumption of water being 147 615 kl and household usage of 96 375 kl which totals 243 990 kl per annum. There is a definite need and urgency for a water main west of Ceduna. The committee is unable to estimate the cost of laying such a main and therefore is unable to establish an accurate rate of return; however, bearing in mind the estimated water usage, it is believed that such a scheme is feasible and highly desirable. It is therefore requested that your department, as a matter of urgency, investigate the proposal and support the committee in their effort to supply water to areas west of Ceduna. If any further information is required, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

I consider that some of the history of this project should be brought to the attention of members. The previous Minister of Water Resources (the member for Chaffey) visited the area and held wide-ranging discussions with the community there. Yesterday, the present Minister kindly told me that he planned to go to Eyre Peninsula to look at the various water supply schemes, and I am pleased that he intends to set aside time to look at the Polda and the Tod scheme, which is an interesting project. However, I sincerely hope that, when he visits Ceduna and discusses water supply with the people there, he can give a definite reply as to what he has in mind for that part of Eyre Peninsula. I am

aware that the E. & W.S. Department has been examining this matter for the past couple of years and is working on a scheme, but it would appear from the announcement made yesterday by the Premier that funds are somewhat restricted. Nevertheless, I believe that, if this scheme qualifies under the National Water Resources Financial Assistance Act, action should be taken quickly by the appropriate Government department to prepare a submission to be forwarded to the appropriate Federal Minister as soon as possible. I know that such action was taken in relation to the Taillem Bend-Keith pipeline and that the Hon. Arthur Whyte was involved, I think in 1972, in discussions with the Dunstan Government to get approval for the Kimba-Polda pipeline.

I think that that project was discussed for about 50 years before it was approved. The area west of Ceduna does not have a great deal of Government services. The people are involved in agriculture. Even in a dry year they normally have sufficient feed, but the problem is the lack of water. For a number of years it has been necessary for the Engineering and Water Supply Department to engage contractors to cart water on a regular basis from Ceduna out to the various Government tanks. This must be very expensive and anyone who has had any experience in carting water knows what a futile exercise it is because it really achieves nothing. I also understand that when the Tod pipeline originally reached Ceduna, undertakings were given at that time that it would be extended west of Ceduna.

I call on the Minister, when he responds next week on this motion, to be in a position to give assurances to those people whom I represent that some positive action can be taken. I am aware, because I was involved in introducing a deputation to the Minister, that he has some knowledge of this matter. That deputation had lengthy discussions with the Minister and he did give them a good hearing, which they appreciated.

I understand the difficulties that the Government faces, but I do believe that those people who live a long way from Adelaide in these isolated communities (and I have probably more of these 'uneconomical' water schemes in my district than any other member) require help and consideration. The two most important things that one can put in these outlined areas is electricity and water, and more particularly to the areas west of Ceduna where there is no underground water. Discussions were held and applications were made under the Commonwealth Government Drought Assistance Programme. This was a scheme operated by the Commonwealth Government where it would pay for the cost of sinking bores. An application was made and the advice that came back was that there was no likelihood of any success. The member for Ascot Park may think that it is funny. He may think that the people to the west of Ceduna have no rights just because his people are fortunate enough to have reticulated water past their door.

Mr TRAINER: I take a point of order. I may not have heard the remark correctly, but I understand that the member for Eyre referred to me as having made some interjection or some remark or having had some expression on my face. I was not even in my seat at the time as I was talking to you, Mr Speaker, in the Chair, and I ask him to retract the reference to me.

Mr GUNN: I certainly do apologise to the member for Ascot Park. It was the member for Albert Park. I do not wish to reflect on the Government Whip, being the jovial character that he is. I do not want to reflect on him at all. I was mistaken. I was referring to his colleague the member for Albert Park who is not as jovial and who is normally involved in looking after his trains. I suggest that he gets out his train set and has a game with it if that is his attitude. I will continue and I will ignore completely those comments

which are coming from certain members. I am pleased that the Minister is listening to what I am saying about this matter, which has been of concern to me for a long time. I could go on at great length in relation to the correspondence and the submissions received on this issue. There have been petitions presented to this House over a long period, but I think that I have outlined in some detail the problems and the action that is required to rectify those.

The people in these areas are reasonable and understand that there is a shortage of funds, but I believe that if the Government could draw up a scheme and phase it in over the next three to four years they would be satisfied as they would know what courses of action the Government was going to take on their behalf. They do not expect the Government to spend huge amounts of money in one year. As I said earlier, it is absolutely amazing that one can have a town as close to Ceduna as Denial Bay and there appears to be no likelihood whatsoever of having a reticulated water scheme connected to that town.

My understanding of these developments is that residents have to have septic systems. This can be difficult for them when they rely on catching all the water in tanks. There is a large number of Government tanks in that part of the State; however, that is not really a satisfactory answer to the problems.

I call on the Minister to give this matter his urgent consideration. I am fully aware that the senior officers in his department have looked at this matter and I have every confidence in their ability. They do an excellent job but they are restricted, of course, by the amount of money which they have available to them. I am not casting any aspersions on them or on the Minister, but I do call on the Minister to do his best to make sure that funds are available so that this project can commence. In my view, it would be a great pity if a separate pipeline was put out to Koonibba using alternate funding methods from the Commonwealth. I believe that the people of Koonibba are just as entitled as anyone else to have a water scheme, but any scheme that is put out west of Ceduna should be designed and built so that everyone can be connected to it. It would be a quite ridiculous situation if the Commonwealth Government, through some of its various agencies, was to provide a substantial amount of money to a small group of people when the wider community requires those services. I fully agree that something has to be done quickly at Koonibba as the existing arrangements are not satisfactory and cannot meet the demands on them.

I believe that the answer to the problems in the areas west of Ceduna, Denial Bay and Koonibba is for the Engineering and Water Supply Department to be involved in supplying reticulated water from the Tod trunk main. The sooner that that can be done the better it will be for all concerned because the project is long overdue. The people have been patient for long enough. They are citizens of South Australia and are entitled to a fair go, and I do not believe that in the past they have had a fair go. Therefore, I look forward to the Minister's response and I hope that the House will support the motion.

Mr EVANS (Fisher): In seconding and supporting the motion by the member for Eyre, I emphasise that there are parts of South Australia now that do not have a reticulated water supply. I remember well the comments of a Queensland member of Parliament some 25 years ago that he was amazed, when he came into this State, to see how much of our State had a reticulated water supply, even though it was a limited water supply, compared to his State.

I believe that this State has set an example to all other States of Australia in serving its community with a reticulated water supply, whether it be in the time of the Playford

Government or the Dunstan Government. We have gradually connected more of the communities, and in particular some of the isolated communities, to the metropolitan supplies. Whether it be the Keith pipeline, which was the last major line that was laid, or whether it be the line that was first put through to Whyalla and Port Augusta, everyone thought that they were massive tasks to have been undertaken by a State with a population of the size it had.

I am aware of the problems of those people in isolated communities, in particular when they happen to be in the driest part of the State. I know that in my electorate there are some people who still want a reticulated water supply and I fight their cause. In the main, my area has a much higher rainfall than the areas to which the member for Eyre is referring.

I offer support to the matters raised by the member for Eyre and believe that we as a State, even though we may be short of money, could carry out these extensions to this reticulated supply to give those country people at least one of the necessary facilities, even though we cannot offer them other facilities, such as in education. We cannot offer them a university that their children can go to down the road; we cannot offer them secondary schooling close to their home; we cannot offer them the opportunity to enter the performing arts and develop their skills close to their home; we cannot offer them a community library close to their homes; and we cannot offer them public transport. Those things are beyond us. However, a reticulated water supply, which is really the lifeline of living within a modern community is one service, I believe, that we as a State can provide for them. The member for Eyre is not asking for it to be done in what one would call a 'rapid fashion' such as during this year but he is asking that it be done over a period of years. I ask the Minister to go back to Cabinet to get some commitment so that we can recognise the difficulties that some of these people have, and so that we can relieve some of those difficulties.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER secured the adjournment of the debate.

The SPEAKER: I am told by the honourable member for Mitcham that at the end of Question Time he was on his feet to make a personal explanation and that he did not catch my eye. I accept that and now call the member for Mitcham.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MINISTER'S REMARKS

Mr BAKER (Mitcham): Last night, during the debate on the Senior Secondary Assessment Board Bill, a number of subjects were raised, and a number of statements made by the Minister of Education were untrue and quoted me out of context. I wish to bring these two matters to the attention of the House. At one stage, the Minister said:

The member for Mitcham made a few points. He did not agree with his shadow Minister, who regretted the delays. The member for Mitcham was disappointed at the speedy entrance of the Bill.

I am not sure whether or not he listened properly. The terminology used was 'speedy passage.' It had already been pointed out that it took some time for the Bill to be introduced and that there was a requirement that it be passed quickly. The Minister then went on to say that the member for Mitcham should be aware of a decision in the New South Wales Supreme Court involving the duty of members of boards not only to represent their own organisations but also to think in terms of the body itself, and he quoted from this decision. They are exactly the points that I was

making in the debate, despite his saying otherwise. The Minister further said:

I was a little amazed that the member for Mitcham . . . had not commented on that situation himself.

In fact, the Flinders University Council had wanted to include a reference in the Bill that took account of the fact that members of organisations must think beyond their own horizons and must think for the good of the organisations themselves. He also said:

The member for Mitcham made the imputation about the board.

I made no imputation about the board: I thoroughly reject that. I said that there were some dangers involved with an organisation which had a wide variety of interests. I made no imputations about the board: the board has not even been formed. Again, the Minister misquoted me. He further said:

Finally, the member for Mitcham raised the question of employer representation.

I did not raise the question of employer representation. I raised the question whether the Minister would reveal to the House the views of employers and universities. That was the question under discussion, and the Minister again misquoted me. He chose to use a debating tactic of misquoting and telling untruths. Later in the evening, the Minister said that I had said that 40 per cent of year 12 students went on to colleges of advanced education and to universities. He then said that that was not true because only 16 per cent had universities available to them. In fact, I did not misquote: I quoted a very accurate figure which is supported by some of the evidence that the Minister's own information contained. However, he chose to ignore that and went on to say that other countries have much higher rates, and I can only agree with him entirely. However, he again misquoted.

Finally, the Minister quoted me as having used the term 'putting this rubbish in front of us'. I was referring to the information that he had provided from the various responses to clause 17 in the original proposed Bill. The point I was making was that the Minister had never bothered to quell the reservations of the people concerned who had put forward those possibilities but that he had said that it was our obligation to ensure that members of the university were well aware that the board would cater for their needs. He further said:

They are the words of the member for Mitcham. It is a gross discourtesy to those people who had considered seriously the implication of this legislation. I am not suggesting that what they have put before us is rubbish at all; it is commentary worthy of consideration.

He has again misquoted me, he continues to misquote me, and he continues to abuse the position he holds.

ELECTRICITY CHARGES

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I move:

That, in the opinion of the House, all citizens of South Australia who are connected to the Electricity Trust grid system, electricity undertakings managed by district councils or corporations and those undertakings operated by the Outback Areas Development Trust be charged on the same basis and that the 10 per cent surcharge which applies in certain areas be abolished and those undertakings operated by the Outback Areas Development Trust which charge at a greater rate than any other country areas be placed on the same charging schedule as metropolitan Adelaide.

If there was one area of discrimination against certain country people, it is the area of charging for electricity. Under the current arrangements, certain citizens in this State, whose properties are connected to the Electricity Trust grid system operated by district councils and other organisations, are

charged to use the appropriate term, Adelaide plus 10 per cent. On Eyre Peninsula there are cases where adjoining neighbours pay different rates. One person pays Adelaide plus 10 per cent, whilst his adjoining neighbour, because that neighbour's property is directly connected to the Electricity Trust system, does not have to pay the surcharge.

All the electricity used on Eyre Peninsula is generated at Port Augusta and is transmitted out from there. Are the people of Whyalla and Port Augusta charged? Of course they are. However, as well as having to pay the 10 per cent surcharge, many of those people have had to pay substantial standing charges to have their properties connected to electricity. That is, they actually have to find thousands of dollars to have the lines constructed; they have to pay for the lines. They accept that, albeit many of them not too willingly, but they desire their properties to be connected to the electrical system.

I know that members will say that the taxpayers of this State should not have to subsidise country people. If we adopt that argument, we would not have any metropolitan transport services or the Festival Theatre. They are the first two things that come to mind. Therefore, I am asking that all citizens of the State be treated equally. The Electricity Trust's annual report to 30 June 1982, headed 'Electricity (Country Areas) Subsidy Act, 1962-1965', states at page 21:

Under this Act the South Australian Government provides funds to enable reductions in tariffs to be made to consumers supplied by independently operated country electricity undertakings. The trust advises the Government on the amount of subsidy necessary to enable undertakings to offer their consumers tariffs at levels determined by Government policy. At present, these are either the trust's metropolitan rates plus 10 per cent or, where undertakings use oil for generation, special rates more closely related to the costs of supply.

During the year the electricity undertaking at Marla, owned by Outback Areas Community Development Trust, was approved for admission to the subsidy scheme. Subsidies paid to country undertakings during the past five financial years are as follows:

	\$
Year ended June 1978	1 429 000
1979	1 809 000
1980	1 920 000
1981	2 503 000
1982	2 584 000

I suppose most people would say that that is a substantial subsidy. However, I understand that about \$3 500 000 is spent each year to subsidise the Festival Theatre. People could well say, 'If people want to go to the Festival Theatre, let it pay its own way.' I understand that this current financial year it will cost \$61 000 000 to subsidise the metropolitan transport system in this State. Only a fool would say that we should not have a properly organised transport system in metropolitan Adelaide, and we all have to pay for it. I do not object to that. What I do object to most strongly is the discrimination being perpetuated against my constituents.

The 10 per cent is bad enough, but I now come to what is happening in places such as Coober Pedy, Marla Bore and Marree. I wish to quote to the House accounts that have been rendered to some of my constituents in that area. I would venture to say that, if members opposite had constituents coming to them with accounts of this nature, they would be jumping through the ceiling, and rightly so. I have one here (not quoting the person's name) showing that up until 24 March 1983, for a 91-day period, the person concerned received an ordinary household account totalling \$493.88. Members must bear in mind that people in this area have to pay \$50 a thousand gallons for their water. If that is not unfair, I do not know what is.

Another constituent received an ordinary household account for a 90-day period up to 24 March 1983 totalling \$727. Until a few months ago, it was typed at the bottom of the account that these charges were subsidised up to 10

per cent, but that information has now been taken off. The South Australian Housing Trust is having trouble at Coober Pedy to get tenants to go into its accommodation, because of the high charges that exist. I have received a letter from a person at Coober Pedy which states:

Enclosed are three samples of the electricity accounts from the Aboriginal housing in the town of Coober Pedy. Mrs has a gas stove so the bill does seem excessive. Her power has been disconnected and will stay that way, with great inconvenience, until she can find the money to pay this account, and reconnection fee. Her income is supporting parents' benefits and possibly some aid from some friends and her mother who come and go. She is caring for four children attending school. I hope this arrives in time to be of some use in your discussion.

These are some of the ordinary household accounts involving Housing Trust houses to which I have referred: to 7 January 1983, \$154; to 31 March 1983, \$308; to 13 January 1983 (for a 78-day period), \$133.65; 30 March 1983 (an 88-day period), \$425.63. If people think that I am engaged in some time-wasting exercise here, I can assure them that there is great concern about these matters, especially bearing in mind that it is costing these people \$50 a thousand gallons for their water. I quote from a letter, headed 'Water a luxury item', appearing in the local newspaper circulating in Coober Pedy, as follows:

I was interested to read in the *Coober Pedy Times* for March the price of water on Kangaroo Island. In letters to the Editor in the *Advertiser* on 18 February 1983 the price of water in Adelaide was quoted as 37c per kilolitre. To convert that to the old measurement: 37c per 230 gallons, or approximately \$1.60 per 1 000 gallons. We in Coober Pedy pay about \$50 per 1 000 gallons delivered, with a rumour that the Government will increase their price again by \$5 in April.

Those people are certainly being discriminated against, and great concern has been expressed in Coober Pedy about this matter. I wrote to the Minister, the Hon. Ron Payne, on 6 April, to which he replied:

I acknowledge receipt of your letter of 24 March concerning the electricity tariffs at Coober Pedy. As you are aware, the Outback Areas Community Development Trust has already requested the Electricity Trust to review tariffs on its behalf for diesel-generated electricity supplies. I understand the review is due for completion in about four weeks time. I suggest that, before any further action is taken, we await the outcome of the review to see what recommendations are made.

I sincerely hope that the review does not increase the charges, or people will not be able to pay them. I received the following petition signed by 189 people at Coober Pedy:

The humble petition of the undersigned residents of Coober Pedy sheweth:

That—We complain of the high tariff rate imposed on the residents of Coober Pedy for electricity:

- (a) that those living above ground, i.e., in houses, have a definite need for additional power and therefore need the subsidy extended to a greater kilowatt rating per quarter period;
- (b) that the commercial rate for electricity be reduced to enable trading to be carried out on a competitive basis with other areas.

Your petitioners therefore pray that your Honourable House will—

Consider on our behalf:

- (a) to increase the base consumption k/watt usage per stage except for Stage 1.

This petition clearly shows these people's displeasure and calls for action to be taken. The only real action that I can take as a member of Parliament is first, to approach the Government and then to bring the matter to the attention of the House, as I am doing today. I have had cases at Marree, and also great concern has been expressed to me by the management of the main commercial operation at Marla Bore about the cost of supplying electricity. People in other areas in my electorate are concerned that they have no electricity at all (people living out from Hawker, as well as at Wilpena and Blinman). There is no longer any reason why the 10 per cent surcharge should continue to apply. I

now quote from some correspondence I received relating to this matter. I know that the Minister is aware of the problem, but I believe that it is time to take some action. Last year I received a letter dated 29 June 1982, from the Moteliers Association, which stated:

Dear Mr Gunn,

Our Association has just been informed of a further increase in electricity charges. We wish to protest at what we consider to be a most unreasonable impost. Since 30 June 1980 electricity charges have risen by approximately 63.7 per cent. As a fair comparison our average single room has increased by only 21.7 per cent in the same period.

The difficulty to justify the proposed increase angers residents of Ceduna even more because of the unreliable nature of our supply. We are subjected to long power failures. During one 11-hour failure last year the total resultant loss of revenue to the four motels in Ceduna was in excess of \$3 200. Another failure this year cost us over \$2 000 in lost revenue.

For this type of service we pay prices which are 10 per cent to 11 per cent greater than those paid in Adelaide. We are sure that residents in Adelaide would not tolerate the quality of service and consequential loss of income that we put up with.

We are aware that the Government pays a subsidy to assist the local council to supply power on ETSA's behalf. This makes ETSA charges to us even more difficult to justify. We would be most interested to learn how the State Government can justify this latest increase in price.

Of course, I had to explain to the association that the State Government does not set the price of power, that it is set entirely by the Electricity Trust and that the Minister of the day does not have day-to-day control or the authority to direct the Electricity Trust. However, during the term of the Tonkin Government we used to hear on nearly a monthly basis the Leader of the Opposition blame the then Government, and he would refer to the increases in electricity prices. Now the matter is firmly in the Premier's lap. I am expecting him to take appropriate action, because on many occasions as Leader of the Opposition he criticised increases in electricity charges.

We all know and appreciate that the Electricity Trust must have suitable revenue to maintain and extend its services. I do not believe that anyone minds paying a fair thing, but my constituents are sick and tired of being discriminated against in a blatantly unfair fashion. No longer is there any justification whatsoever for the Adelaide plus 10 per cent surcharge that has applied for many years. It is beyond my understanding why people continue to discriminate in such a blatant fashion against those people living in isolated communities.

Recently I attended a meeting at Thevenard where the Local Government Association considered this matter. Those present were unanimous in their view that the Adelaide plus 10 per cent surcharge which applies should be abolished immediately. In regard to the matters that I referred to concerning Coober Pedy and those other places, it is absolutely beyond my reasoning why people there should be victimised in such a fashion. They live in a difficult area; they are there in an endeavour to make a living; and they are doing something for South Australia. If these types of impost continue it will be fairly obvious that the Government believes that all people should live in the metropolitan area. There can be no other conclusion that one could come to.

Unfortunately, these days there are few of us who live in isolated parts of the community, but those of us who have spent all our lives in these isolated communities fully understand the difficulties involved in living in those areas. People there do not have access to facilities which people take for granted in metropolitan Adelaide or in the large cities and towns that we have in South Australia.

If the Government wants to take positive action to help these people, it should with one swoop of the pen provide that all people in South Australia be charged for electricity on the same basis. It is easy to say that I am asking for another subsidy. I have already explained to this House

today and on a previous occasion that a State Government is subsidising a number of operations within metropolitan Adelaide. I realise that people can say that the Government is subsidising water supplies. Country water subsidies amount to about \$17 000 000 or \$18 000 000, although that should be compared with \$61 000 000 for the transport system, and, say, \$3 500 000 for the Festival Theatre.

Mr Evans: More than that.

Mr GUNN: My good friend, the member for Fisher, says that it is a lot more than that. That simply strengthens the argument that I am making. One could go through the Auditor-General's Report and find without too much trouble a number of other services that are being subsidised. No member of Parliament would be prepared to sit by and see inflicted upon his constituents the sort of charges that apply to the people that I represent in Coober Pedy. It is absolutely unreasonable, it cannot be justified and it cannot be allowed to continue. Many of these people are of limited means.

I have already explained the situation in regard to the high cost of water. In the past the member for Albert Park has had a lot to say about various things: if his constituents had to pay \$50 for water and received the sort of electricity accounts that I have referred to, and were inflicted with these sorts of discriminatory charges, I wonder what sort of performance he would put on in this House—I would think that he would be worthy of winning an Academy award!

I have at my disposal a number of letters that I have received from my constituents over a considerable period of time which I could bring to the attention of the House. However, I think that I have made the position very clear in regard to this discrimination. I look forward to the Minister's considered response. I sincerely hope that the Minister will reply next week so that this matter can be brought to a vote. I believe that the Parliament should express an opinion on this matter. I do not want the situation created where the matter simply falls off the Notice Paper. I believe that it is a matter of such importance that the Parliament ought to make a decision on it. A number of my constituents are watching very closely for the results of the deliberations of this House on this matter.

I said earlier that the majority of people living on the upper Eyre Peninsula and other parts of the State receive their electricity from Port Augusta. The people at Port Augusta do not have to pay the 10 per cent surcharge: it is the same electricity, but because one lives in an isolated community or in a rural area one gets slugged, as the member for Mallee points out. I will admit that the original scheme introduced was a great improvement, but the time has now come when there should be equality in regard to these matters. There is certainly no equality in the way that those involved have been treated. I therefore call on the House to endorse this motion so that action can be taken to alleviate the problems to which I have drawn the attention of honourable members. I refer particularly to those people living at Coober Pedy and in the other areas that I have mentioned.

I know that the cost of electricity is high and that generating plants must be maintained; they must have people there to be on call for 24 hours a day. The previous Government did the right thing in approving the extension of a number of schemes such as those at Penong and Marree. The withdrawal of A.N.R. from many of these areas has placed a considerable strain on the resources of the Outback Areas Community Development Trust.

Bearing all that in mind, I believe that the charges cannot be justified any longer. I believe that it is worth repeating to honourable members (I am just following the line of the Minister of Education, who is a great one for re-emphasising points) that in many of those areas people paying the 10

per cent surcharge have had to pay up to \$25 000 just to have electricity connected to their homes.

They all appreciate and value having electricity connected to their properties but, as I said earlier, they want to have the benefits that apply to people in other country areas of South Australia and metropolitan Adelaide. Therefore, I commend the motion to the House, and look forward to the support of all honourable members who believe in a fair go and a bit of justice.

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): I support the remarks made by the member for Eyre, and I want to support him in a particular way. He has given the House the details of the history of this regrettable and iniquitous charge now continuing to be made on the people who live in those isolated circumstances, and whom he has the honour and responsibility to represent. He represents them very well: none of us could do a better job for our constituents than he does for the interests of his.

The point that he makes is further underlined by the point I want to make. Since the time this charge was introduced the cost of recovering the funds which were outlaid has escalated, and the sum to be paid to reimburse the State and the trust (its agency in this instance) for the expense incurred to extend those services and to ensure that they are available to make life there as reasonable and as civilised as possible compared to life in urban areas and the nearer settled areas has also escalated. They were capital costs incurred at the time. Inflation in the fullness of time has meant that they pale into insignificance as a minuscule amount of the actual contributions now made as the 10 per cent surcharge. If we were to look at \$100 spent on such a project in 1970, in today's money terms, given that we compound that figure with the c.p.i. since that time, it will have doubled and redoubled. Yet we have had the same fixed percentage of the bill for power added as a surcharge to their costs since the time those services were extended to each of the communities (and it varies from community to community) as and when it arose.

Therefore, I believe that along with all the other reasons the member for Eyre has given it is only legitimate and fair to take account of the original capital that was outlaid and the contribution that has now been made to the trust and the agencies that provided that capital to defray it from the surcharge already charged, and call a halt.

The least we should do if we are not prepared to do that is to fix it in dollar terms at what it was when it was first proclaimed in percentage terms, because that was the amount calculated at the time as being necessary to service that increased capital expenditure, which was incurred in providing the service to those people. Their lifestyles are chosen by them, I acknowledge that. The location in which they live has been their choice and so it is with all of us. We as taxpayers living in other places in South Australia have greater access to a far wider range of community services and entertainment facilities, and far better access to the provision of reliable electrical energy and a water supply to our homes. Many of those people still rely on rain water for their domestic use.

Mr Evans interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: As the member for Fisher points out, when there is a drought they do not have sufficient rain water and they have to cart it just as people in my own district have to do. They also do not have, as we have, deep drainage; they do not have access to the Festival Centre; they do not have access to the benefits that public transport can bring; and they do not have the same standard of sealed roads on which to travel as we do. The least we can do in all honesty and fairness is to now recognise that enough is enough and stop increasing that charge initially made to

service the debt incurred then by the percentage rate by which that charge was fixed, and give them some relief from at least that burden and not expect them to go on making further disproportionate contributions to the benefits they derive, which are less than the benefits available to anyone else.

I make that plea to the House, I make that plea to the Minister, and I make that plea to anyone in the trust who in any way has any responsibility for deciding to remove the surcharge and thereby try and redress the scales of justice on this matter. I thank you, Mr Acting Speaker, and members for the assistance you have given me in presenting that view.

FEDERAL MINISTER FOR TOURISM

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Coles): I move:

That this House condemns the Federal Minister for Tourism, Mr Brown, for his statement denigrating Adelaide as an international gateway; calls on the Premier to seek immediately an explanation from the Prime Minister as to whether Mr Brown was expressing the view of the Federal Government; and further, urges the Premier to ensure that Mr Brown retracts his statement and that he takes active steps to promote South Australia in order to compensate for his statements.

Every member of this House, and I believe every South Australian, would now be aware that last Friday at a function in Brisbane the Federal Minister for Tourism, Mr John Brown, said that Australia had too many international gateways, and that the cost of building and maintaining them was built into every air ticket. In a report in the *Australian* on Friday 29 April, he is reported as saying:

We have Adelaide—though why anyone would want to fly to Adelaide I don't know.

To say the least, those remarks, coming as they do from a Federal Minister responsible for promoting tourism both within the Commonwealth and overseas, are deplorable, and they have roused deep resentment within the tourism industry in South Australia, as well as throughout all the industries associated with tourism which, as the Minister of Tourism would know, include all industries except the defence industry. The irresponsibility of those remarks has angered all those people who have for years worked hard and long, some even in an honorary capacity, to try to build up the tourist image of South Australia.

They must certainly have angered the officials of certain Government departments, notably the Department of Tourism and the State Transport Authority, who worked so hard to prepare South Australia's case for an international airport. The remarks have angered personalities in the media who recognise that the image presented by politicians of the tourism product we sell has a powerful influence not only within the country but also beyond its borders. For a Minister charged with the heavy and important responsibilities of Mr Brown to have said what he did say makes one question his suitability for his portfolio.

Mr Lewis: And his sanity.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Yes, and people have questioned that subsequently. In questioning why anyone should want to fly to Adelaide, Mr Brown has insulted one of Australia's most beautiful capitals. Indeed, I suppose that we in this House would say that it is Australia's most beautiful capital, a city described by the *New Yorker* magazine, an authority of considerable standing, as 'possibly the last well planned, well governed, and moderately contented metropolis on earth'. However, there is a fair degree of discontent around the place at present, and it is entirely focused on Mr Brown. In speaking of Adelaide as an international gateway, Mr Brown referred to Perth, Port Hedland, Launceston, Hobart, Sydney, Brisbane, Townsville, and

Cairns, and said that the simple cost of building these things and the cost of maintaining places like Townsville with two flights a week is built into every domestic air ticket.

What an extraordinary statement for a Federal Minister to make! In the first place, he is lumping into one category the international gateways in the capital cities and those which are outside the capital cities and which, in the case of Townsville, Cairns, Port Hedland, and Launceston, are supplementary to an international gateway situated in the capital city of the respective State. He is virtually saying that Adelaide alone of all Australian capitals should be the city that does not have an international gateway; that South Australians should be the only citizens of this nation who must be subjected to the cost and inconvenience of travelling outside their State if they wish to go overseas; and that Adelaide alone of all capital cities is the only capital city, and South Australia the only State, that should have the disability of not having an international gateway to permit easy access to international visitors. In that regard, Mr Brown's remarks are so discriminatory that one cannot help wondering what kind of reception he will get when he next visits Adelaide, which I believe he does occasionally in order to play golf at Kooyonga.

I see that the Minister of Tourism is making notes, and I look forward to his warm support and that of his colleagues for this motion, because it seems to me that the Minister is also trying as best he can to encourage tourism in this State. Indeed, he must have been as shattered as, if not more shattered than, anyone else when he read the remarks of his Federal Labor colleague.

Having made the extraordinary statement about Adelaide and the cost of domestic flights, Mr Brown compounded the insult by subsequently confirming, reinforcing, and repeating his remarks. I refer specifically to his statement about the cost of the building being built into the cost of every domestic air ticket. What an amazing statement! I would remind Mr Brown that domestic air fares are costed on a commercial basis, and that the running of international airport facilities bears no relationship to the cost of domestic air fares.

Indeed, the only possible relationship that could be read into Mr Brown's remarks might be if he was suggesting that the loadings on interstate carriers are lighter because of the number of passengers who now use international carriers to come into Adelaide directly instead of through Melbourne, Sydney, or Perth, and because South Australians going overseas no longer have to use one of the other gateways. If that is what Mr Brown is saying, it is tantamount to saying that South Australians should carry the rest of the Australian citizens on their backs in the matter of domestic air fares. However, that is a proposition that no-one in this House could sustain.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: What did Mr Brown say about koalas?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The Minister of Tourism has at last noticed that I am wearing in my lapel a koala. Although it is not a real koala, it is a nice little koala that will do neither me nor him any harm; that is also the case with the live koala which I have had the pleasure of cuddling. As the Minister has prompted me to talk about koalas, let us hear what Mr Brown had to say about them in the same extraordinary speech.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Do you disagree with his remarks on koalas?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Yes. Mr Brown said that koalas were pesky little animals. Indeed, I am reluctant to read all he said about koalas because his remarks were so offensive that I would not like to see them included in *Hansard*. Suffice to say that Mr Brown was extremely insulting to koalas. My first official engagement as Minister of

Tourism (coincidentally, in view of Mr Brown's remarks) was a commitment to launch a booklet *Peninsula Way* for the Yorke Peninsula and Eyre Peninsula Tourist Associations. The function was arranged in the department and, when I arrived, I found that the then president of the association (the late Mr Harry Darling) had gathered in the room a wombat and a koala, and the photographers were anxious to photograph the new Minister cuddling a koala. I was happy to oblige and, on the strength of that experience, I know that the koala was pleasant to hold, that it snuggled into me as a small child would snuggle, that it was immaculately clean, that it did not smell, and that it had no fleas. The wombat appeared to be in the same condition, but I did not cuddle it, because I was led to believe it was too heavy for me to cuddle.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I am telling the truth. I may not have told the whole truth, but I have told the truth.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: To satisfy the Minister of Tourism, with whom I had a private conversation late last week, the koala, having been set down on the ground, relieved itself as any animal would have. I do not see why Mr Brown is being so—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Particularly in the presence of Mr Brown.

Mr Lewis: The tension and the excitement.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Yes, that is right. In a report of the same luncheon, which appeared in the *Advertiser*, Mr Brown said that the international airport at Adelaide was a great mistake. Well, that is Mr Brown's view. It is not the view of the tourism industry in South Australia and it is not the view of the airline industry or of the international carriers. Mr Brown might be interested to know that an estimated 48 000 passengers have used the airport since its 2 November opening. Those passengers, in the main, have stopped in South Australia, have spent money in South Australia, and are an asset to the State, an asset which we would not have had in such large numbers had there not been an international gateway. The workers at the airport have their own views about Mr Brown. One of those workers is reported to have said:

When I heard what he said, I said, 'Surely the guy couldn't be that cracked?'

That was certainly a genuine question that was being asked around the tourism industry on Friday when those remarks were reported, and one which is still being asked. What type of man have we got in charge of the destiny of tourism in Australia if he can make thoughtless, irresponsible, discriminatory and prejudicial remarks of that kind? In respect to the interstate flights, the burden and the disability that was imposed on most South Australians in being required to make those flights, one of the airport workers is reported to have said:

Let him [and that is Mr Brown] wait in one of those airports for four or five hours and see how he likes it.

It is not nice, and it can discourage people from making that extra stopover. Mr Brown, of course, completely ignored the freight benefits (and I will not deal at any length with that area), or the export benefits in terms of fragile or perishable freight such as seafood and flowers. Both of those industries are of significant importance and will be of growing importance to South Australia.

Having dropped his clangers, Mr Brown then, in the words of the *Sunday Mail* headline, 'Slips off to the footy'. He certainly does not make an apology. A day later, on 2

May, we see the headline in the *Advertiser* which states, 'Amused Minister sticks to his koala remarks'. The article goes on to say:

The Federal Minister for Recreation and Tourism, Mr Brown, has no regrets over his koala comments and the hue and cry they caused. 'I find the whole thing quite humorous,' he said from his Sydney home yesterday. 'People now know I am the Minister of Tourism, and that is good.'

If ever a politician was to insult a whole section of the population and then deliberately rub salt into the wounds, Mr Brown has done that in his remarks. They are the remarks of an egotistical and thoughtless man who thinks that he can insult a capital city and its citizens and then pass the whole thing off as a humorous incident, patting himself on the back at the same time because he has managed to get himself national and international publicity.

Indeed, everyone does now know that he is the Minister of Tourism, and everyone now regrets that he is the Minister of Tourism. I have no hesitation in saying that until those remarks were reported I had respected Mr Brown. I read with interest the speech he made at the summit conference. It was a sound speech, except in one respect where he said that the Federal Government was to establish a national school of tourism located in either Cairns or Townsville. I looked at that with great interest, and I thought that that was a strange place to establish a national school (with the exception of Port Hedland or Darwin), as it would be the most inaccessible and costly place for students from all over Australia to stay. I thought that that was a strange comment and that there must have been a policy reason for that. I thought that the political reason was that Cairns is a marginal Federal seat.

Let us consider the reality. It is widely understood around the tourism industry that there was no policy basis for giving those locations, and I hope that the Minister who is listening to this speech has made his own investigation and found that there was no policy basis for that statement that the school would be in Cairns or Townsville. It was literally something that popped into the heads of the Minister and his aides while the speech was being prepared. If anyone was to look at the degree of irresponsibility, let them look no further than that kind of ridiculous shoot from the lip statement that is going to bring tourism in Australia, which has been developing, quickly to its knees.

I hope that, when the Minister responds, he will not insult this House by attempting to defend his Federal colleague. If he does so I think he will set the seal of alienation on the tourism industry in South Australia that Mr Brown has already put in place. If anyone wants reference to the considerable angry comments that have been made by people in South Australia, one only needs to read the columns of the Letters to the Editors that have appeared in South Australian papers over the previous three to four days. William Reschke of the *Sunday Mail* wrote:

Oh dear, Mr Brown, we can bear it no longer, your absence from us. You must come to South Australia.

Indeed he must, and what a welcome he will get. Mr Reschke goes on to say:

We can promise you our koalas in their lovely mountain home at Cleland Reserve—just 20 minutes from town—will not pee on you. Like all South Australians, they are pretty happy with the relaxed hassle-free way things are done here. You might feel as though you are flying into Adelaide on the way back to town, but that is just how beautiful and spectacular our freeway drive down to the city is.

Mr Reschke then comments favourably on the tourism attractions of Adelaide. Indeed, the koalas and their ready accessibility to the heart of the city are very strong attractions for international visitors. The Department of Tourism research newsletter refers to this fact: in its issue dated December 1982 it states:

The park is continuously praised by international visitors, and by the many publicists who have visited it as part of Australia's familiarisation tours.

Indeed, for several years the front cover of the Australian Tourist Commission has kept on it a photograph of the park's fauna. So much for the Australian Tourism Commission; in the eyes of Mr Brown, it has apparently done the wrong thing. What is likely to happen as the result of Mr Brown's remarks? That is what we are considering now. I want to know what action the South Australian Government has taken to support the tourism industry in the light of the attack on it by the Federal Minister. I also want to know what action the Prime Minister has taken, and if any representations have been made to him other than those that have been made by me and other sections of the tourism industry.

I want him to reprimand Mr Brown. I want to know whether the Minister was speaking as a member of Cabinet and is reflecting a general attitude of the Federal Government to Adelaide as an international gateway. Everyone is entitled to believe when a Minister speaks that it is not a personal opinion, because a responsible Minister cannot do that, and everyone believes that when a Minister speaks he is reflecting Government policy.

At least he must be reflecting a view that Government will take into account in making its policy. The really worrying thing for the tourism industry in this State about Mr Brown's remarks is that they demonstrate beyond doubt (and he has repeated his remarks, so there is no doubt: he has not apologised for them; he has reaffirmed them) that he has very luke-warm support for the airport and for Adelaide as an international gateway. The ramifications of that are considerable because the relationship between the Federal Government and the international carriers is important. I know from discussions that Ministers in the Tonkin Cabinet had with international carriers, the informal discussions about the necessity for flights, the likelihood of flights, the assistance that Governments can give to help an airline promote its flights (and the Minister of Tourism will need to answer some questions about that, particularly in relation to New Zealand), that Governments can be and are, indeed, very influential in their relationships with international carriers. It does not inspire any confidence at all in the tourism industry in South Australia to know the Minister's views because it simply means that we South Australians do not have an advocate in the Minister for Tourism when that Minister is dealing with the international carriers, when he is talking to Qantas, British Airways, and Singapore Airlines. It is quite clear that he will not give any advocacy for Adelaide.

In the light of that, what do we have? We have a statement which I would describe kindly, I think, as an ineffectual statement by the South Australian Minister of Tourism describing Mr Brown's comments as 'unnecessarily provocative'. I would have thought that he might have come up with something a bit stronger. He is the one who is supposed to be—

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I did, but they didn't report it.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The Minister says by way of interjection that he did, but that they did not report it. I would be very pleased if he could provide me with a copy of his statement. I accept what he says, and I know how selective editors can be. Indeed, if he did make a strong public statement, then he is to be commended. However, the *Advertiser* of 30 April reports as follows:

Mr Keneally said the thought behind Mr Brown's comment was not shared by the State Government or the travel industry in South Australia.

That would have to be the understatement of 1983. The travel industry in South Australia is absolutely enraged. It

is not only enraged, it has a feeling of sick discouragement that the millions of dollars that we, as taxpayers, have spent on promotion of this State, the unremitting efforts to get the airport, the endless hours of work and discussion that have gone into developing some cohesion in the industry, count for nought when a Federal Minister gets up on a stage in another State and gives one a very swift kick below the belt.

What is the industry in this State supposed to think of that kind of attitude on the part of the Federal Government? It is not too strong to say that the reaction has been one of heartbreak. So many people in this State have tried so hard for so long. They were entitled to believe that we were actually getting somewhere with tourism. Indeed, we have been, and the figures have been read into the record so often that I will not read them in again. However, the reality is that the growth in tourism in South Australia, interstate, intrastate and international tourism, outstripped the national average by a very long way according to the 1981-82 figures.

However, as far as Mr Brown is concerned, that is merely a little something that can be brushed aside while he is at lunch, and dismissed again when he reflects in a satisfied fashion at the week-end on what a big name he has made for himself. I would like to refer Mr Brown to the 'South Australian Tourism Development Plan' and the heading on page 13 which deals with prospects for the tourism industry. The chapter deals with the difficulties which the industry in South Australia faces. It states:

If these trends continue and no major initiatives are undertaken, the most likely future for the tourism industry in South Australia is one of limited growth in the short term, with the likelihood of a no growth situation in the longer term due, in the main, to competition from the other States.

What are we now supposed to feel when our competitive position with the other States is eroded by a Minister who asks, 'Why would anyone want to come to Adelaide?' Incidentally, Mr Brown was reported subsequently as denying that he said that. In the *Advertiser* of 2 May it is reported:

Mr Brown said he did not say 'Why would anyone want to fly into Adelaide?'

I took the trouble to ring three journalists in Brisbane who had taped Mr Brown's remarks, because I knew that I would be standing in Parliament, moving this motion, and I wanted to make sure that what I said was accurate, and that I did not rely on reports that may not have been correct. I was told by each of those journalists (each of them representing reputable national publications or electronic or press media), that is, journalists from the *Australian*, the A.B.C. and the *Brisbane Courier Mail* (which, of course, is a State publication, not a national publication) that Mr Brown did say that. That raises another very serious consideration: a Minister stands up in public, makes a statement, and subsequently denies that he made it. Again, one has to call into question the man's integrity, and his credibility.

An honourable member: And his honesty.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Indeed, and his honesty. However, the real point of this motion is to ensure that redress of some kind is made to South Australians. Therefore, the motion asks the Premier to seek immediately an explanation from the Prime Minister as to whether Mr Brown was expressing the view of the Federal Government. If he was, the implications for this State are very, very serious and far reaching indeed. We have to be assured that there was no Federal Cabinet endorsement of his remarks. Indeed, I would like to be assured that the Prime Minister had reprimanded him.

One could go further, as many people have, and say that he should resign. A person who has been as irresponsible as he has should not hold a Ministerial portfolio. Therefore, we want to know that he was not expressing the view of

the Federal Cabinet. We want more: we want Mr Brown to apologise and to retract his statement. We want him to make amends and, by doing so, to take active steps to promote South Australia in order to compensate for his statements. I hope that when the Minister gets to his feet he will be able to assure me that those steps have been taken; that Mr Brown has been reprimanded, that he is not expressing Federal policy, that he will come to South Australia and apologise, that he will provide some kind of active support (by that, I mean funds) and the moral support that goes when a Minister can use his influence to talk to major tour operators and say, 'Let us see what we can do to give South Australia a boost.' Why could not Mr Brown come here and do a tour of Adelaide? I would be delighted to take him on a tour of Adelaide.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I guess that the Minister might want to escort his colleague, and I guess that he will have some fairly strong things to say to him: I certainly hope so. When that tour is over I would like Mr Brown to stand up and agree with the *New Yorker* magazine that Adelaide is possibly the last well planned, well governed (and he would be referring to local government, the Adelaide City Council, when he refers to government) and moderately contented metropolis on earth.

Mr Hamilton: You wouldn't give an inch.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The member for Albert Park says I would not give an inch. Why should I give an inch? I am fighting for the tourism industry in this State and I wish his Government would do the same. The Premier made some feeble, vague comment which was barely a criticism of the Federal Minister. The Federal Minister himself has said nothing. What kind of a show are they running on the other side? There are people in this industry who are barely viable in South Australia. They depend on tourism to create jobs and the member for Albert Park sits across there, almost as if he is defending Mr Brown. I hope he is not, because if he is his ranking with the industry in South Australia will be at rock bottom.

I am anxious to hear what the Minister has to say in reply to this debate. I am speaking on behalf of many angry people who have contacted me. I will not name them specifically, but suffice it to say they represent all the umbrella tourism organisations in South Australia and the Minister of Tourism confirms what I am saying and, as he would know, that covers a very wide spectrum of decent people who are trying to do a worthwhile job. There are not a lot of them doing it for themselves. Many of them will not make any real money out of tourism, but they do gain a great deal of satisfaction from seeing growth and increased employment, and from seeing the sheer pleasure that comes to visitors who have the opportunity to see our beautiful capital and our magnificent State.

I hope that the Government does not in any way move to amend this motion because, unless the Minister can provide me with very satisfactory answers (and none has been made public to date) as to the action that has been taken and the action that will result, to make amends for Minister Brown's statement, then I believe the condemnation of this House should stand.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Tourism): When I first heard the reported remarks of the Federal Minister for Tourism, the Hon. J. Brown, I thought if he has been reported correctly, I am outraged and all South Australians should be outraged and, if he has not been reported correctly, then he is inept as Minister to allow such statements to be circulated about him, because he obviously made some comment that would have engendered that sort of media response. On 29 April, Friday last, I wrote to the Minister in these terms:

My dear Minister,

I was dismayed and somewhat incensed to hear of your reported statements concerning South Australia and one of its outstanding tourism features, the koala bear, alleged to have been made by you in Brisbane last week. Can I tell you that what you are reported to have said has brought an outraged reaction throughout the tourist industry in this State. I would hope you have available a transcript of what you actually said yesterday. If it in any way resembles the reports of the local press (examples of which are enclosed) then I must say that your words were ill-advised.

Quite apart from the undesirability of such give-away lines like '... who would want to come to Adelaide anyway?'... my Government totally rejects your thesis that international terminals in cities like Adelaide increase domestic airfares and are counter-productive to the promotion of international tourism to Australia. We would hold the contrary view and from the nature of the marketing strategies adopted by the Australian Tourist Commission, I would judge that body holds a contrary view.

Whatever your actual words were, the reports have produced continuing hostile comment in this State. I believe that you owe the industry an explanation of what you said and therefore invite you to come to Adelaide within the next week or as soon as possible to meet the South Australian Tourism Industry Council. While in Adelaide, I invite you to inspect and enjoy the superb tourist attractions and facilities this State has to offer so that when in future you express an opinion about South Australia your response is somewhat better informed. If you can let me know an acceptable time I will arrange an appropriate itinerary for you.

I also sent a teleprinter message to the Minister and I have followed up those two contacts with him by telephone and I will come to that in a moment.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Has the Premier communicated with the Prime Minister?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I have not asked whether the Premier has communicated or written to the Prime Minister. The Premier certainly expressed his legitimate concern about the remarks that have been reported to have been made by the Federal Minister for Tourism. I might say also, in my discussion with Mr Brown, that he claims that he has been misrepresented by the press, and I noted the comments made by the honourable member, but my Federal colleague says that if anybody disbelieves that, he should contact the honourable member for Moreton, a very senior member of the Liberal Party in Canberra and in Australia, who was one of the 150 people who attended the function at which Mr Brown spoke, and he assures me the colleague of members opposite will tell them, as he has told me, that what he said was not as has been reported. In fact, in my discussions with the Minister, he has indicated a strong support for the International Airport in Adelaide.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: What about the tapes, the taped records?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I have asked the Federal Minister to forward me a copy of the tape of the speech he gave and hopefully that is in the mail. I will listen to those tapes with a great deal of interest to see exactly what statement the Minister is alleged to have made. I agree very largely with what the member for Coles has said. In South Australia the one industry that is showing a significant growth rate, growth potential, is the tourist industry. It is an industry dependent very largely upon the support of all those organisations, particularly the Government, who are able to provide the stimulus to the industry. We have in South Australia a group of people who have great get up and go in the tourist industry and who are prepared to put their money where their mouth is.

These people rely upon a favourable climate that can be engendered by actions of Government, and by the views of Government, and any statement at all, like the one that has been reported, can have a crushing effect upon tourism. I believe it has had a crushing effect upon tourism in South Australia and it is for that reason I have asked the Federal Minister to come to Adelaide to speak to the representatives of the industry and to explain exactly what his position is

in relation to Adelaide, the Adelaide Airport and the tourism potential of South Australia. In fact, the Minister and I have had a very long discussion about this, and it will be followed up at the end of this month at the Tourist Ministers' Conference in Sydney.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: When is he coming?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The Minister has not told me exactly. I expect he will be here before the Tourist Ministers' Conference. He has also told me that his Federal colleagues (who are also Federal Labor members of Parliament from South Australia) have been most vocal in their criticism of him, and have also demanded that he come to South Australia, not only to explain what he has said and, if what he has said is what is reported, then I will be the first to demand an apology. What I am prepared to do, having had the contrary view put to me by the honourable gentleman, is to wait until the tapes arrive in South Australia so that I can make my own judgment.

The Minister did not deny that he used Adelaide as an example in a most unfavourable context. I think that it was unfortunate that he did so and that he should be criticised for doing so. I make no apology for it. As I understand it, what he was saying was that we have enough international airports in Australia and that the economy cannot stand any more. To prove the point unfortunately he used the example of the Adelaide Airport. He could have easily used another example but it was unfortunate for South Australia that he decided to select the Adelaide International Airport.

I have pointed out to the Federal Minister that there is considerable benefit not only to the South Australian economy and the tourist industry but to Australia in having a viable international airport at Adelaide. He concedes that fact, but makes the point that currently there is considerable unused capacity at the Adelaide International Airport and that there is considerable unused capacity in the customs division of that airport. However, he concedes that, with very vigorous international promotion that the Federal Government will be participating in over the next two or three years, within five years he expects the Adelaide International Airport to be viable in its own right, having regard to the increase in international custom for that airport. So, that is quite contrary to what the press reports had him saying.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I am waiting until I hear the tape of what he had to say. All I can judge his comments on is what he assumes to be the view of a senior member of the Liberal Party, a Minister in the previous Government who, I understand, has no criticism of what he said.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Yes, he is a Queenslander and I know what Queenslanders are like on both sides of the spectrum. I know of the parochialism that permeates the Queensland political system. I do not want members of the Opposition or anyone to believe that in any way I would countenance any such comments, if in fact such comments were made, but I think it is fair that having had the alternative views put to me I should listen to the tapes of the speech before I add my condemnation.

The Minister quite obviously was not speaking on behalf of the Federal Government in criticising South Australia. In fact the Minister (here again this was in private conversation) has impressed on me that he would not say that sort of thing about Adelaide. As was reported, he is a frequent visitor to Adelaide, and I understand that as a horse owner he has a close interest in the industry in South Australia: one of his horses has won a number of very important events here. All of that, of course, would mean not one whit if in fact the reported comments are correct.

Mr Evans: He said it.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: For the benefit of the honourable member who obviously has not been listening, the Federal Minister for Tourism has told me that he has been misquoted, in the sense that the quotation has been taken out of context from a 50-minute speech. He is sending me the tape of what he had to say so that I can judge for myself, as Minister of Tourism, whether or not the criticism is valid. He concedes that there has been a quite outraged response in South Australia (quite legitimately so) to the comments that he was reported to have said. He says that he did not make those comments as reported, and what I am saying in fairness to the honourable gentleman is that I must wait until I listen to the tape before I am able to judge whether or not he—

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Will you report to the House?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I intend to seek leave to continue my remarks so that I will be able to listen to the tapes and report to the House next week in regard to the comments made. In regard to the Minister's comments on koala bears, I certainly do not share those sentiments at all. I doubt whether very many people do. My Ministerial colleague federally made the statement, as the member for Coles has already pointed out, that this has made him the best known Minister for Tourism in Australia. I do not really think he takes any pride in that, but he is acknowledging a fact of life. It might be of interest for members opposite to know that as a result of this controversy Australia has been featured in two 10-minute prime time segments on the major American radio network, which we would not have had otherwise. I would have preferred that we had that prime time without this controversy, which, as I acknowledged, has derived from the comments that the Minister was reported to have said.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I will wait until I have heard the tape.

Mr Lewis: Will you give us a copy of the tape?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I think it is a public tape.

Mr Lewis: So you would not mind?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I do not see any problems in that. I am simply saying that I will wait until I have listened to the tape after which I will report to the House. In terms of koalas, I do not share at all my Federal colleague's view. I believe that they are an enormous tourist attraction for Australia. One has only to travel around the world and be on an aeroplane that leaves Australia with visitors returning to other countries to see the mementoes that they take back with them, and predominantly, it is the koala. I have not had a close personal contact with a koala, and I do not know whether those unfortunate things happen.

I know that some people have complained that it does happen and that, further, a koala is a very nervous and timid animal. All nervous and timid animals are inclined to do that kind of thing if they are frightened; in a sense that is a fact of life. Unfortunate as it might be, a person who cuddles a koala is always liable to run that risk. I have been informed that in South Australia our koalas are much better behaved and people can cuddle them with a great deal of freedom.

I know that South Australians have a legitimate concern and a legitimate cause for complaint if the reported remarks are correct. I have already been informed by the South Australian Tourist Industry Council in regard to the action it has taken. SARTO through its chairman has already contacted the Prime Minister and the Federal Minister. The Tourist Industry Council has indicated its deep concern about the comments that have been made and I think that that is a legitimate response. Before I seek leave to continue my remarks, I want to reinforce the point made by the member for Coles, a point that I have made previously,

namely, that in South Australia we have a possibility of developing a very viable and good tourist industry that will have benefits not only to entrepreneurial people within the industry, with jobs flowing from that, but there are large benefits to South Australia generally and a benefit to the Government, because a viable tourist industry with its potential for job creation and with its very sound economic benefits provides advantages to all sections of the community.

Anything that would detract from that will certainly receive the firm opposition of the Government. If that means that the Government has to take to task Federal colleagues for insensitivity towards the tourist industry or that we have to take to task Federal colleagues for outrageous statements against the South Australian tourist industry or that we have to take to task Federal colleagues for their ineptitude in their statements about the South Australian industry, that will be done. What I am asking this House to do today is to allow me time to listen to the tape so that I can come back next week with a much more complete report as to what was said. I therefore seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: FEDERAL MINISTER FOR TOURISM

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I claim that I have been misrepresented, and I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr HAMILTON: During the contribution by the member for Coles by way of interjection I stated that the member was uncharitable in her remarks in response to giving credit to this Government and not being prepared to give an inch.

Mr LEWIS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker. Is it within the province of Standing Orders to correct proceedings of the House which are out of order in the first instance? I would have thought that to attempt to do so is to give the imprimatur of orderliness to the behaviour which precipitated it. I do not think that would be so. I seek your ruling.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Whitten): The honourable member claims that he heard remarks that clearly misrepresented him. I give him the opportunity to make the explanation.

Mr HAMILTON: Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. The member twisted my remarks to make a political point, intimating that I was not really concerned with the tourist industry in South Australia. I categorically refute such an allegation and, in fact, given sufficient time today during Question Time it was my intention to ask the following question of the Minister:

If the Minister has not already done so, will he extend an invitation to the Federal Minister for Tourism to visit South Australia in the near future so as to have discussions with representatives of the tourism and associated industries?

Mr GUNN: I rise on a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker. The member for Albert Park is now going far beyond what is accepted as a personal explanation, and he is entering into matters which he intended to put before the House but which were not debated; and therefore I suggest that he is totally out of order.

The ACTING SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The member for Albert Park was endeavouring to explain his attitude.

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): I move:

That the Acting Speaker's ruling be disagreed to.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Will the honourable member please put into writing the reasons for his dissent?

The SPEAKER: Order! I uphold the ruling of the Acting Speaker. I understand that the member who dissented has now produced a document setting out his reasons for the dissent. It is not signed, but I will accept it as coming from the member for Mallee. It reads:

I move that this House dissents from the ruling of the Acting Speaker that the member for Albert Park was not out of order when giving a personal explanation of his allegedly being misrepresented by the member for Coles when he attempted to read a question he said he intended to ask had he had an opportunity to do so during Question Time today.

The situation we have now reached is that the member for Mallee is dissenting from my ruling as distinct from the ruling of the Acting Speaker. I call on the member for Mallee, who has 10 minutes in which to explain his reasons for dissent.

Mr LEWIS: I understand the gravity of the action I took and I did so at the time I took it. As I understand it, personal explanations are made at a time when they do not otherwise interfere with the speech of any member during the course of a debate. To that extent the personal explanation was quite in order. I do not question that.

The point about which and upon which I differ from the ruling of the Chair is that the matter canvassed by the member for Albert Park was not in any way countenanced and could not have been countenanced by the member for Coles in the remarks she made in response to an interjection from him. He allegedly claims that she had misrepresented his view when he interjected upon her in his speech. I accepted the ruling of the Acting Speaker on the point that, given that the member for Coles had made a comment about how she perceived the member for Albert Park's remarks, I nonetheless do not accept that the member for Albert Park can in any way claim to you, Sir, or to anyone to whom you deputise your authority, or to this House, that the member for Coles could have been aware that he intended to ask a question today on that subject.

That is exactly what he started to do: he began to read a question which he alleged he would have asked had the opportunity presented itself. That bears no relationship to his explaining where he had been misrepresented. He had begun to debate whether or not he would have done something at some other time, and that was in no way related to the need for him to explain how his view of the matter had been misrepresented.

In my judgment, Mr Speaker, it is a mistake to allow that kind of debate to enter into personal explanations and, to my certain knowledge, you, Sir, earlier this session ruled the member for Alexandra out of order because he tried to do exactly the same thing, and he was summarily sat down. I do not understand the reasons you have for the variation between the decision on that incident and the decision on this occasion, but I do wish to understand that there is no favouritism, in your judgment, to the member for Albert Park either because he belongs to the same Party as you or because he is a member of the same Party as that of the member to whom you deputised your responsibility.

I do not consider that in either case it is good enough reason, on the one hand, to permit the member for Albert Park to continue his explanation by debating the matter and, on the other hand, to earlier follow the precedent, which has been established since personal explanations were introduced in this House, that the matter shall not be debated. I refer, of course, to the occasion when you sat down the member for Alexandra when he tried to read the document that he would otherwise have put on record had the opportunity presented itself prior to his making that personal

explanation. It is for that reason, and for that reason alone, that I seek the opinion of this House whether it is legitimate to sit down a member of the Opposition when he tries to do something that a member of the Government is permitted to do on a later occasion.

The SPEAKER: The way in which the honourable member expressed himself at the end of that speech lays him open to making a very grave reflection, or to the possibility that he reflected very seriously, on the Chair in the sense that I had drawn a distinction between Government members and Opposition members. I should have thought it perfectly clear to anyone, first, that that is not the case and, secondly, it is gravely in breach of Standing Orders. I now give the honourable member an opportunity to think about what he has said, and he may care to withdraw those last remarks.

Mr LEWIS: Mr Speaker, I made no such assertion. I put a question to you to reassure me that that was not so, as I believed it was unlikely to have been so. I sought a reason from you, since no other reason had occurred to me. There seems to be an inconsistency and I cannot find the reason.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member may not debate the matter again. Just so that I am clear on what the honourable member is doing, I take it that he did not wish to reflect on the Chair and that, if he did inadvertently reflect on the Chair, he withdraws that reflection. Is that the substance?

Mr LEWIS: That is so, Mr Speaker.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Tourism): I oppose the motion and strongly suggest that members should support the ruling made by the Acting Speaker. With you, Sir, I was somewhat appalled to hear the member for Mallee say twice that he was wondering whether favouritism had been given—

Mr Lewis: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, that has been withdrawn.

The SPEAKER: I uphold that point of order. The honourable member withdrew it and I think that we can let that issue lie.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I merely wanted to reinforce that, and I am pleased that that withdrawal has been made. What took place was clear. During the debate on the motion moved by the member for Coles, the member for Albert Park interjected, saying, 'You won't give an inch.' As a result of that interjection, the member for Coles took my colleague and the Government to task, saying, 'It's about time that you and the people on your side did something about tourism in South Australia.' She went on to say that we were not concerned about tourism, and she made other remarks that will be seen in *Hansard*.

As a result of that, my colleague sought to make a personal explanation when the debate was adjourned, and was given the right by the House to make such an explanation. During that explanation, he sought to clarify his position and, so as not to debate the issue and in order to prove to the House that his concern for tourism in South Australia was legitimate and genuine, he wanted to read to the House a question that he had intended to ask me, as Minister, today, not to debate the issue but merely to clarify his position. Had that question involved an altogether different matter, the criticism may have been valid, but the question was pertinent to his personal explanation, and on that basis I believe, Mr Speaker, that your colleague's ruling was correct and that this House should support that ruling.

The SPEAKER: My observation will be brief. In accepting this office, I told the House that I would play it down the line. I believe that I have not shown favouritism in my dealings with the Government and with the Opposition, and I will not show favouritism. That is all I wish to say.

Motion negatived.

NATURAL DEATH BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

Ms LENEHAN (Mawson): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is in similar terms to the one recommended by the Legislative Council Select Committee on the Natural Death Bill, 1980, which passed in the Legislative Council on 26 March 1980. The difference is that part of the previous Bill which referred to the definition of death has been omitted as unnecessary due to the Death (Definition) Act, 1983.

The principal purpose of the Bill is to provide for, and give legal effect to, directions against the artificial prolongation of the dying process. This will ensure that a terminally ill patient will be able, if he or she wishes, to issue a direction that extraordinary measures are not to be taken when death is inevitable and imminent.

As the select committee report and the *Hansard* reports of the debate are readily available to Members, I feel that a summary of the arguments for the Bill is more appropriate than a further extensive second reading. The proposition is a simple one. Adults have (with some minor exceptions) the absolute right to refuse medical treatment, and no doctor is permitted to treat the patient against the patient's known wishes. If the patient is conscious, aware of his rights, and able to signify consent or otherwise to treatment, no problem should arise. However, once a patient is unconscious or is heavily sedated, and is therefore unable to exercise that right to refuse or consent to medical treatment, then the treatment at that stage of a terminal illness is entirely at the discretion of the doctor. It may be that the treatment the doctor gives would not be wanted by the patient, but the patient is unable to have any effective say. This Bill, if passed, would provide a framework that would ensure that any person who so desired would have their wishes respected in the circumstances previously outlined.

Besides this part of the Bill's most important function of ensuring that the patient's wishes are respected, it would also have the effect of relieving the doctor and relatives of terminally ill patients of the responsibility of deciding what treatment should or should not be applied.

On a topic as sensitive as this, it is also important that it is clearly understood what the Bill does not do. This Bill does not attempt to solve every problem involved in death due to a terminal illness. Some people might think that it should; the fact is that it does not. For example, the Bill specifically restricts itself to adults; so the problems relating to terminally ill children do not come within its scope. A person whose condition is commonly understood as being a human vegetable may not come within the scope of the Bill. On reading the interpretations, it is immediately apparent that death has to be 'imminent' and treatment has to be 'useless'. Very many people in that state would not meet this criteria. The *status quo* would, therefore, be undisturbed.

The Bill does not authorise any act that causes or accelerates death, as distinct from an act that permits the dying process to take its natural course. The Bill not only does not authorise such acts, but specifically states that it does not authorise those acts in clause 7 (2). While it is not usual for a Bill to state what it does not permit, the select committee unanimously agreed that, to avoid any misunderstanding by lay people reading the Bill, such a clause should be inserted.

This Bill is a result of a unanimous decision of a select committee of the Legislative Council. It answers some important medi-legal questions. It does not disturb the present doctor-patient relationship unless the patient wants it disturbed. If it is disturbed, it is disturbed in favour of the

patient, allowing him or her to assert his or her rights to make his or her own decision regarding useless medical treatment in cases of terminal illness. This Bill does not disadvantage anyone, as no-one's rights are adversely affected; in fact, they are strengthened owing to the safeguards written into the Bill. It cannot be misused.

The Bill allows for people who are about to die, some say in their own dying process—not if they are going to die, not when they are going to die, but how. I think that it is appropriate at this point to briefly read from an editorial that appeared in the *Advertiser* on Friday, 26 September 1980. In respect to how a person is going to die, the editorial is headed, 'Dying with Dignity' and goes on to state:

The report of the Legislative Council Select Committee on the Natural Death Bill is an instance of the Parliamentary process at its best . . . The committee has refined and developed the original idea to produce a valuable report and a new draft Bill. What is now proposed is a sensible, and perhaps even overdue, recognition of the previously unknown dimensions of the legal and ethical problems that modern medical technology can create in matters of life and death.

Ordinarily, one wants the best medical treatment available; but one also wants to be able to die with dignity . . . By providing for people to make witnessed statements (in advance of the event) that they would not want to be subjected to extraordinary measures to prolong life in the face of terminal illness. The necessary safeguards are there, both for doctors and for patients who may reconsider, and the proposals seem consistent with what is generally required by religious and theological considerations. They are also consistent with a recent statement on the subject by the Pope.

That should be sufficient to reassure everybody that this Bill has no relationship to euthanasia. It is not a case of mercy killing; it is a case of eliminating the merciless withholding of natural death. Mr Blevins and the whole committee deserve our thanks.

I believe that the sentiments expressed in that editorial are as appropriate now as they were then—in fact, even more so. I, therefore, strongly commend the Bill to the House, and I seek leave to have the detailed explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 provides the necessary definitions. For the purposes of the Act, a terminal illness is a condition that is such that death would be imminent if extraordinary measures were not taken to prolong life, and from which there is no reasonable prospect of a temporary or permanent recovery. In this context, 'recovery' includes a remission of symptoms or effects of the illness. 'Extraordinary measures' are medical or surgical procedures that are designed to prolong life by maintaining vital bodily processes that are not capable of independent operation. This would include, for instance, the supplementation or supplanting of a bodily function by a machine.

Clause 4 provides for the making of a direction by a person who wishes that, in the event of his suffering from a terminal illness, his life shall not be prolonged by extraordinary measures, and also provides that the medical practitioner who is treating him shall act in accordance with the direction, unless there is a reason to believe that the patient has revoked or intended to revoke the direction or that when he made it he did not understand what he was doing. The provision does not derogate from the duty of a medical practitioner to inform his patient of all treatments that are available in his case.

Clause 5 provides that the Act does not limit the right of a person to refuse medical treatment, nor the legal consequences of taking, or refraining from taking, therapeutic measures in the case of a patient who has or has not made a direction under the Act or extraordinary measures in the case of a patient who has not made a direction under the Act. It is not to be inferred, for instance, that a medical

practitioner may not, in the exercise of his judgment, withhold extraordinary measures in the case of a patient who has not made a direction.

Clause 6 provides that the non-application of or the withdrawal of extraordinary measures shall not be regarded as a cause of death for the purposes of the law of this State. Clause 7 is a savings provision that will permit the preservation of organs for transplant and the life of a foetus where the mother has died.

Mr OSWALD secured the adjournment of the debate.

VENUS BAY ACCESS ROAD

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I move:

That, in the opinion of the House, the Government should provide adequate funds to continue the sealing of the Venus Bay access Road.

In moving this motion, I must explain to members that, in the view of my constituents who live in that part of the State, this is an important matter. Some people may believe that it is not suitable matter on which to take up the time of the House. However, the patience of my constituents has reached a stage where they consider that no other course of action could adequately be taken to give this matter the attention that it deserves. People who live on Eyre Peninsula or in the Northern parts of the State believe that, for a long time, they have not received a good deal in relation to road funding. This is only one of many such matters that I intend to highlight during the life of this Parliament.

I was elected to Parliament to represent the people in my district, and I intend to raise from time to time, in the strongest possible fashion, a number of matters of this nature. I am sorry that time is running out today. However, to emphasise my feelings, I quote from a document prepared by Mr Chilman, the Secretary of the Eyre Peninsula Local Government Association, which states:

Finance to local government generally and in particular the area of road funding is rapidly losing ground in real terms and we must be forever vigilant to correct this situation. For many years South Australia has been treated as the poor relation of and without doubt has been disadvantaged by the Commonwealth and to a greater extent, Eyre Peninsula has had to accept being even more disadvantaged by the State to the point of being treated like second-class citizens. The main reason for this is because of our small percentage of State population (2.6 per cent, in Eyre statistical division, plus 2.5 per cent in Whyalla, which totals 5.1 per cent). However, Eyre Peninsula has 17.9 per cent of the State's road length excluding unincorporated areas—if unincorporated areas are included, percentage is 14.5 per cent; consumes about 20 per cent of the State's auto distillate and 6.3 per cent of its motor spirit (including Whyalla).

Eyre Peninsula's general rate revenue is \$52 per head. The South Australian average is 27.6 per cent per head of population. In Eyre Peninsula 98 per cent of the roads are under council control (unsealed—12 716 kilometres). In South Australia, 88 per cent of the roads under council control are unsealed, which makes it a figure of 69 333 kilometres.

The State's road funding proportion is low enough, but the situation is accelerated on Eyre Peninsula because of the great deficiency of road funds that have been emphasised in this area over a longer period. Notwithstanding the percentage of financial contributions being made by a small percentage of the population to the State and Commonwealth, something must be done about this great disparity of funds. It goes on to make a number of uncharitable comments in relation to what has actually happened.

The Highways Department had approximately \$137 000 000 to spend on roads last financial year. The District Council of Elliston for a considerable period of time has made repeated representations to the Highways

Department and the Government in relation to having this road sealed. I want to quote from a letter which was written to the Minister of Transport (Hon. R.K. Abbott) on 22 March 1983, which states:

As you would be aware, council is most concerned over the present funding levels on the abovementioned roads and is now seeking a commitment from your Government that the funding of sealing works will be at least maintained in the case of the Venus Bay access road and be substantially increased in regard to the Lock-Elliston Road. Prior to the recent change of Government, council had been advised by the then Minister of Transport and the Commissioner of Highways that sufficient funds would be allocated to council to enable the sealing of the whole length of Venus Bay access road to occur within a reasonable period. This assurance given by the former Minister was only given after years of representations made by council by means of correspondence and deputation and council therefore felt that at last it had won the battle in regard to this road.

Circumstances have of course now changed, with there being a new Government in power. There have been suggestions or rumours heard by council that the continued funding of sealing works on the Venus Bay access road may be in doubt and furthermore that council was exceptionally fortunate in being allocated a grant this financial year. Council is extremely concerned with such rumours and would be loath to consider that there was any truth in them. The deputation will seek a commitment from you guaranteeing the further continuous funding of sealing works on the Venus Bay access road to enable it to be completely sealed within two years.

In view of the time schedule involved, I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

METROPOLITAN TAXI-CAB REGULATIONS

Adjourned debate on motion of the Hon. D.C. Brown:

That the regulations under the Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act, 1956-1978, relating to fees, made on 3 March 1983 and laid on the table of this House on 15 March 1983, be disallowed.

(Continued from 20 April. Page 935.)

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Minister of Transport): In speaking to the motion moved by the member for Davenport to disallow the regulations that were tabled in the House on 15 March, I say that the Government opposes the motion. Its reasons for that are that the Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Board is not funded by the Government, and is totally reliant on fees that are obtained from the taxi-cab industry to carry out the duties and functions imposed by the Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act to enable sufficient revenue to be raised to cover the salaries of employees, and the operational expenditure necessitates that fees, licences and otherwise be increased whenever necessary. Over latter years this has been on an annual basis and, because of legislative provisions, alterations to fees must take place on 1 April each year. The sole exception to this is the transfer fees which may be altered at any time, subject to approval.

As I said, the financial year of the board is from 1 April 1983 to 31 March 1984. The board incurred a deficit of approximately \$31 000 for 1982-83 and, if the fees had not been increased from 1 April this year, which is the beginning of its financial year, the deficit for 1983-84 would have been approximately \$57 000. The increased fees based on no change to the transaction level, will recover about \$45 000 of that deficit. Three of the four increased fees are for annual licences from 1 April 1983 and, if the regulations are disallowed, \$33 000 would be lost in 1983-84. That would increase the 1983-84 deficit of the board by that amount. This would necessitate higher increases for 1984-85 and, in reality, it would have represented a two-year freeze to general taxi-cab board fees.

The fees were last increased on 1 April 1982, and, if the regulations are not amended to increase the fees as from 1

April 1983 which, as I pointed out earlier, is the commencement of the financial year for the Taxi-Cab Board, they cannot be increased until 1 April 1984. The taxi-cab industry recovered increases in December 1982 and the fee increases should not impose any hardship on the industry.

The increased fees compare favourably with those applying interstate where the fee for transfer of a taxi-cab licence in Western Australia, Victoria and New South Wales is approximately \$1 400. The fee for a driver's permit varies between \$20 and \$35. The Taxi-Cab Board recommended that the driver's permit fees be \$20. It is also relevant to note that taxi-cab fares were increased on 6 December 1982, and the now increased fees will not be passed on to the general public by way of fare increases. Of course, the industry is aware of this.

The Taxi-Cab Board, which includes two members of the taxi-cab industry and one member of the Transport Workers Union, voted unanimously for the fee increases. Despite the wage pause, the Government believes that it is reasonable to treat the Taxi-Cab Board as essentially a commercial operation which does not draw on the Consolidated Account. The board could be regarded as being sufficiently distant from the Budget to be excluded from the Government's undertakings in relation to fees and charges which accompanied the wage pause. For those reasons, I oppose the motion and I appeal to members of the House to reject it and allow those regulations to proceed.

Mr EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

LANDLORD AND TENANT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 20 April. Page 938.)

Mrs APPLEBY (Brighton): It is with much pleasure that I take this opportunity on behalf of the small business people operating in my electorate and the State as a whole, to second the private members' Bill put forward in this House by the member for Hartley to correct the oppressive lease conditions under which the majority of small retailers are operating. These oppressive leasing conditions place great burdens on the effective operations of business. A general characteristic of a shopping centre is that there is one common landlord granting tenancies to a number of diverse businesses collected in one area. This encompasses most retail development in metropolitan Adelaide, ranging from the large regional centres down to the smaller neighbourhood and local centres.

This development has resulted in many changes in the status and independence of the small retailer. The family business is still the mainstay of retail activity, that is, the number of retail outlets operated by such businesses relative to the total number. The concentration of small retailers is in shopping centres which are owned and controlled by large corporations and institutions.

Over a period of time, minor tenants have voiced dissatisfaction relating to their leases but also have become frustrated with their lack of bargaining power with the large corporate and institutional landlords. Over the past few years this problem has grown. The previous Government commissioned a working party in March 1980 to examine the complaints, and detailed submissions were presented to the working party. Some small business proprietors have expressed their situation openly and some of these put submissions to the 1980 working party.

But the majority have expressed their concerns among themselves or have just given in and complied out of fear as to how they will be treated when they are about to

negotiate their new leases. The working party recognised this fact and made the following comment:

Total response was disappointing. This is perhaps indicative of low incidence of lease problems amongst tenants. On the other hand, it may be due to apathy amongst tenants, or a reluctance to reveal their problems to a Government working party for fear of retribution from landlords.

From the discussions I have had with small business people and from my personal experience in the retail industry, I tend to believe that the fear aspect is nearer the truth. The deliberations and resulting report of the working party recognised the disparity of bargaining positions between the parties but recommended only voluntary controls and voluntary arbitration of disputes. Considerable concern was expressed by the small business community for the consideration of the working party. The disquiet has grown to the extent that considerable pressure has been, and will continue to be, brought to bear until this situation is corrected.

Having been involved in the retail industry for many years, I feel that the concerns expressed by the small business community are real and urgently require action. Many tenants are subjected to verbal blackmail and I make no apology for using this term as it is generally accepted as part of the tenant's vocabulary. Tenants are verbally harassed on a day-to-day basis and I shall cite an example. Tenants will be approached on the floor of their business and be told that it would be in their interest to consider changing this fixture or the wallpaper or their staff uniforms. More serious than that is a case where a tenant had a franchise which was given prominence in the shop and generated a substantial flow of traffic in the mall area.

He was continually verbally harassed, being told time and time again that if he did not do this or if he did not ensure that they could work against his interests by ensuring that before his lease came up again he would not be in possession of the franchise. Whether or not this could be carried out, in fact, is not the point. The point I make is that the extent of verbal pressure placed on tenants and the inconsistent requirements (even though guidelines are set down) place additional pressure on tenants in many instances. It has been expressed to me by tenants in regional centres that they feel they are 'employed by the landlord' with no better security than the people they themselves employ.

The small businesses of South Australia as an industry constitute one of the major employers providing full, part-time and casual employment. They invest in their businesses expecting a fair return on capital invested. They provide goods and services, especially service that the major retailers have paid diminishing attention to. In centres where the major retailer is the landlord small businesses could be forgiven for thinking they are active retailers, often seeing the major retailer over-riding their promotional activity with counter promotions at the same time.

There is the situation where all tenants are required to install uniform computerised registers which cannot be cleared in these cases the management of the centre can read the register when they require to. This agitation creates underlying discontent with a feeling of helplessness as the businesses are not in control of their own destiny. The disquiet has grown and will continue to grow if some relief is not forthcoming.

Small retail business will continue to be a smoldering situation that will see more withdrawal of investment, thus depriving the community of the variety of trade which small traders do so well. The Landlord and Tenant Act, 1936-1978, is the only South Australian Statute directly concerned with the relationship between landlords and tenants of premises in shopping centres and other commercial premises. The Act mainly refers to steps a landlord may take to recover rent.

If the existing Act is failing one or other of the parties, then the need for change is urgent. The Bill before the House will provide a fair arbitration of disputes and ensure that percentage rents based on turnover and the payment of a proportion of goodwill on sale are prohibited. The Bill will also require six months notice of rent variation and will provide that a landlord cannot unreasonably withhold consent to assignment of a lease nor demand a sum of money other than reasonable expenses in consideration of such assignment. Further, the provisions of the Bill will limit security bonds to an amount equal to one month's rent in advance, as well as limiting to one month rent in advance.

The small business community in South Australia is not alone in contending with this oppressive situation. Other States are making attempts to overcome the problem, but I feel that with this Bill the Government has considered the majority of problems expressed by small business people to the working party and those that have been conveyed to members of this place over an extensive period of time.

I am sure that each and every one of us, as members representing the electorate, have had people coming to our offices time and time again complaining about the oppression that they are suffering and requesting that changes be made. In conclusion, I commend the Bill to the House and suggest that every member considers it with a fair and open mind, giving consideration to a section of our community that has a right to a fair and just decision.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): It is with a great deal of pleasure that I commend the Bill to the House. I recall, some three years ago, talking to a business person on the Port Road in my electorate, and this very question of unfair rents arose. After the Bill was introduced by my colleague, the member for Hartley, I distributed a letter to most small business people within my electorate. The person to whom I alluded a moment ago contacted me and asked whether I would come and see her and I did so. Resulting from that, I obtained a copy of the reference data and exhibits and the lease pertaining to the business which she and her husband occupied. The landlord was Myer Shopping Centres Pty Ltd, Tea Tree Plaza, 976 North East Road, Modbury, South Australia. Some of the contents of that contract are certainly worth while reading into the record. Whether or not my colleagues have read it, I do not know. On page 7 of the contract, under the heading 'Records and Examination', it states:

4.5 For the purpose of ascertaining the amount payable as rent and unless otherwise agreed by the parties hereto

- (i) The tenant shall prepare and keep on the leased premises or at such other place as the landlord may from time to time authorise in writing for a period of not less than three years from the end of the lease year or portion thereof in which the transaction to which such records related took place adequate records which shall show separately and distinctly inventories and receipts of merchandise at the leased premises and separately and distinctly daily receipts from all sales and other transactions on or from the leased premises by the tenant and any other persons conducting any business upon or from the leased premises—

and this is important—

(including but without limiting the foregoing all sales slips, sales records, sales dockets, hire-purchase agreements, credit sale agreements and cash register tapes all properly dated);

- (ii) The tenant shall record or cause to be recorded at the time of sale each and every receipt from sale or other transaction whether for cash or credit—

- (a) in a cash register having a non-resettable audit counter and having such other features as shall be approved or required by the landlord.

It continues in paragraph (iv):

- (iv) The tenant further agrees to keep or cause to be kept on the leased premises or at such other place as the landlord

may from time to time approve in writing all proper books of accounts and records conforming to usual accounting practices showing separately all the gross sales at, in, from or upon the leased premises (including all tax returns, inventories, sales records, purchases records, and bank deposit records).

I find it unbelievable that in this day and age tenants are subjected to those sort of demands. Paragraph (v) provides:

- (v) The landlord or its agent or any auditor selected by the landlord shall have the right at any time to examine the cash registers and cash register tapes and totals, sales slips, sales records and sales dockets of all persons carrying on business at in from or upon the leased premises;

I do not believe it! It galls me and makes me wonder why people want to go into business under such conditions when I look at paragraph (vi), which states:

- (vi) In the event that the landlord or its employees or agent shall purchase goods, wares or merchandise from any person conducting any business at in from or upon the leased premises for the purpose of ascertaining if such person or his employees are correctly recording sales the tenant shall take back, or cause to be taken back, such goods, wares or merchandise purchased by or on behalf of the landlord as aforesaid and refund or cause to be refunded to the landlord or its employee or agent the price paid provided such goods and merchandise are returned within a reasonable time and have not been damaged;

I find it incredible that a landlord or his agent can go into any shop in the Mall, for example, purchase maybe 300 or 400 different articles, put the proprietor or an assistant to the inconvenience of getting all the goods together, pay for them and, at a reasonable time (and it is debatable as to what is a reasonable time), come back and say to the person leasing the shop, 'You are now to take back all the goods because we only wanted to test your honesty as to the amount of goods purchased in your shop.' Talk about Big Brother! If that is not Big Brother tactics, I will go he. That is a matter on which the previous Government quite clearly—

Mr Groom: Went to water over.

Mr HAMILTON: Yes, as my colleague says, the Government went to water over the matter. Also, within the contract under the heading 'Merchants Association', part 7.38, the following is stated:

To join and maintain membership in an association of merchants or other association formed or sponsored by the landlord among the tenants of the centre and to produce to the landlord upon demand evidence of such membership and to pay promptly as and when the same fall due all contributions subscriptions or levies which the Merchants' Association may by its Constitution and/or Rules properly require to be paid by its members and to participate actively in any promotional activities from time to time sponsored by the Merchants' Association and to comply with the provisions of the Constitution of such Merchants' Association and all valid resolutions passed thereunder.

It is unbelievable then to hear the Opposition talking about compulsory unionism. When have we heard from them on this situation? The gutless approach is fostered and supported quite obviously because the Liberals were not prepared to take on these people. When the Liberals get their house in order, let them come back and tackle the trade union movement in this State. I cannot believe the hypocrisy of members opposite. They are prepared to attack the trade union movement in regard to compulsory unionism but not one word has been said about this matter. Members opposite knew of the situation when they did their study into shopping centres and into the Landlord and Tenants Act. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE

THE SPEAKER: Before calling on the Deputy Premier, I make clear that, when people are speaking to their motions or other matters this evening, the same rules will apply to both sides as I said this afternoon, and they will be strictly adhered to. I ask everyone to bear that in mind. I fully realise that there could potentially be a fairly long exercise and, unless everyone understands what I have said in the very beginning, we could get ourselves into much trouble.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Deputy Premier): I have listened attentively to you, Mr Speaker, and I will be very cognisant of what you have said. I move:

That the House, at its rising, do adjourn until 10.30 a.m. tomorrow and, at its rising tomorrow, adjourn until 10.30 a.m. on Friday; and further, if the House be sitting at 1 p.m. on either day, the sitting shall be suspended for one hour.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I seek clarification of the motion. Does it mean that it will be a normal sitting day, with Question Time occurring at the start of tomorrow's activities?

THE SPEAKER: As I understand the matter, that would be the case but, so that there may be complete clarity, I will ask the Deputy Premier without, interfering with the rights of the Deputy Leader to speak subsequently, if he wishes, to indicate, by leave of the House, precisely what is intended tomorrow in terms of the normal routine such as questions and the like.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: In order to facilitate the Government's business this week and next week, and so that the bulk of the work is done this week and the Government can be sure of being able to complete its work next week, the Government intends (and it has not taken this decision lightly) that the House shall sit at 10.30 a.m. tomorrow, that the first hour shall be devoted to questions and other matters involving normal business, that the House will not sit tomorrow night, but that it will rise at 6 p.m. tomorrow. The activities of the House will be the same on Friday as they are tomorrow: the House will sit at 10.30 a.m., and there will be a Question Time again. Both days will therefore be treated as normal sitting days. The Government does not intend that the House shall sit on Friday night.

THE SPEAKER: The motion before the Chair has been duly seconded. I now recall the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I thank the Deputy Premier for clarifying the situation, but I cannot allow the motion to pass on the voices without saying that the Opposition is far from satisfied with the way in which the business of Parliament is being organised by the Government. The sittings of the House have been known for some time, having been published by the Government. However, the fact that legislation has piled up at this eleventh hour simply indicates to us that the Government has not yet come to grips with the satisfactory organising of Parliamentary business. I believe that no member in this place can recall the business of Parliament being arranged in this way towards the end of a Parliamentary session.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally interjecting:

THE SPEAKER: Order! The Chief Secretary will come to order.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The House is now being asked to sit on Friday. Members have made appointments for Friday; perhaps the Chief Secretary has no appointments (it may be his golf day), but other members and I have appointments, and to learn now that those appointments must be cancelled because the Government cannot arrange its business is rather galling to an Opposition that is trying to co-operate. Opposition members are far from satisfied with the arrangements the Government has

made. I, as manager for the Opposition, and other members on this side have been more than patient with the Government. We protest at the fact that the Government is incapable of organising the Parliamentary session so that we can sit civilised hours and keep what are normal appointments.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I do not want to add to the provocative speech of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: It was provocative in two ways. First, he accused the Chief Secretary of wanting to play golf on Friday, but the Chief Secretary does not even play golf, so he has made an awful blunder there. Secondly, the Deputy Leader was provocative when he said that the Government could not put its house in order and run its business. Apparently this is the first time that the Deputy Leader can remember when such a thing has occurred. I remind him, however, of his own conduct of this House when his Party was in Government. This always happens towards the end of the session (it happened to us when we were in Government previously; it happened when the Liberals were in Government, and now it is happening again). This situation cannot be avoided towards the end of the session.

At least I have tried to negotiate with the Deputy Leader in an effort to get certain hours, and I respect those situations. However, I remind him that, when he was in charge of activities of the House, one sitting did not stop at all: we sat through the night and through the next day and it was declared one session. So, I do not think that people living in glasshouses have much right to throw stones.

Motion carried.

INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1972-1981. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act is the principal piece of industrial legislation in this State. It tackles the very essence of industrial relations, the regulation of the employment relationship and provides the means and procedures by which industrial disputes can be settled. It is an Act that has been much amended.

In 1981, despite the fact that the Cawthorne review of that Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act was still in progress, the Liberal Government attempted to amend the Act on three occasions, only two of which were successful. The main thrust of the 1981 amendments was to place a strait-jacket on the Industrial Commission in the exercise of its jurisdiction under the Act.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much audible conversation, and I cannot hear the Minister.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: You would be missing a good speech too, Sir, if you cannot hear me. The Bill introduced in August 1981 required, amongst other things, that industrial authorities pay due regard to the public interest and in particular to the state of the economy in arriving at decisions affecting remuneration and working conditions. The Bill provided that industrial authorities were to give special regard to the likely effects of the decision on the level of unemployment and inflation at the State level.

In introducing the Bill, the former Minister stated that the Bill sought:

... to bring the jurisdiction of industrial tribunals in South Australia more into line with that of the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission so that with the abandonment of

the wage indexation system our State tribunals would be required to apply similar principles of wage fixation as those currently being applied by the Australian commission.

The amendments contained in the August 1981 Bill placed an unworkable burden on the Industrial Commission by requiring it to have regard to factors that were not quantifiable and were directly contrary to the commission's prime function of preserving industrial peace. It was and is the widely held view in the industrial relations community, on both sides of the fence, that these particular amendments were incapable of practical application. The August Bill also sought to fetter the discretion of industrial tribunals in this State by forcing the commission to apply without variation any principles determined at the Federal level. Consideration of local conditions was not possible however logical or necessary that may have been. The State commission was thereby rendered a mere puppet of the Federal commission.

As one could only expect, these amendments attracted heated debate, not only in this place but amongst industrial relations practitioners in the community at large. Despite sound arguments being advanced against restricting the discretion of the commission in the manner proposed, the former Government would not budge. It is to correct the deficiencies in the legislation caused by the passage of these earlier Bills that this current Bill has been placed before this House.

Not long after the last Bill had been put to this Parliament in 1981, Mr F.K. Cawthorne presented his report and recommendations to the former Minister, outlining his suggestions as to the future direction the Act should take. Mr Cawthorne had been most critical of the existing provisions and had argued strongly for repeal in this area. In the discussion paper, he canvassed in detail the two sets of amending proposals and concluded that the former Government's intention '... intrudes into the general jurisdiction of the commission and its day-to-day award-making process'. In addition, he considered that the amendments were not likely to meet what was expected of them and instead could act to the detriment of the principles of industrial relations as a whole. For example, he was concerned that the steps proposed by the former Government would encourage parties not to seek commission ratification of agreements or award variations, but rather enter into common law agreements which are outside the Act's scope. In Mr Cawthorne's own words.

Given the general cries for commitment to the system of conciliation and arbitration, this is hardly a desirable course.

In concluding his comments on this matter, Mr Cawthorne stated:

... it might be said that the difficulty faced by the Government is that the amendments attempt to implement or continue a wages policy by the indirect means of placing fetters on the discretion of the Industrial Commission in making award determinations on wages and conditions of employment. Because one is dealing with such an imprecise and often unpredictable area, the Government's primary objective is very difficult to attain by this method. One is forced into the use of abstract concepts and mechanisms which may achieve little in practical terms, possibly prove counter-productive to the industrial relations system as a whole, and may provoke a backlash which perhaps is coloured more by the appearance of what is being done than what actually occurs in practice. At a time when the lament has been that there no longer exists a firm commitment (if there ever was in the manner those lamenting desire) to the system of industrial relations in Australia, any legislation which can possibly be viewed as discouraging compliance with the requirements of that system must surely be avoided.

In the face of this examination of the problems of the existing provisions, the Government has given careful consideration as to what is necessary to preserve the authority and autonomy of the commission without putting at threat any centralised approach to wage fixation determined within the Federal arbitral arena. This has become particularly

important in the light of the outcome of the recent economic summit and the agreement made between employers, trade unions and Government as to the future direction of wage fixation. Part of the communique emanating from the summit stresses that:

... The centralised wage fixing principles developed by the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission should provide the framework for the operation of other wage-fixing tribunals in Australia, but the summit recognised the authority and autonomy of these tribunals.

In other words it is accepted by all that the general framework for restraint will be provided by the Federal commission. Within that general framework there must be some flexibility to allow each State commission to exercise its discretion having regard to local circumstances. Accordingly, to allow for this margin of local autonomy, the Bill seeks to repeal section 146b with its rigid application of unworkable public interest notions, and replace it with the more flexible approach already adopted successfully under the Industrial Commission Jurisdiction (Temporary Provisions) Act. The provisions of this latter Act are to be incorporated within the parent Act and the (Temporary Provisions) Act is to be repealed.

The new provisions will require the Full Commission, in any determination affecting remuneration or working conditions, to have due regard to and to apply and give effect to in whole or in part and with or without modification, any principles, guidelines or conditions enunciated by the Commonwealth commission. Again in accordance with the (Temporary Provisions) Act approach, other industrial authorities will have to have regard to decisions of the Full Commission, and industrial agreements will have to be certified by the commission to ensure that they do not offend any such guidelines or principles.

The effect of these amendments will be to preserve the general framework provided by Federal Conciliation and Arbitration Commission decisions and thus takes on board questions of the national interest. However, although the State commission will be required to have regard to the principles of its Federal counterpart, it will be given flexibility to adapt the Federal principles to suit local circumstances. I must emphasise that giving the State commission greater autonomy will not lead to an undermining of any national package for wage restraint. It will simply allow the commission to adapt that package in a marginal way to suit local conditions. This has certainly been the record of the State commission to date. Our Government has every confidence that the Industrial Commission will act in a manner that is consistent with the national interest. Indeed, to impose restraints upon it reflects upon the commission's good name and the responsible approach it has always adopted with regard to its obligations under the Act. At the same time the Bill does not cut across the commission's use of traditional wage-fixing arguments, such as the capacity to pay, in any consideration of what is appropriate at the industry and firm level nor affect its power to dismiss applications that are not in the public interest pursuant to section 28 (1) (f) of the Act.

To provide for a speedy translation of any Federal guidelines a new machinery amendment has been included in the revised section 146b. At present, the mechanism used to initiate a flow-on of the Commonwealth commission's decisions is through section 36 of the Act which gives the Minister, amongst others, the right to apply for a flow-on order by the Full Commission. However, as became apparent with the introduction of the wage pause last year, section 36 can only become operative if the Federal decision also involves a general wage increase. In the case of the wages pause, no such general wage movement was contemplated, and thus a normal award application before the

commission had to be used to bring the more general principles before the Full Commission.

It is not difficult to see that the absence of a suitable award application before the commission could create complications and delay in the application of the Federal commission's guidelines at the State level. This is a highly unsatisfactory situation. Accordingly, the Bill provides that either the Full Commission on its own motion, or the Minister, can bring on proceedings to have Federal decisions considered in those instances where the Federal commission has issued a decision or declaration that deals with principles of wage fixation only. In view of the pending national wage determination and the likelihood of new guidelines and principles being laid down by the Full Commission, the Government feels that urgent steps must be taken to amend the Act in order to achieve the objectives I have outlined.

Two further matters requiring urgent attention are included in the Bill. The first relates to an evidentiary deficiency of the Act. Section 171 at present enables the Industrial Court to order a person convicted of an offence to pay the aggrieved party such sum which has been shown, to the satisfaction of the court, to be due. In the past, the court has always accepted a wages schedule or other statement issued by a departmental inspector as being sufficient evidence of the amount in question. However, the final authority of such wages schedule or statement has recently been questioned, and it has become apparent that an evidentiary provision is necessary to avoid challenge on this issue. Accordingly, the Bill provides that, in the absence of proof to the contrary, a certificate of an inspector certifying as to any matter relating to the employment in question shall be proof of the matter so stated.

At the same time, the opportunity has been taken to reintroduce the moratorium for an additional three years on challenges to the operation of registered associations, pending a further consideration of the *Moore v Doyle* problems in the light of the Cawthorne Report. This matter has been before this House on a number of occasions, the last time in 1981 when the former Government's Bill to amend the Act failed for other reasons. As a result, the moratorium period expired in January this year, and it is essential that it be reinstated to enable the whole matter to be re-examined. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* the Parliamentary Counsel's explanation of the clauses without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 3 of the principal Act which sets out the arrangement of the Act. Clause 3 amends section 133 of the principal Act which is designed to protect the continuing legal existence, membership and other affairs of registered associations from challenges based upon the decision of *Moore v Doyle* in the Commonwealth Industrial Court. The clause extends the operation of this section by a further three-year period. Clause 4 amends the heading to Division IA of Part X of the principal Act. The clause amends the heading so that it will now read 'Industrial authorities to have due regard to certain general principles, etc.'

Clause 5 amends section 146a of the principal Act which sets out definitions of expressions used in Division IA of Part X. The clause removes the definition of 'determination affecting remuneration or working conditions' which is no longer required in view of the wording of proposed new section 146b (4). The clause alters the present definition of 'industrial authority' which comprises the Industrial Commission of South Australia, conciliation committees and the Teachers Salaries Board by adding the Public Service Board, the Public Service Arbitrator, the Local Government Officers Classification Board and any other wage-fixing body declared

by proclamation. The definition, as amended, will then correspond to the definition of proclaimed wage-fixing authorities presently contained in the Industrial Commission Jurisdiction (Temporary Provisions) Act, 1975-1981.

Clause 6 substitutes a new section for present section 146b. Present section 146b requires each industrial authority to have regard to the public interest and to refrain from making a determination affecting remuneration or working conditions unless satisfied that it is consistent with the public interest. In deciding whether a determination is consistent with the public interest, the industrial authority is required to consider the state of the economy of the State and the economic effects of the determination, it is required to give effect to principles enunciated by the Commonwealth Commission that flow from that commission's consideration of the national economy and it is required to consider the desirability of achieving or maintaining uniformity between Commonwealth and State rates. The proposed new section adopts the approach presently contained in the Industrial Commission Jurisdiction (Temporary Provisions) Act which provides that the Full Commission shall have regard to and may apply in whole or in part and with or without modification principles, guidelines or conditions laid down in any relevant decision of the Commonwealth Commission and that each other industrial authority shall have regard to and may apply principles, guidelines or conditions laid down by the South Australian Full Commission. The new section also adds a provision whereby the Full Commission may, of its own motion, or upon the application of the Minister, adopt in whole or in part and with or without modification principles, guidelines or conditions laid down by the Commonwealth Commission. Finally, the new section ensures that industrial agreements are tested by the Commission against any principles, guidelines or conditions laid down by the South Australian Full Commission.

Clause 7 amends section 146c so that the Division, as amended, would apply to determinations made after the commencement of this measure whether the proceedings were commenced before or after that commencement. Clause 8 amends section 171 of the principal Act which authorises a court convicting a person of an offence against the Act to order the defendant to pay an amount due to the person in respect of whom the offence was committed where the liability arose out of the defendant's employment of that person. The clause adds a new subsection providing that a certificate of an inspector certifying as to any matter relating to that employment shall constitute proof, in the absence of proof to the contrary, of the matters so certified. Clause 9 provides for the repeal of the Industrial Commission Jurisdiction (Temporary Provisions) Act, 1975-1981.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY secured the adjournment of the debate.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's message intimating that it insisted on its amendments to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I move:

That the House of Assembly insist on its disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: The Liberal Party opposes this motion. The Liberal party put forward these amendments in the Lower House. We have argued the case on several occasions. I understand that there is a likelihood that the matter will go to a deadlock conference. Certainly, members of the Liberal Party here believe that they are sound amend-

ments. I believe that that deadlock conference, if it is held, will see the wisdom of the amendments, either in the form in which we have put them forward or in some modified form. However, I believe that there is a justifiable case. I have been through the details, and I do not intend to go through them again.

Motion carried.

A message was sent to the Legislative Council requesting a conference at which the House of Assembly would be represented by Messrs Abbott, D.C. Brown, Gregory, Hamilton, and Lewis.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 3 May. Page 1055.)

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): The information presented to the House yesterday by the Premier must concern all South Australians. He has outlined a grave Budget situation. However, the gravity lies more in what the Premier did not explain than in what he revealed. Clearly, the Government will have to take action to offset the cost of the three natural disasters, and I agree with the Premier that never before in the one year has South Australia had to cope with drought, fire and flood of the magnitude that we have suffered in the past 12 months. As it immediately became apparent that these disasters could have a major impact on the Budget this financial year, the Opposition indicated it would be prepared to consider any reasonable proposal to recover their cost to the State, and we asked questions in this House in an attempt to establish that cost so that a better appreciation of the Budget situation was available. Until yesterday the Government was not prepared to reveal the cost or even an estimate of it, in the same way as the issue of the Treasury's monthly figures on Budget receipts and expenditure has been inordinately delayed by the Premier. Now that the Premier for the first time has given us some general detail of the cost to the Budget of the drought, fires and floods, I am prepared to join him in helping the public to understand that this cost was impossible to budget for and is obviously unavoidable.

However, I draw a distinction between the information presented to this House yesterday, which refers to unavoidable cost, and that which clearly does not. Most of the Premier's words yesterday were directed towards trying to blame the former Government for the present Budget situation, yet the figures he presented completely contradicted his case. Indeed, his figures laid to rest once and for all the deception which the Premier manufactured in December, and with which he persists now, simply in order to break his election promise not to raise existing taxes or introduce new taxes.

Members of the House need to be clear on this point. The Premier was laying the ground to break that promise long before it became apparent that natural disasters could cost the State so dearly this financial year. I remind honourable members that the estimated costs of these disasters to the State is \$23 000 000—only 30 per cent of the accumulated deficit as now estimated by the Premier. Most of the remainder of that deficit is not in any way the responsibility of the former Government. An amount of \$14 000 000 of the deficit accounts for salary and wage increases approved in the main by the present Government. Spill-over in departmental expenditure and advances make up \$26 000 000: more than half of the \$50 000 000 deficit was not caused by disasters. This over-run has trebled since December and since the Premier told this House that departmental over-runs had exceeded Budget estimates by

\$9 000 000, which is a fact that the Premier completely and conveniently ignored in the answer that he gave on this matter earlier today.

The fact is that the majority of the over-runs has occurred, on the Premier's admission, since he took office. Clearly, the Government is failing in Public Service management; departments are overspending and overstaffing. The Premier admitted this in a memorandum he signed in February. Rather than acting to restore control, the Government seems to have let things get even worse. Of the remainder of the deficit, \$8 000 000 is attributable to the Labor Party election promises, and \$4 000 000 is attributable to the remission of the gas levy, announced by the former Government. It is only that last item accounting for \$4 000 000 (5 per cent of the accumulated deficit) for which the Government has no responsibility. As to the other \$75 000 000, the former Government would have taken steps to avoid the major proportion which is not due to disasters or not contemplated at the time that the last Budget was presented. I shall deal first with the amount of \$23 000 000, which is the cost of the disasters according to the very general figures that the Premier has so far presented. If the Government decides to raise revenue to cover this cost, the Opposition believes that the Government should set a time limit on the necessary measures so that once the cost is recovered the measures are removed. There is a recent precedent in regard to this set by a Labor Government for introducing revenue raising for a fixed period contingent on the Government being able to take other action to restore its Budget position. I am referring to the act of the former Premier, Mr Dunstan, introduced in 1975 making provision for repeal of the licence fees payable by petrol resellers, subject to approval of the Railways Transfer Agreement.

While revenue-raising measures for a fixed period is one option, the Government might consider that in this case there is no reason for the public to be asked to bear any extra burden as a result of the Budget position that the Premier has revealed, because it has occurred as a result of the present Government's maladministration and beat-up Government policies. The Premier has given notice already that he intends to break a fundamental election promise: his most important election promise and the one that he repeated most often, namely, the promise not to increase taxes.

As I have said already, the Premier was preparing to break this promise long before the occurrence of the natural disasters that have added to Budget costs. The Premier now has a responsibility to admit to the people of South Australia that he made other extravagant promises in his grab for power, other promises he must also break. He must change the direction of his Government's financial management before it becomes mismanagement on an irreversible scale.

I am concerned that hidden in the information the Premier presented yesterday is the indication that taxes and charges are to rise over the next three years to pay for bigger Government and to pay for promises that the Premier said before the election would not lead to higher taxes. I refer to the Premier's statement given with no elaboration by him and with no priority in the order of information presented yesterday, that the accumulated deficit on the Consolidated Account could approach \$400 000 000 by June 1986. This estimate is potentially much more serious in its implication for all South Australian taxpayers than is the current deficit position. It sits like a creeping cancer in the Premier's Department virtually overlooked so far but possibly devastatingly costly. It is five times more than the present deficit.

Assuming that this figure includes the present deficit, it could require the average South Australian family to pay

an extra \$512 a year in State taxes, or \$9.80 a week for the next three years if left unchecked. It would mean an intolerable burden on South Australian taxpayers—the unavoidable cost of Labor's big government policies. Before the last election the former Government estimated that implementation of Labor Party promises would cost well over \$100 000 000 in a full year. That estimate was detailed and was based on advice as to the costings from Government departments—the same source of information that the Premier is now drawing on. It was generous to the Labor Party to the extent that it did not include costings of some major promises that the Labor Party refused to be specific about in terms of how they would be implemented.

The figures presented yesterday have now confirmed the credibility of those pre-election estimates—estimates that were rejected by the now Premier before the last election. The figures that the Premier presented suggest that if left unchecked the deficit will rise at the rate of \$2 000 000 a week for the next three years. Nothing like that was ever suggested by Treasury as being the result of programmes and policies of the former Government: it can be due only to the plans of the present Government.

The Premier's options to avoid such a huge deficit are clear. He must go on breaking his election promises or he must reduce the size of the public sector—not increase it. The former Government's policies for firm control over the size and efficiency of the public sector are now saving South Australian taxpayers in excess of \$64 000 000 in a full year. Imagine what the deficit would be this year had we not implemented that policy over the past three years. I will admit that those reductions were not universally popular but they were necessary and responsible. Let me point out that that policy did not represent an unrestrained and indiscriminate attack on the public sector; it was not based on a view that public services are undesirable; it was a hard option, a necessary option, but not one which resulted in any public servant being sacked or any important programme being sliced. I remind the Premier that not one public servant during those three years was sacked, and that reduction was by way of attrition.

I recognise that the public sector provides many essential services and that there are many in our community who, for various reasons, are dependent on the protection and assistance provided by the Public Service. However, those of us responsible for contributing to the decisions of Government must demonstrate that we are prepared to act to ensure that the public's money (and it is not the Government's money, but the taxpayers' money) is spent only in necessary areas and not used inefficiently or inequitably.

The overspending in Government departments and the spare manpower revealed by the Premier himself in a docket show that there is capacity for further significant reductions in the size of the public sector. The Government must introduce a Budget review mechanism similar to that initiated by the former Government. During the past three years the Treasury welcomed that mechanism to ensure that a much better check was kept on the Budget movement from month to month. Departments that had overspent in one period were required to account for that and to develop ways and means of making savings in subsequent periods to bring spending back into line with Budget estimates.

The Government must also give a commitment to maintaining development of programme performance budgeting and the Estimates Committees. The Premier must not resile from those responsibilities and he must not go on employing more public servants at the expense of expenditure on capital works. Understandably the Premier did not put a figure on the cuts announced yesterday in the capital works programme and the reason for that is because they are savage. In fact,

the Government's decision amounts to a reduction of more than \$70 000 000 in spending on capital works. This will cost jobs in the building and construction industry and will rob the community of important and already promised projects. The Liberal Government promised during the last election campaign to complete the O'Bahn project by 1986, on schedule. That busway will benefit residents of the north-east greatly in improving travel times. During the election campaign the Labor Party also promised to give priority to upgrading transport corridors to the north eastern suburbs. Thus the decision to defer completion of the O'Bahn project represents a major breach of faith with the people of the north-eastern suburbs.

It will rob the State of the opportunity to have a significant transportation project completed in the year of our 150th anniversary and it means that the Labor Party, which once proposed a much more expensive solution to the north-east public transport through a light rail option, is now putting in jeopardy a major part of a much less costly option. In continuation of my comments on the economic management policy of the current Government, I point out that in the last Budget presented by the former Government a commitment was given for the commencement of work on a new sewage treatment plant at Finger Point in the South-East. This was a project long promised to the people of the South-East initially by the Dunstan Government and is long overdue.

The Liberal Government took action to ensure the plant would be built. Its cancellation by this Government could present local health problems. It will jeopardise export markets for our lobster industry, principally to the West Coast of America, a very lucrative overseas market for South Australia. The plant is needed also to help the tourist industry in the South-East and I just hope that that market potential for the fishing industry of South Australia, that export industry, is not placed in jeopardy as a result of the Government's decision on Finger Point. Labor said during the recent election campaign that it would proceed; it must proceed; it can proceed with the Government raising taxes.

The decision to abandon the Cobdogla rehabilitation irrigation scheme could well be the first step by this Government to abandon the fight to save the Murray River from salinity. The rehabilitation of irrigation distribution systems is a vital part of the salinity control programme. Like the O'Bahn and Finger Point sewage treatment plant, it must proceed. These decisions come only a week after the Federal Labor Government has thrown into doubt the future of the national water resources development programme. In his statement the Premier said yesterday that he hoped the Commonwealth's decision would still allow work to proceed on filtration of the northern town's water supply and more of the metropolitan system. South Australians want more than hope. They want action, positive action to protect the interests of South Australia. The Government must ensure that these projects are not scrapped by the Commonwealth and certainly the Liberal Party will lend any support to bring those projects, which a former Federal Liberal Government placed on its schedule, to fruition, and on time.

If the Government had been prepared to continue reductions in the size of the public sector, the money for these projects could be found. The former Government had budgeted to reduce the size of the public sector this financial year by approximately 740 positions. This would have saved some \$10 000 000. A similar reduction in each of the next three years could save in total more than \$70 000 000. It would allow these capital works programmes to proceed, but they have been scrapped because the Government cannot manage its finances properly and is locked into the promise it made to the Public Service unions before the last election.

In his speech yesterday, the Premier referred to his predecessor's statement to the June 1982 Premiers' Conference without any acknowledgement of the fact that, as a result of Mr Tonkin's fighting words, South Australia won an extra \$20 000 000. He ignored totally the warnings of Mr Tonkin in his last Budget speech presented to the House on 25 August 1982, conveniently overlooked by the Premier. In that speech the former Premier referred to a most difficult task facing the Government in relation to the Budget position. He said:

Given our responsibility for the economic wellbeing of the State, we will not resile from the challenge.

Nor did we. During the election campaign, when the now Premier was playing the political bigamist, when he was promising limited taxes and bigger Government, well knowing he could not have both, the former Government remained honest with the public. Let me quote what the former Premier said in a press statement on 26 October 1982 just over a week before the last election - so much for honesty in approach to the election. He said:

My Government has been consistent and determined in its policy to reduce taxation and restore efficiency in the public sector. We are ensuring high standards in health, education, community welfare, public housing and other important services. However, we will not promise what we cannot afford, because all South Australians will have to meet the costs in terms of higher taxes now and lost opportunities in the short and long term.

The Premier was clearly warned about the economic and moral bankruptcy of his policies, but he is already locked in by the promise he made last May, and that promise was not a response, as the Premier has tried to pretend, to detailed information available at the time of the Premiers' Conference in the Budget, but a knee-jerk reaction, a dishonest promise generated by the lust for power. The Liberal Party said consistently and honestly and asserts again today with complete vindication that the cost of the promises made by the Labor Party during the last election campaign will mean higher State taxes and charges for all South Australians.

Since the election the Premier has, as yesterday's *Advertiser* put it, embarked on a tortuous trip towards taxation increases, yet in doing so he has never disputed figures I presented to this House in December which indicated that, under continuation of the former Government's programme, tax increases would not have been necessary and a blow-out in the Budget deficit of the magnitude now foreshadowed by the Premier would not have been in contemplation. Of course, that was before the impact of the natural disasters was apparent, but nothing the Premier has cited in the way of Treasury documents or Premiers' Conference minutes blames the former Government for a \$400 000 000 blow-out in the Budget deficit projections over the next three years. Nowhere has the Premier been able to show that the former Government was guilty of financial mismanagement or irresponsibility. It is now clear from the information the Premier has presented that his financial policies have been devoid of consistency or responsibility.

Before the election the Premier promised he would not increase taxes, but now he intends to do so, possibly in a massive and unprecedented way. In Opposition he consistently criticised the Government for not spending more on capital works, but now has made significant cuts in spending on vital projects, promised projects, planned projects. Before winning office he also complained repeatedly about higher Government charges, yet now increases in electricity tariffs, water rates, bus and rail fares are obviously imminent. Clearly, the Premier refused before the election to be honest with the people of South Australia, to tell them that fundamental to Labor Party policy is the need for higher taxes

and he is not being honest now in the presentation of this information. It is a manifesto for big Government. The Labor Party platform openly acknowledges what the Premier has tried to conceal, and that is that the Labor Party, the Labor Government, must regulate its financial position by raising taxes.

We now have revealed for all to see the most important difference between Liberal and Labor policies, our commitment to financial and economic responsibility as opposed to Labor's plans for bigger, high-spending, interfering Government. Let me summarise the alternatives available to the Government. The Liberal Party's alternatives are for better Government and maintenance and lower taxes. The Government must immediately appoint a Budget review committee to keep firm control on all Government spending, to prevent the over-runs the Premier revealed yesterday. The Government must scrap other promises which will significantly increase spending and which the Labor Party well knew when it made them that they could not be implemented without higher taxes and charges. There must be no halt to capital works programmes already approved which will provide work for the building and construction industry and vital projects in South Australia.

If the Government does decide to raise revenue to cover the cost of natural disasters, it must be on a one-off basis so that the revenue raising measures are removed once the cost is recovered; that is, it is not a permanent tax. Our approach is responsible and manageable. It is consistent with the policies which the Liberal Party put to the people at the last election but the Government has now broken major basic promises that it made. The Government must change direction. It has no mandate for putting this State \$400 000 000 in the red.

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

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

Motion carried.

CASINO BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I move:

That the second reading of this Bill be made an Order of the Day for tomorrow.

Mr BAKER: I rise on a point of order—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We have a point of order and I will be listening to that point of order. I warn the Leader of the Opposition (and anybody else that I did not catch) that there will be strict control over the procedure of the House this night. The member for Mitcham.

Mr BAKER: I understood that this Bill is a private member's Bill and originated as such and therefore is not due to come on until next Wednesday, at the earliest convenience.

The SPEAKER: My ruling is that it is a purely procedural matter. None of the substance of anything contained in the message can be dealt with. It is purely a procedural matter. A member rose in his place and I called him before calling for the point of order. He has moved that the second reading be made an Order of the Day for tomorrow. Is the motion seconded?

An honourable member: Yes.

A division on the motion was called for.

While the division bells were ringing:

Mr EVANS: I seek clarification of the position in which

we find ourselves. I believe a misunderstanding exists, Mr Speaker, on your ruling or on what we are voting. I know that the motion is that the second reading be made an Order of the Day for tomorrow. It appears that the Government is of the view that it is a private member's matter and is to come on next Wednesday. I believe that your ruling, Mr Speaker, was that it was a procedural matter but that still implied that the Bill would be read a second time tomorrow. I would like clarification so that members know how to vote in the current situation.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is part of the House, along with the Premier. The situation is that I adhere to what I said in the first place: it is a purely procedural matter. I do not need a seminar on my right, nor will I tolerate it. First, it is a procedural matter. Secondly, it is moved by a private member. Thirdly, if it is going to go any place on the Notice Paper other than on private members day, it will need a suspension of Standing Orders. I will put the question again that the second reading of the Bill be made an Order of the Day for tomorrow.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The House divided on the motion:

While the House was dividing:

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order. I warn that anyone continuing to interrupt the count will be named. That applies to members on both sides.

Ayes (23)—Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Baker, Bannon, Becker, M.J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Ferguson (teller), Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs Mayes, Payne, Plunkett, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (16)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, Ashenden, D.C. Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Lewis (teller), Meier, Olsen, Oswald, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pair—Aye—Mr Peterson. No—Mr Blacker.

Majority of 7 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

The SPEAKER: Before calling on the next speaker, I wish to explain my action in reading the message as slowly as I did.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! That applies to the Premier and the Deputy Premier, as well as to other members. It also applies to the member for Coles. I read the message slowly, even though there was no request from any member, either Government or Opposition, that I do so, and it was a foolish thing for me to do. I should have read it fast and let events take their course, and a great mess would have eventuated. If that is the sort of Parliamentary tradition members want, they can have it, but I do not think that they want it. I read it slowly so that there could be a sensible contribution from members to sort out their act. As for suggestions of a conspiracy theory which I gather from the highly out-of-order remarks and interjections from both sides, please do not direct them at me. I call on the next speaker, the honourable member for Light.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1)

(Second reading debate resumed.)

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I congratulate the Leader of the Opposition on having put into perspective the most distasteful and despicable document presented by the Premier

yesterday. I use those adjectives because the document failed miserably to identify correctly for the people of South Australia the correct position of the finances of this State. Against a background of telling the media for days on end that there would be a total report on the finances of this State, we have a selective piece of information made available to the House which left many questions unanswered and which sought to lay the blame on members of the previous Government when, in fact, it was easy to demonstrate that the difficulties had resulted from the actions and inaction of the present Government. Seeking to have a bob each way, the editorial in this afternoon's *News* takes up this point and would have us believe that we have a prudent Premier, when it states:

The cutback in State Government public works programmes announced by the Premier is good housekeeping.

Opposition members certainly question that statement. The editorial continues:

The only point at issue is whether the Government cannot indulge in some better housekeeping.

There is the conflict. The *News* would have us believe that the actions of the Premier are prudent while, at the same time, suggesting to him that he should have been indulging in better housekeeping. Indeed, he should have indulged in better housekeeping and kept stricter control over his Ministers (and they in turn over their departments) so that we did not have this \$26 000 000 of over spending, the blame for which, during Question Time this afternoon, he sought to lay at the feet of members on this side, especially those who were Ministers in the previous Government.

He completely forgot that, in a statement to this House in February, he had said that the amount by which the Budget had blown out up to November 1982 was \$9 000 000. That is why it is deceitful: he tried to change the record, which is his own record, that there was a \$9 000 000 blowout by turning it around and lumbering members on this side with a blowout of \$26 000 000.

My Leader has correctly put that matter to rest, but I believe that it is incumbent on the media which report these matters that they watch carefully the sleight of hand being practised before their eyes by a Premier who will use any figures at any time to satisfy his own ends. The following is a brief extract from a debate in this House, on 9 June 1976, on an Appropriation Bill:

I address myself once again to a document which purports to be a factual statement of this State's financial position but which is a myth. Several documents have been brought forward in the House and Ministerial statements have been made by the Treasurer to organise the attitude of the media to the whim he wants to follow. When it suits him he can conjure up (and he does conjure up) all manner of figures that subsequently bear no relationship to the last statement he has made.

I made those comments in addressing myself to a document that had been presented to the House by a former Premier, Hon. Don Dunstan, in a form that is precisely the form of the document that the Treasurer yesterday delivered in this House. It is a form that is deceitful because it does not rely on fact in every instance and because it is not the type of public statement that anyone would expect of a person who is and would seek to remain the Premier of any State, let alone South Australia.

The playing with figures by the Premier to suit his own ideals on any particular day is a matter which should be lost and lost for ever. It does nothing for the integrity of his Government; it does nothing for the public debate on a very serious matter, and it is a matter which will be his end if he continues with it. His end is in sight regardless of the statements that he makes now, but it will certainly be his

end if he continues to play with the truth in this manner.

It has been stated, and quite correctly stated, that we are in difficult times. It is recognised not only in this State not only in Australia, but the world over. Unfortunately we in Australia, and certainly we in South Australia, have not been doing a lot to enhance our future. It may well be that we are in some diabolical trouble at the present time because of the unfortunate three catastrophies that we have experienced. No-one would wish that on any Government whatever its political persuasion. Indeed no-one would wish it on the people of any State. However, notwithstanding that difficulty there are a number of other problems associated with the conduct of business in Australia and in this State. Those problems are adverted to quite frequently by the financial press, not only the daily papers but also the quarterly business indicators by organisations such as the A.N.Z. Bank and the Westpac Banking Corporation. A fairly recent statement in the A.N.Z. Bank business indicator, dated October 1982, states:

For economic recovery to develop, political considerations must not override economic imperatives, namely, lower inflation, tax and wage-setting reform, and improved domestic and international competitiveness. While undue pessimism hinders economic progress, false optimism can be as damaging. Unless the present realities are widely appreciated and squarely faced, solutions will not be forthcoming.

There is a good deal of other important commentary along those lines in that document. It is based on the whole of Australia's economy. If we refer it to the situation in South Australia, the word 'inflation' becomes quite important because, regrettably, in figures announced last week we find that South Australia was on the top of the c.p.i. for the most recent quarter—a quarter which was entirely under the administration of the present Premier. Therefore, whilst he would try with other facets of the document to which we are referring tonight to lay the blame on members on this side of the House, he is walking away from the reality of what has taken place in his own period of Government in relation to inflation as it applies to this State. If we look at the document issued in February 1983, we find, among other comments, under the general heading of 'Economic priorities', the following:

However, even if the international economic environment does indeed improve, appropriate domestic economic policies will be essential if Australia is to benefit.

I go one step further and say that, if the benefits which South Australia requires are to occur, we need a better policy and a better attitude by Government to the South Australian scene, otherwise that benefit is not going to materialise.

In the March edition of the same paper we find under the heading of 'Pathways to recovery', the following (and it is quite obvious from the document that the paper embraces that period between two Federal Governments, one of either political persuasion, but the importance so far as South Australia is concerned relates to a Labor State Government):

While latest statistics show that recession is still deepening in Australia, it is possible that the low point may be in the June quarter. Gathering signs of recovery in the U.S. economy and lower crude oil prices are salient features of the world scene. The situation, together with the 8 March 10 per cent devaluation of the Australian dollar (reduced to about 7.2 per cent by 21 March) could enhance prospects for an export led recovery during 1984, provided appropriate economic policies are pursued.

There is the proviso which is equally as important to the South Australian scene as it is to the broader Australian scene:—'provided appropriate economic policies are pursued'.

What do we have by way of example in the last two or three days of this Labor Government and 'appropriate pol-

icies' to address the deteriorating financial scene? If we look at yesterday's *News* at page 20, an article headed 'Plans to improve housing' states:

Education Department housing for country teachers is to be upgraded. The Education Minister, Mr Arnold, has announced a \$434 000 injection of funds for maintenance of teacher housing authority houses in rural and remote areas of the State. The funding, additional to money previously allocated under the authority's 1982-83 budget, marks the start of a progressive elimination of the maintenance backlog.

I do not decry the need for funds in the Teacher Housing Authority area for maintenance. I do not decry the need for funds for a whole host of other areas. However, when we are told, as recently as yesterday, that another \$434 000 beyond Budget has been made available we have immediately an example—

The Hon. H. Allison: And no rent increases!

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Rents are frozen, and there will be no increases. We have immediately a situation where the Government is casting aside the responsibility that it should be exhibiting. It is unfortunate (or fortunate, as the case may be), that the Minister in charge of the House at this very moment is the Minister of Housing. We have seen the debacle of the Government, which threw away \$100 000 on the ill-fated Ramsay Trust scheme—and I say 'ill fated' not because we do not recognise the urgency of providing housing for people who are needing housing, but ill fated in that the scheme which was submitted as the Ramsay Trust had been demonstrated to the previous Government, to the present Government, to the I.D.C., and in the public arena as a no-win situation, and yet the Government went head-over-heels—

Mr LEWIS: This matter is of such importance that I believe that there ought to be more than two members of the Government in the House. I draw your attention, Sir, to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: The obvious answer to the point raised by my colleague, the member for Mallee, is that the members of the Government are so ashamed of their actions that they are not prepared to put their faces into the place and accept the responsibility which is theirs for running this State further into the mire. They are prepared to criticise a Government, which is now out of office and which was very credible in the records that it kept and the records it has made available to this Parliament, to substantiate the responsibilities that it exhibited as a Government. They criticise that Government with documentation which is phony, and walk away from the responsibility of learning the truth of the activities. My colleague, the member for Hanson, has indicated to me that, quite apart from the comments that I have already made relative to the teacher housing situation, a bi-partisan committee of this House (the Public Accounts Committee) has highlighted to the House the very real dangers which exist in proceeding further with a number of aspects of teacher housing.

Here we have a Government, as witness the report in last evening's *News*, which has walked away from the advice of that bipartisan committee and which has injected a massive \$434 000 additional funds into a project which is under question, just as it injected \$100 000 into the Ramsay Trust, a project which was under question. There are other examples to which I am quite sure my colleagues will refer in the balance of the debate this evening.

I sought to highlight that, if we are looking in a global sense, more particularly the Australian global sense, there are documents available to us which suggest that the turning

point may perhaps be not too far away. Indeed, the Westpac Banking Corporation headed its review of January 1983 '1983—Year of the Turning Point?' and it makes this editorial comment:

Some of the essential pre-conditions for international recovery have begun to appear, and 1983 might not be such a disappointing year as the one just passed.

Let us analyse that. It is talking of an international improvement and, if one goes on further into this document and other writings relative to the Australian scene, if one takes heed of the documentation made available at the national summit in Canberra only a fortnight or three weeks ago, one will find consistently the view that Australia will, regrettably, not share that immediate recovery; Australia is more depressed than is the general international scene and will have to wait just that much longer for its recovery.

Regrettably, if Australia will have to wait that much longer to see a recovery, so will South Australia. South Australia will have another problem: it is invariably from seven to 12 months after the end of a drought before there is an injection of any vigour or purpose into the economy following that recovery. It is always and has always been, as has been recorded in this House on many occasions, that the injection of the belief that matters are improving, the injection of the funds generated from the agricultural sphere, primes the pump, which gets the city or the whole general economy under way.

Balanced against the delay which will follow the existence of the drought, we have other unfortunate consequences. Because of the fire much of the stock which would have been available to provide the impetus for improved agricultural spending later in 1983 is no longer available. Therefore, on balance we would have to accept the situation that if it is normal under drought circumstances for there to be a seven to 12-months delay from the end of the drought until there is an effective injection of funds and injection of attitude into the public arena, and add to that the compounding problem of the loss of stock, therefore, the loss of resources capable of generating funds, we would have to believe that in South Australia that seven to 12-month period might run out, regrettably, to a period nearer to 12 to 18 months.

Against this viable fact, which can be easily demonstrated by any person interested in agriculture (it has been stated in the agricultural press and demonstrated in this House previously), the Government has still sought to allow the Public Service to continue to blow out with an increase in the vicinity of \$15 000 000 since Nov 1982. It is continuing to spend money as if it were going out of style, as a result of the funds in relation to teacher housing. It continues to promote activities such as the Ramsay Trust and fritter away funds which ought to be conserved for a much more important purpose. As demonstrated by the Leader, the Government is also increasing the Public Service at a time when that is totally imprudent. Again, in case it has passed the knowledge of members opposite, there are great dangers in increasing the Public Service.

I draw attention to a graph which appeared in the publication *The Bank of New South Wales Review*, No. 22 of July 1977. Table 8 on page 8 gives an indication of the growth rate in Commonwealth, State and local government employment across Australia. It is purely statistical, and I seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard*.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Can the honourable member assure the Chair that it is statistical?

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: It is.

Leave granted.

GROWTH RATES IN COMMONWEALTH, STATE, AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT

		State Government Employees		Local Government Employees		State and Local Government Employees	
		Total	Change 1973 to 1975	Total	Change 1973 to 1975	Total	Change 1973 to 1975
		'000	%	'000	%	'000	%
N.S.W.	June 1973	234.8	—	57.4	—	292.2	—
	June 1975	252.7	+ 7.5	64.5	+ 12.4	317.0	+ 8.5
VIC.	June 1973	170.4	—	24.7	—	195.1	—
	June 1975	189.6	+11.3	29.8	+20.6	219.4	+12.5
QLD.	June 1973	99.3	—	22.0	—	121.3	—
	June 1975	112.9	+13.7	24.4	+10.9	137.3	+13.2
S.A.	June 1973	79.9	—	7.5	—	87.4	—
	June 1975	92.9	+16.3	7.9	+ 5.3	100.8	+15.3
W.A.	June 1973	71.4	—	7.8	—	79.2	—
	June 1975	79.6	+11.5	10.2	+30.8	89.8	+13.4
TAS.	June 1973	25.6	—	3.1	—	28.7	—
	June 1975	29.2	+14.1	3.9	+25.8	33.1	+15.3
Total six States	June 1973	681.2	—	122.5	—	803.7	—
	June 1975	756.7	+11.1	140.7	+14.9	897.4	+11.7
Commonwealth Government Employees		June 1973 '000		June 1975 '000		Change 1973 to 1975 %	
		359.4		397.7		+10.7	

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I will allow members to view this graph and put their own interpretation on it. I draw attention to only one factor and that is that, in respect of this graph which was relative to the 1976-77 era, South Australia had shown an increase of 16.3 per cent in the State Government employee percentage. That figure was far higher than that in any of the States, a position which continued to escalate, notwithstanding recommendations to the Government that it should look very seriously at the consequences of its continued over-indulgence in the Public Service.

Undoubtedly, there are subsequent figures which I am unable to put my finger on at this moment. I merely make use of the fact to point up the matter raised by my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, and the admission made by the Premier yesterday that the Government has knowingly allowed Public Service numbers to increase against the pattern which has been set and which had responsibly reduced the recurrent spending of this State.

On page 9 of the document that the Premier circulated yesterday as this supposed economic statement he indicated that there has been additional funding associated with the recognition of the Labor Party election policies. However, let us not have a situation of the Premier again coming into this House and seeking to lay the blame where it does not lie. If the Premier continues to talk about economic matters he should put the facts clearly and truthfully. The Premier is currently indulging in the practice of mixing the figures to suit the whim of the day; he is making suggestions that are not based on fact, which does nothing to assist the future of South Australia.

We are in urgent need of a united approach to bring about a recovery in South Australia. Certainly there has been a need for a united approach to bring about a recovery in Australia and such a recovery in South Australia is a distinct possibility, with the Opposition playing its vital part, if the facts and details made available to the public, and more specifically to members of this House, are factual and truthful. The Opposition will continue to oppose, and will continue to highlight and identify, untruthful statements made by the Premier or by any of his Ministers.

Ministers provided a collective answer to 13 questions that were placed on notice soon after the new Parliament came into existence. The Opposition wanted to know what initiatives had been commenced within the various areas of Ministerial responsibility since 8 November 1982, the expected cost of initiatives for the 1982-83 financial year and for the full financial year thereafter, details of what, if any, programmes within areas of Ministerial responsibility had been stopped or scaled down, and what, if any, cost benefit had accrued for the 1982-83 financial year and for the full financial year thereafter. The Opposition received the answer on a collective basis, that the Ministers found it impossible to answer the question. Apparently they were not prepared to apply themselves or have their staff apply themselves to answering those simple questions.

Those questions were so simple that if Ministers had been effectively controlling their departments they would have been able to answer those questions on the day after they were asked. They fudged it, because they wanted to hide the reality, as the Premier is trying to hide the reality of who is responsible for blowing out the Budget.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN (Davenport): I take the opportunity to speak on this Bill as a former member of the Budget Review Committee. I suppose that it would be fair to say that members of the committee, more than anyone else, had the chance to say what was occurring in Government as far as Government finance was concerned. In preparing the Budget, the committee used to spend about six weeks working most mornings and afternoons, sometimes for up to six or eight hours a day, purely sifting through every single aspect of the Budget, looking at individual budgets for departments and trying to assess how savings could be made. We would then also have meetings at least twice a month to examine the performance of individual departments and ascertain whether they were achieving their budget or over-running it.

As a former member of the Budget Review Committee, which is not now in existence, I want to support very strongly the Leader of the Opposition this evening in saying that the first thing that the Premier should implement is some sort of Budget Review Committee, because without

that form of committee (and this is a fair lesson learnt by the Tonkin Government) one cannot contain the over-runs that inevitably occur within Government departments. One cannot have an effective monitoring system at Ministerial level without such a committee. Such a committee needs to include people who understand the capital works budget and the employment budget and who have influence at the highest Cabinet level. The former Deputy Premier was on the Liberal Government's Budget Review Committee. Although it was not always popular, the Budget Review Committee earned the respect of a large number of Government departments and senior public servants. Initially, many of them were critical of its existence, but after it had been operating and they had seen the benefits it afforded they were very strong advocates of the system.

That is why I so strongly support what the Leader has said this evening. I think that it was a recommendation to the Premier made with a great deal of wisdom. As a former member of the budget Review committee, I understand fully the very tight budgetary situation which has existed in this State for several years and which will continue to exist. That tight budgetary situation and the problems that the Premier now faces involve exactly the same situation as that confronting the former Government, and that is the very reason why it adopted such policies. It is the very reason, for instance, why we set staff manning levels for each Government department, and why we made sure that those departments maintained the estimates set for achieving reductions in manning. I therefore support the recommendation of the the Leader that manning level budgets must be set for each Government department. That does not mean sackings, as the Premier implied this afternoon.

For three years the Liberal Government achieved significant reductions in the manning levels of the South Australian Public Service without a single sacking. Within the Public Buildings department we reduced the manning levels from 3 500 people (the level that existed when we came to Government in September 1979) down to 2 350 by November 1982—reduction of about 30 per cent. That was achieved without a single sacking within that department. It was achieved by a number of measures, partly by offering early voluntary retirement which the Labor Party of the day and the trade union movement criticised. However, I found that the people who accepted this did so willingly, and it more than paid for itself within 12 months.

That early voluntary retirement scheme was widely accepted in the Public Buildings Department and in the Engineering and Water Supply Department where it was initially introduced. It was then offered on a broader basis to the Highways Department and to one or two minor areas of Government. The interesting thing was that it was a one-off offer, and I was continually getting requests from other employees of the State Government to reintroduce that early voluntary retirement scheme. The second initiative that the former Government took was to offer the chance for employees to transfer from one Government department from one position to another. Until the former Liberal Government came into office the previous South Australian Government had operated on such a basis as to make it the most rigid employer that one could find anywhere within the State.

A person applied for a job, and once a job vacancy had been filled a person was there for a lifetime. I am talking not about the Public Service but about the weekly-paid area where there some 30 000-odd people are employed in various Government departments and statutory authorities. Once a person was in a position there was no chance to apply for another position in another department or elsewhere. If a department wanted to fill a vacancy it did not look at areas where surpluses existed but instead advertised and took on

someone from outside the public sector. By introducing a scheme of transfer and setting up the Government Job Transfer Office, for which I had responsibility, it was possible to transfer people from areas with surpluses to areas where there were vacancies.

I forget the exact figure, but we achieved something like 450 transfers in less than three years under that scheme, and again the employees appreciated that. As I walked through Government facilities I was stopped on a number of occasions by people who said how much they appreciated the fact that for the first time they had the chance to apply for a job somewhere else in Government and actually improve their position as a weekly-paid employee. For the first time we had given some hope, some promise and some chance of excellence in lifting a person's standards within the public sector.

The third thing we did was introduce a scheme which provided that when a vacancy occurred the permanent head could not fill that vacancy automatically; it had to be scrutinised by the Government job transfer office, and we adhered to that very closely.

The next measure we implemented was the manning levels and a forward budget for manning levels for each Government department with anticipated run-downs that could be achieved in those departments, especially where there were areas of surplus. In some cases departments were set a budget where they would have an increase in the manning levels. In other areas there would be a decrease. In the State Government we have approximately 50 000 to 60 000 employees—some public servants, some teachers, some weekly-paid employees—and the degree of inflexibility that currently applies in that whole mass of employment is incredible. If a Government is to be flexible and meet the needs of changes that occur, it is time that a far greater degree of flexibility should apply in the conditions of employment.

It disappoints me that the new Government, now that it has come to office, seems to have thrown out at least a number of these very significant measures which were saving the State so much in terms of paying people to sit in a position that was not really necessary. Again, that is why I support what the Leader of the Opposition said this evening, namely, that the Premier, if he is really to tackle his projected accumulated Budget surplus of \$400 000 000 by 1986, will be successful only if he takes a hard and difficult decision that, where there are areas of surpluses, those people should not be replaced if they retire. It is done by voluntary retirement and natural attrition. As the Premier implied today and as he tried to suggest in the second reading explanation yesterday when introducing this Bill, it does not involve sacking people. In fact, I was disgusted when the Premier said in his second reading explanation that the options were to increase taxes or to sack public servants. We can in fact reduce the costs of running the Public Service without sacking anyone and, if the Premier does not understand that, he will be a very poor Premier of this State.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: The words of a desperate person.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I think it does show the words of a very weak Premier.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: He could have dropped them by not feeding the fat cats, too.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I will mention that as a point, because as a former Minister responsible for wage increases for some time it is a subject very dear to me. On the day that the wage freeze was introduced, senior public servants, the permanent heads, received retrospectively a 4 per cent wage increase, which I found totally without comprehension. They received 6 per cent, and some argument could be put forward that they could justifiably have argued for 6 per cent back-dated to last year. However, there was no way in

which one could argue for another 4 per cent over and above that during the period of the wage freeze. Yet we find, as the member for Light said, that because of that there is now a surplus or Budget over-run of \$14 000 000 for salary and wage increases. Again, that was due to the rather weak-minded attitude of the Government in allowing such increases, for which the taxpayers of this State will now have to foot the additional cost.

I stress to the Premier that his options are far greater than he outlined in his second reading explanation. The options are not just whether to increase taxes, cut public works, or sack people. There is the very real option, when one realises that there is a natural retirement rate of about 3 per cent to 5 per cent a year within the public sector, varying between departments and the type of employment. Even if some of those are replaced, we can achieve a very real saving each year, perhaps up to 3 per cent or 4 per cent. In looking at the overall size of the Budget of \$2 000 000 000, a saving of 3 per cent or 4 per cent becomes very significant and, in fact, starts to become the money that we are talking about in terms of the deficit.

The next point that needs to be realised is that the vast degree of the funds in the State Budget are committed to wages and salaries. If we are to achieve anything in terms of saving money in the long term, the wages, salaries and staffing levels must be tackled. I personally believe that there are areas and functions in Government which have been carried on without question for 20 or 30 years or more and which should now be questioned. In other areas new services have been required, and that will always be the case.

I would be the first to advocate that we should be supplying new services in areas of need. That implies that one does not automatically maintain existing services but adopts a degree of flexibility in being able to adjust staff from one service to another. I believe the public needs to understand the extent to which that flexibility can be achieved and certainly not trained, as the Labor Party tried to train them in Opposition, simply to cry out in shame every time one Government service is terminated, even though the benefits of that service were really questionable to the overall community and where there are higher demands.

I know that in my departments we achieved that very successfully where we did an assessment of new services that were needed. We carried out an assessment of services where we felt there was some question as to whether they should be continued at least at the present level, and we very successfully achieved a transfer of resources, including human resources, from one area across to another. That was done, despite the cries from the then Opposition, without any adverse effect on the community of South Australia.

The other area on which I wish to comment in relation to the second reading explanation and the Supplementary Estimates is that of the capital works programme. As a former Minister of Public Works, again as a member of the Budget Review Committee and now as the shadow Minister of Public Works, it is an area in which I have taken a great deal of interest. It is an area which is not often understood by people. Invariably, they do not appreciate the fact that if one makes a commitment to a project today, that commitment can carry on for a period of five or six, or even up to 10 years. This applies particularly to a large water filtration plan, and I think the latest one in Happy Valley is about a nine-year project. But, even with smaller programmes like \$500 000 schools, if one starts to make a commitment, then one is bound to that for the next four or five years by the time one goes through the design stage, documentation, calling of contract, the completion of the work and the payment of bills. It is an area where a great

deal of change has occurred, because the needs of the community have changed.

With the slow-down in the population growth of South Australia, we have found that there has been less demand for new schools. During the 1970s, certain political decisions were also made where money was not spent in terms of capital improvements. I refer particularly to the prison system of this State, which was run down to a deplorable condition. The Dunstan Government during the 1970s hardly spent a dollar on security in prisons. As a result, the Adelaide Gaol is a disgrace, despite a recommendation from the Industrial Commission of the State as far back as 1972 that it was unfit for human habitation, let alone for people to work in.

We also found areas where the Dunstan Government, because no significant votes were involved, allowed public works to run down. Another area which concerned me greatly, and for which I had to pick up the cost when I was Minister, involved the extent to which the Dunstan/Corcoran Governments decided to defer maintenance on Government assets. As a result of the run-down of Government assets accelerated, and therefore there was a need to spend additional capital funds in trying to restore those Government assets, particularly buildings. There was a significant run-down of maintenance on Government assets.

I asked the Public Buildings Department to undertake an assessment of what it saw as urgent repairs, such as painting and the replacement of timber, floor boards, gutters and roofs of Government assets in the State, and the figure was astounding: it came to something like \$20 000 000 to \$28 000 000 work of work needing to be done. If one breaks that down into categories, there was an urgent demand for \$5 000 000 to \$6 000 000 to be spent on repairs.

I found on becoming Minister of Public Works that there was insufficient allocation of funds by the former Labor Government to meet the breakdown maintenance within Government areas. As a result, there were cases of schools where gutters had completely deteriorated. One school had no reticulated water and relied on the collection of rainwater from the roof of the school building. The gutters had broken down, no water was being collected and the school had to cart water. That was the extent of the problem which existed and on which I asked the department to prepare detailed documentation. My concern is that, as a State Government, we invested significant sums of money to overcome that problem. The Premier has criticised the fact that we took additional funds from the revenue side of the Budget to pay surplus employees within the Public Buildings Department. Much of that money was spent on items which needed urgent repair within schools. We established the Visiting Tradesmen Scheme, which was greatly appreciated throughout the State. I know that members on both sides of the House have acknowledged the valuable work done by the Public Buildings Department employees under that scheme. That is the very area that was criticised yesterday.

Mr Whitten: That was Loan money.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: No, it was not Loan money—it was recurrent expenditure. The Deputy Premier yesterday criticised the former Government for spending \$4 100 000 in employing surplus tradesmen. I believe that that is the very area in which the surplus tradesmen should have been employed and were employed, particularly in the maintenance area. The Premier and Cabinet, on behalf of the Government, has made decisions on the capital loans programme. It has decided to defer the rehabilitation of the Cobdogla irrigation area and to postpone indefinitely, the establishment of the sewage treatment plant at Finger Point in the South-East, which I believe is a very serious decision.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: They've been deleted; that means they've gone.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Yes, deleted, not deferred. The project involving deletion of rehabilitation of the Cobdogla irrigation area could have long-term implications for the quality of water in the Riverland. The Government has also deleted the sewage treatment plant project at Mount Gambier, and I find that a most unfortunate decision.

Mr Whitten: When was that announced?

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: The programme was announced by the then Premier in Mount Gambier 2½ months before the election. It was planned as part of the capital works programme when the Budget Review Committee went through that programme back in June or July last year. The documentation and design were started back in 1980 by the Electricity and Water Supply Department. Something like two years work had been done on preliminary aspects of that treatment works well before the Government made the final decision that the project should proceed.

The cancellation of these three significant capital works programmes, as the Premier said, will not have a great deal of effect this year but will on future Loan works programmes. What will be the effect on the State of such short-term decisions? Let us face it: they are short-term decisions. They are moves of expediency by the present Government which will have a long-term deleterious effect on all aspects of the State. The Finger Point sewage treatment plant deletion could destroy the South-East lobster industry if we are not careful. It will only need one case of *E. coli* in the crayfish tails sent to America due to the pollution from the Finger Point area, and the entire crayfish export industry of South Australia, worth \$8 000 000 to \$10 000 000 a year, will be destroyed.

Mr Whitten: No improvement in Victoria, either.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: The same could also apply in Victoria. However, the real damage to this State will be to the lobster export industry that is so significant in Robe and other such places. We started the documentation and design in 1980. We were due to start the contract work in the current financial year. The long-term damage to the Murray River in deciding to delete the Cobdogla irrigation scheme shows the little impact that the Minister of Water Resources has in the present Government. He apparently has no say. He is totally ineffective both in the House and obviously in Cabinet, otherwise the decision would not have been made.

The other area which directly affects my own portfolio is that of the north-east busway. I find most unfortunate the decision taken, that the busway will proceed only to the end of Darley Rd by 1986. That means that only the first half of the O'Bahn busway is to be constructed by 1986 and that no firm decision is to be made as to when the project is to be completed. In other words, the people of Tea Tree Gully are left in a state of limbo. For a period of eight to 10 years they have been promised a significant, fast and efficient public transport system. What do they have? They have six kilometres of busway which finishes six kilometres short of its destination of Tea Tree Gully. It is like trying to build a car with only two wheels. It is a most incredible decision, ending up with a lame-duck project. I wonder what the impact will be on the Darley Road area where the Government is expecting express buses, which have shot out to that point at great speed, to spill out their passengers on to suburban roadways, those people then having to complete the next six kilometres to Tea Tree Gully. Let us make clear that the previous Liberal Government had given a commitment to complete the O'Bahn busway by 1986.

Members interjecting:

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I draw to the attention of the House that the member for Davenport is trying to

speaking, and he does not need help from either Opposition or Government members.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I realise that members opposite are interjecting because the decision made on the O'Bahn busway is acutely embarrassing for them. It is the worst decision that could ever have been made on the busway: to complete half and leave the other half. This means that the people of Tea Tree Gully after eight years of promises, especially from Labor Governments, are to be left with a scheme that will not work. They will save two or three minutes, but at great expense and inconvenience to the people now living in the area of Darley Road, and I would suggest that this will affect especially the constituents of the member for Coles and of the member for Gilles, whose district borders on this area.

Another aspect of this matter with obvious implications is that the magnificent linear park that was initiated by the former Minister of Water Resources, in conjunction with the member for Torrens, to be provided along the Torrens Valley is now likely to finish at Darley Road because, if money cannot be found to develop the busway beyond Darley Road, the money will obviously not be spent on the undeveloped section to provide a linear park through one of the most beautiful parts of the Torrens Valley. It is a real tourist attraction, yet at this stage it appears to be one part of the project that will not proceed.

To say the least, I was disappointed with the speech made by the Treasurer in this House yesterday and the decisions made by the Government on budgetary matters. They show that the Government has gone for short-term political options rather than the long-term benefit of the State and the Government has not been willing to take the hard, tough decisions that any Government must take in hard times. It is prepared to take the easy options of saying no run-downs in Government staffing levels, no discipline within Government departments but, instead, impose burdens on South Australian taxpayers.

Australia is out of line with other developed countries in relation to its inflation rate which, based on the increase last quarter, is running at an annual rate of over 11 per cent. The specific area that shows less discipline than any other area is that of Government charges and taxation. Government costs have escalated at more than twice the rate of increase in the consumer price index over the past 12 months, and no area has contributed more to escalation in terms of the c.p.i. than the increase in Government charges and expenses. We see that the present Labor Government of this State is not only willing to continue with, but is about to escalate, that rate of inflation by imposing new taxes and charges on the South Australian public. I cannot accept the reasoning and proposals put forward in the Treasurer's second reading explanation and I urge all members, especially those on the Government side including the Treasurer and other members of his Cabinet, to reassess what I think are some foolish decisions they have made.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Coles): The Leader of the Opposition, the member for Davenport and the member for Light have aptly described this Bill as irresponsible legislation and, in fact, a mish-mash of proposals designed to disguise the Government's economic mismanagement even in the short time during which it has held office. If we enumerate the key figures that make up the deficit, we see that \$23 000 000 is attributed to the cost of disasters, which Opposition members all acknowledge are not the fault of anyone, least of all the Government; \$14 000 000 is due to increases in salaries and wages which have been approved by the Government and which must be laid squarely at the Government's feet; \$26 000 000 is due to over-spending by departments, which is a shocking

indictment of the Government and of each Minister; \$8 000 000 can be attributed to the Labor Party's pre-election promises; and \$4 000 000 may be attributed to increased gas levies, which the Opposition acknowledges without criticism. Thus, the Government in the short space of barely six months since it was elected has simply allowed the South Australian economy to run out of control.

I wish to examine the way in which an uncontrolled economy can affect the one South Australian industry that has the potential to drag us out of our unemployment difficulties, to improve the standard of facilities enjoyed by our citizens, to generate prosperity, and to provide a fulfilling life for those who can be involved in it, not to mention those who visit the State. I refer, of course, to the tourism industry, which is an appropriate industry to consider in the context of any Government Budget, whether State or Federal, because tourism is the one industry which can affect, and is affected by, every single sector of the economy. Earlier today it was said in this Chamber that only the defence industry is not affected in one way or another either by the development of tourism or by its lack of development.

If one looks at the costs incurred by the tourist industry, one finds that they are costs experienced by every section of South Australian industry; therefore, any increase in those costs and charges to the industry has a pervasive effect on the economy. A chart included in the South Australian Department of Tourism information booklet, *How Tourist Spending Flows Into The Economy*, provides an interesting set of headings under which this Budget could be discussed.

The column identifying the components on which a travel department spends money includes about 20 items, several of which will be directly affected by this State's Budget. The Leader of the Opposition has already said that, if the Government is to reduce the present projected deficit of about \$400 000 000 expected by June 1986, it will have to impose taxes which will mean that the average South Australian family will pay an extra \$512 a year, and I point out that in that connection the Leader was talking directly about families. However, I shall refer to businesses and consider the opportunities the State Government has to increase taxes and thereby reduce this deficit, and then to consider the effect those taxes would have on the tourism industry.

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

THE ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Meier): There not being a quorum present, I ask that the bells be rung.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The first and most important cost to any industry, any business and certainly to the Government, is the cost of wages and salaries. We have heard much talk over the past few months of the implications of this cost for Governments, taxpayers and businesses. The alleged consensus, which I predict has been short lived on the question of the wages pause, is fragile indeed and it seems, looking at the statements made by the Premier, that one of the chief components of putting a spike in the possibility of consensus of the wages pause is the Premier himself. In the *News* last night there was the heading 'Wage offer by P.M. is realistic—Bannon'. The article goes on to say:

The State Government has backed the Federal wage restraint deal which offers workers only small wage rises later this year. The wages tradeoff proposed by the Prime Minister, Mr Hawke, depends on limited wage rises this year in return for full wage indexation next year.

What is the Premier doing condoning or even encouraging limited wage rises? The whole national purpose, responsible action, and wish of Australians, or the majority of Australians, is for a pause which means just that: an actual stoppage

in wage rises of any kind. For the Premier to go public in what almost might be described as an incitement to wage demands by saying that he believes that it is unrealistic to expect the wage freeze to continue beyond the end of June is virtually to throw in the towel as Leader of the Government and to say, 'Well, we have to accept the fact that wage rises are inevitable.' They are not inevitable if the right kind of leadership given by the Government and if there is a steadfast resolve to contain costs and taxes. The only way that that can be done, of course, is by containing wage rises. The Premier goes on in this article in the *News* to say:

It may be possible to maintain the freeze in some areas with difficulty while in other areas the lid could blow right off.

What a statement for the Premier to make by acknowledging that in his opinion the lid could blow right off! He is virtually saying that we have to accept what comes. A more responsible statement by a Leader of the Government would have been, 'We must make certain that the lid does not blow right off.' But no, the Premier said that the lid could blow right off. Then, and I think he is addressing Trades Hall in his next statement, he says:

Wage restraint has to recognise the needs of the workforce if it is to work. The best way to do that is to have some sort of increase in the second part of the year then move progressively towards indexation.

In other words, immediately after an national economic summit conference which has endorsed the principle of a wage pause, we have a State Labor Premier saying that the best way to make that work is to have some sort of increase in the second part of the year. I predict that there is no way on earth that this Government will fight wage demands past the end of June and when that happens the lid certainly will blow off. The acid test for this Government and for every Labor Government in Australia, including the Commonwealth Government will be the June arbitration conference. If the Full Bench, on the basis of submissions put to it by Governments, does not refuse increases I predict that for industry throughout Australia (and certainly for taxpayers who will have to foot the Bill for increased Public Service wages and salaries) will find that it is back to square one. We will be back to the position that we were in last year when the Federal Liberal Government called for a wage pause. We will be back at the foot of a spiral which will be an upward spiral of wages and a downward spiral of prosperity.

The first and most important item as regards cost increases in the tourist industry is wages and salaries. On the basis of the Premier's statement and, indeed, on his past performance and his Government's past performance, I think that it is most unlikely that wages and salaries will be contained, and I predict that the costs which result from wage and salary increases being imposed will cause an extreme burden on the tourist industry and will inhibit growth in that industry.

We then go down the list and look at the items which the travel industry pays for: tips and gratuities, pay-roll taxes (and there has been some effort to contain pay-roll taxes) commissions, administrative and general expenses, purchases of goods sold, purchases of material and supplies and when one looks at—

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! There is too much discussion in the House. I ask that the member for Coles be heard in silence.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The purchase of material and supplies is, of course, a principal cost, probably second to wages and salaries, for any employer. The Bill which the Government introduced to amend the Workers Compensation Act is likely to impose costs on industry which will very much adversely affect the prices of materials

and supplies. It cannot do otherwise. The Government's proposals again would put South Australia back in the position where we would have the most generous, not to say the most indulgent, workers compensation provisions in Australia. The cost of those provisions has in the past proved to be insupportable for industry. I predict that that situation will again occur.

A further cost, looking down the chart, is the question of licences. The Premier has stated unequivocally that State taxes will increase. One can assume that licences will also. That, of course, is quite in contrast to his unequivocal statement prior to the November election that that would not occur. He has leapt to the other side of the fence on that question.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: I would say he is totally dishonest.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The member for Coles will resume her seat. Interjections are out of order. I have asked that the member for Coles be heard in silence and I ask all members to respect that.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Looking at the licences that the State Government can impose, one finds that many of those relate directly to the tourist industry, and particularly to the hospitality industry. The first licence that comes to my mind which I believe that the Government will substantially increase is the liquor licence. Liquor licence fees must be very attractive to the Government because those fees are calculated on the basis of liquor sold in the previous 12 months. They are based on 9 per cent of turnover. I predict that it will be amazing if in July, when we resume the Budget session, the Government does not introduce a Bill to increase liquor licence fees to a total of 10 per cent. At the present time it is 9 per cent of turnover and I say that in the latter half of this year hotels will be paying 10 per cent of turnover. For many of the hotels, that will be an imposition which will greatly affect their viability.

Petrol franchise is another licence, the benefits of which are directly related to the tourist industry. Petrol franchises again depend on turnover. I predict that petrol licences will be increased and that the cost of petrol will go up. The capacity of South Australians to travel around and see their own State and the likelihood of interstate visitors motoring to the tourist regions of our State will be reduced. Again, we have that upward spiral of costs and the downward spiral of profitability.

Looking at other licences which the State Government is very likely to increase, one can go through landbrokers' licences, land and business agents, which are areas which have a very close relationship with the tourist industry, transfer of land and development of property. Secondhand motor vehicles licences again is an area which has a relationship with the tourist industry. Builders' licences, commercial and private agents' licences, credit providers' licences: all these things have a very close relationship with various sectors of the tourist industry, many of which are now struggling and on the borderline of profitability. Increases in costs such as those which are inevitable when the first Bannon Budget is introduced will certainly have an adverse effect.

Mr Becker: Does the honourable member suggest that we ought to do away with penalty rates?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The member for Hanson raises a question which I had intended to introduce myself later in this speech. On the question of penalty rates, it is interesting to see that the Federal Minister of Tourism has done a most extraordinary somersault. Immediately before the Federal election, the Federal Minister of Tourism was questioning the effect of penalty rates on the tourism industry. He was calling for some kind of review of penalty rates in the interests of the health of the tourist industry. What

happens? He would have got a very swift rap over the knuckles from the Prime Minister (then the Leader).

There are statements such as those reported in the national and State newspapers at the end of last week, that penalty rates were not the bogey of the tourist industry. What an extraordinary statement for a Federal Minister to make! Obviously, everyone who has a real stake in the tourist industry and who cares about its future and profitability, will call for a seven-day week in the industry and for overtime to be based on that seven-day week so that employers and small businesses do not have to practically go into hock if they want to open on a Saturday, Saturday night or Sunday. As for a Monday holiday, that is pretty well an impossible dream.

Restaurants that would do very good business if they were open on Monday holidays simply cannot afford the monumental cost of penalty rates. Consequently, the business that they might do and the money that might be spent and flow into the economy, simply stays in people's pockets while they sit at home because there is no way that anyone can afford to pay the kind of prices of hospitality which are incurred when double time and triple time loadings for Monday holidays need to be paid. Of course, the result is that many restaurants and hotels simply do not make their facilities available on those holidays.

Mr Mathwin: There is nowhere else in the world where they have those penalty rates.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The member for Glenelg is quite correct. There are very few other countries in the world (if any) which have a penalty rate system like the system in Australia. However, there are very few other places which have a 17 per cent holiday loading. That is a uniquely Australian 'help yourself and look after yourself' feature of our wage system which was fought for and obtained by the unions and which is now costing us.

Mr Mathwin: How did the teachers get 17 per cent loadings?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The question is asked, 'How did the teachers get the loadings?' The teachers are a separate subject in themselves and I do not propose to refer to them in a speech addressed to the problems of the tourist industry. However, there is a very close relationship between education and the tourist industry and one which I hope this Government will address.

Having itemised some of the measures which I believe that this Government will take in order to reduce the deficit which has occurred because of irresponsible management in the main (not entirely, but in the main) and failure to control spending, I want to look at the effects that that will have in the long term.

In August last year the then Government adopted and endorsed a plan prepared by the South Australian tourist industry called the South Australian Development Plan. I have heard nothing to indicate that this Government has withdrawn that endorsement. Therefore, I assume that the objectives outlined in the plan are endorsed by the Government, together with the assumptions on which those objectives were based.

On page 10 of that plan a reference is made to major trends relative to the future of the industry. In particular, there are three of those trends which are directly related to the impact of this Government's economic management, the impact of this Bill and the impact of the State Budget which will attempt to raise more revenue. Those three trends are as follows: the first trend which will affect the tourist industry is the level of general economic activity and movement of key economic variables, for example, inflation, interest rates and fuel prices. Of course, inflation will be affected by wage rises. Interest rates will be very much affected by the enormous borrowings that this Gov-

ernment will have to undertake in order to handle the deficit. Money will become more scarce when Governments move into the money market. It also becomes more costly. As I have said, fuel prices are bound to rise.

The second factor, which is relevant to this debate and to a wider debate, is the deterioration of industrial relations. That is one thing which the tourist industry really fears. I believe that the State Government will try to buy industrial relations in future as it has in the past. The cost will be dear and the parties cannot continue to pay, because the taxpayer simply will not be able to sustain the demands that unions will make of this Government in return for the support they gave it and for the unions' acquiescence in the early days of this Government's office.

The third and most critical factor in terms of trends affecting the tourist industry is identified at both State and national levels as being a climate of expenditure restraint and reassessment of priorities by Governments. Those words were written when there was a Liberal Government in South Australia and Canberra. The industry recognised that there was a climate of expenditure restraint and a reassessment of priorities. That has now gone out the window. There is certainly no climate of real expenditure restraint when Government departments are allowed to over-run their Budgets in the space of six months by \$26 000 000. No-one can describe that as expenditure restraint.

I certainly endorse the words of the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Davenport when they called on the Government to establish a Budget review committee. As a Minister, whilst I was naturally concerned about any measure which would make it more difficult for the departments under my control to live in the frugal manner which was necessitated by our circumstances, I must say that I had nothing but respect for the kind of sound management principles which the Tonkin Government pursued vigorously and rigorously in order to make sure that only those moneys which had been appropriated by Parliament and approved by Parliament, only those measures in the various spending areas of the departments which had been approved, would be spent. Every officer knew that he had to live within the particular areas of expenditure that had been approved. That principle seems to have gone out the window to the tune of \$26 000 000.

I am extremely concerned that these three factors—economic variables, namely, inflation, interest rates and fuel prices which will adversely affect the industry—have not been responsibly addressed by the Government. I am apprehensive about the prospect of a deterioration of industrial relations and its effect on the tourism industry. I am concerned with good reason that the climate of expenditure restraint that existed when the plan was developed and endorsed no longer exists, as evidenced by the Government's actions.

The final point that I want to make is that, unless the Government recognises the impact that its activities are having on the tourist industry, the goal of achieving 10 per cent growth in the industry each year over the next five years cannot possibly be achieved, and yet achievement of that goal should be the Government's highest priority. If that goal can be achieved it has been estimated that an additional 8 000 jobs will be created in South Australia. I do not have to outline to the House the beneficial effects and the enormous stimulus and the enormous human and economic benefits that would flow from the creation of another 8 000 jobs. It would bring the number of people employed in the tourist industry in South Australia from the current level of about 14 700 up to a level of 22 500 jobs. I am talking now about full-time equivalent jobs, not about part-time jobs, which is another matter, and an important one, because so many people in the tourism

industry work in part-time and casual employment, many of whom value the kind of structure of the employment which suits their own personal situation.

Therefore, I simply sound a warning to the Government: if it increases taxes and charges in the areas I have outlined it will inextricably set in train a depressive effect on the tourism industry and all industries associated with it. Those industries include not only the hospitality industry, the tourism and travel industry, the accommodation industry and the wine industry, which in this State is inextricably linked with the tourism industry. The ramifications affect all activities from accountants and advertisers to butchers and carpenters, to greengrocers, importers, insurance agents, office equipment suppliers, painters, printers, real estate brokers, restaurateurs, room maids, taxi drivers and those in wholesale establishment—every sphere of activity will be affected and, having regard to what the Premier said, they will be adversely affected.

I serve warning to the Government that no longer will the industry be acquiescent in the acceptance of these things. I ask the Premier to give the highest priority to identifying the impact of the Government's measures on the tourism industry during the time between now and July when the Budget will have been framed. Unless the Premier does so, he will find that the State will be much the poorer because of the measures that he proposed.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I note with interest your protection, Mr Acting Speaker, for the member for Coles during her speech, and I respect your comments insisting upon silence. Indeed, I understand that the Standing Orders of this House dictate quite clearly the matters concerning the conduct and control of members within the Chamber. Standing Orders 159 and 174 refer in particular to those requirements.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable member please resume his seat. I feel that this matter is completely irrelevant to the Bill, and I ask the member for Alexandra to address himself to the matter that he is supposed to be debating.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: In relation to the matter before the House, my comments were relevant to the extent that what I might propose during this debate might provoke members from one side or the other to cause some disturbance. To pre-empt that occurring, it seemed to me to be beneficial to clarify the position. I am not reflecting on the Chair, as indeed I compliment you, Sir, on the carriage of your duties.

Mr PLUNKETT: On a point of order, it appears that the member for Alexandra is reading his speech.

Mr Ashenden: Listen to who's talking!

The ACTING SPEAKER: I am satisfied that the honourable member is in order.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: Indeed, at this stage I have not referred to a note or a word from any document: it was simply on my recollection of Standing Orders that I made my brief comments. I want to raise a number of matters regarding the Bill. The Leader commenced this day's sitting with what I thought was a very relevant question to the Premier. The Premier's response to that question about the State's finances and the direction in which we are heading interested me greatly, but disturbed me. Earlier today amongst other things the Premier in his reply to that question about finances indicated that the results for this financial year will be troublesome which would have occurred whether or not the Labor Party was in Government.

Members would realise that prior to the last State election the members of the Liberal Party realised also that the finances of this State were in bother and would continue to cause further bother if management were not applied. From

as far back as the commencement of the current financial year South Australia has experienced devastating natural disasters, with the drought throughout the spring period into summer and beyond, the fires that occurred towards the end of summer, then more recently the floods. Collectively they caused South Australia and its people great trauma, more than has ever occurred before. As a result, the Budget was put out of gear. The Opposition's reluctance to question Ministers of Government about their role during those disasters has shown that we recognise the impact of those disasters on the community at large and the difficulty that any Government would have in such circumstances.

As far as the rural community of the State is concerned, I know that I have not pressed or aggravated the former Minister of Agriculture, and in similar circumstances I would not aggravate the present Minister. I believe that it is our job as responsible members of this place to assist the Government of the day during such times. I know that neither I nor my colleagues on this side of the House have been anything other than very fair in our approach to inquiring about the impact on the community of these matters in an attempt to assist our constituents.

However, the Government must uphold its undertakings to stick rigidly to the Budget that it inherited and to manage carefully the financial affairs of the State, which it undertook to do prior to the election. I do not believe that the Labor Party has demonstrated its capacity to do that. Indeed, an attempt to trade off its embarrassment in recent times by citing the effects of the natural disasters (in isolation from its bad administration) is quite despicable. I refer to the situation surrounding the funding of assistance to disaster victims.

I understand that so far this financial year some \$33 000 000 has been expended for the purpose of assisting the disaster victims following the fire, flood and drought. The Premier admitted today that in recent months he has received from the Commonwealth a non-repayable assistance grant of \$10 500 000. That leaves the State with a \$23 000 000 debt, a third of the total deficit that is anticipated for this financial year, so that despite the massive impact these disasters have had on the community at large, they represent a total of one-third of the total deficit envisaged. Therefore, I do not believe that they can be blamed as an ingredient of what is clearly mismanagement as it applies to the other two-thirds of the anticipated deficit for this term.

On the other hand, the Premier indicated to the House that the State was burdened with some \$3 000 000 contribution to each of the disasters identified before the State qualified for any Commonwealth subsidy assistance. That is simply not true in relation to these disasters, because the \$10 500 000 grant more than covers the three times \$3 000 000 required for each disaster identified within this financial year. Each \$1, each \$4, each \$4 000 or indeed each \$4 000 000 thereafter is contributed to by donations received from the Federal Government to the tune of three to one, so that, if we look at the net \$23 000 000 in cold hard cash terms, the State is up for only \$6 000 000, and the remaining \$17 000 000 is paid for by the Commonwealth. Measured against the anticipated \$70 000 000 the \$6 000 000 is really peanuts.

I think it is quite unfair and quite misleading for the Premier to blame, or in any way conceal the true position, the expenditure caused by the natural disasters for the current situation. It is true, and I am the first one to accept, that before the winter is out, before this year is out and perhaps in some cases before that time, there will be ongoing costs associated with assistance programmes for the victims, but other funds are available to the State, outside the budgeted figure, from the Commonwealth.

I wrote to the Premier on 26 January asking for details of the finances in the Industries Assistance Division of the Department of Agriculture. I appreciate the time lapse, because some research obviously had to be done, and it was during the period when the Rural Industries Assistance Branch was as flat as a strap in applying itself to the needs of applicants. However, I received a reply from the Premier in a letter dated 27 April in the following terms:

I have been advised by my colleague the Minister of Agriculture—

that is, of course, the Minister who has departed the scene—that sufficient funds are available from the Rural Adjustment Fund to meet likely demands from farm build-up, debt reconstruction and farm improvement during 1982-83.

That reply was not consistent with an answer that I had received earlier from the then Minister of Agriculture, nor was it consistent with reports by the Minister of Agriculture that the Rural Industries Assistance Division of his department was out of money, or nearly out of money, when he came into office. However, the Premier was straight enough to give me the position. He went on to say:

The following table gives an estimate of the current (February 1983) financial position relating to Rural Adjustment Funds:

	\$ million
Funds available 1.7.82-30.6.83	5.7
Expenditure 1.7.82-30.12.82	2.7
Budgeted expenditure 1.1.83-30.6.83	3.0
Total estimated expenditure 1982-83	5.7

Quite clearly, on that table provided by the Premier on 27 April, the Rural Industries Assistance Division had a capacity to perform and had the money in hand to pay for various rural industries assistance purposes. The Premier went on to say:

Providing loans at the rate indicated above depends upon the receipt of instalments payable on existing loans. Monthly receipts are not received as equal amounts throughout the year and funds available in any one month may not be sufficient to meet the demand for loans in that particular month. The cash flow position of the rural adjustment funds was particularly bad in January 1983 but the allocation of \$600 000 from Commonwealth funds together with budgeted instalment income of \$1 300 000 during February and March will allow operations to continue with a minimum of inconvenience to farmers. A further \$1 400 000 can be called upon from the Commonwealth on 1 July 1983, being the amount which can be committed but not advanced. Arrangements have been made to provide sufficient resources to remove any backlog of applications.

DROUGHT FINANCE—FARMERS ASSISTANCE FUNDS

The following table indicates the progress of this fund during 1982-83:

It then refers to a table of balances and monetary amounts which I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* without further reference.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Do I have the honourable member's assurance that it is purely statistical information?

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: You have that, Sir.

Leave granted.

Fund details		\$ Million
Balance at 1.7.82		3.2
Allocation from Treasury		4.1
Total Income to date		7.3
Expenditure to 4.2.83		7.3
Carry-on finance		2.3
Small Business		0.3
Frost Damage		1.1
Stock Slaughter		0.1
Freight Subsidy		0.5
Repaid to Treasury		2.5
		6.8
		6.8
Balance in fund 4.2.83		0.5

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: In conclusion, the Premier said:

Treasury has made arrangements to provide further funds to allow the drought schemes to proceed without delays caused by inadequate funding and for Commonwealth contributions on a \$3 for \$1 Commonwealth-States contributing basis to be called up as required.

I think it is important to have on record those details provided by the Premier. I know that many primary producers in South Australia have wondered about the availability of funds under the ordinary avenues of financial assistance from the R.I.A. Division of the Department of Agriculture, and clearly that information should be made available to them.

The budget in that division is on stream. I am proud to say that we left the department in good shape in November 1982 with its officers in high spirits and its finances in order. I believe that there was no reason for the incoming Government and the incoming Minister to allow it to get out of gear while funding is provided within the guidelines of the Commonwealth-State contribution scheme for that purpose.

Neither the Premier nor his Cabinet colleagues can in any way blame the Department of Agriculture and its financing division for the mess that is now obvious. Within six months of coming into Government, it has demonstrated that, by its own policies and attitudes towards increasing the Public Service, selecting certain items of expenditure, and displaying so many examples of loose management, its need to now increase taxation and charges is not only contrary to the undertakings given before coming into office but is clearly and publicly a symbol of the Government's incapacity to manage such levels of finance and the affairs of the State.

I do not want to make a song and dance about the subject. I believe that the chickens will come home to roost and that the public of South Australia, if it has not done so already, will recognise its folly and that the term of this Government will be one and one alone. The other subject to which I would like to refer in this debate has remote connection with the financial situation of the State and may come within the ambit of the Bill presented to the House this afternoon. It is one that relates particularly to an industry with which I have had some considerable involvement over the years and one about which I have real concern at present. I refer to the wool and shearing industry. An incredible, if not ridiculous, situation has developed within the trade union movement over recent weeks, fostered, encouraged and cultivated by certain persons within the hierarchy of that movement. A number of shearers—too many shearers—have found themselves in an out-of-work situation, on so-called strike, with some of them on the dole and some sneaking off to work while others loyally stick with their colleagues (as has been described) and badger others seeking employment to maintain a reasonable standard of living at the family level. Others are carrying on under the canopy of the law and going about their work in a proper manner.

It is difficult to keep up with the figures and reports of what is occurring in the field. As far as I can ascertain, a growing number of shearing employees are going back to work. I admire these people for what they are doing, so long as they are acting within the terms of the law. They are taking, in some cases, a risk of being molested, aggravated or attacked by so-called colleagues for so doing. They are getting on with the job essentially needing to be done. Some are saying that shearing is not in full swing; indeed it is not over a great part of the State. At this time of the year the shearing of sheep is limited to specific areas where sheep are, by practice, shorn in the autumn but otherwise are being shorn for market or export. The numbers involved in the agricultural region are relatively limited. It is a different situation in the North, where a great number of sheep are shorn in the early months of the calendar year.

Otherwise, there is an important function in the field to be performed—crutching. It is essential that sheep, whether they be in the inside country or the outside country, are crutched at this time of the year so that, approaching the winter, the lambs and heavier wool period, they are cleaned up and at least every effort is made to minimise the risk of fly strike, which causes great losses in sheep numbers. Around 17 000 000 sheep in South Australia has been the figure for a number of years, but it is already down to about 14 000 000. We are lucky in South Australia that we have been able to maintain our numbers at that level. Those numbers will further diminish this winter and in the early months of spring if sheep are not crutched and attended to under the ordinary management programme of sheep husbandry. We need those men in the field to do the work. A limited amount of work can be carried on by the growers and their sons. Neighbours will also apply themselves, if the balance of the shearing industry refuses to go back to work. I believe that the employees of the shearing industry, or those directly involved in the current strike—

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I have put up with the chatting from one section of the House for some time. I said earlier that I wanted members to be heard in silence and I ask all members of the House to hear the member for Alexandra in silence.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: I appreciate the style with which you, Mr Acting Speaker, apply yourself in the Chair. Personally, it does not worry me if members opposite yap or interject. In fact, I rather welcome some positive interest in what is going on in the House. Might I say, with due respect, that it is dam boring to be addressing a subject of importance—

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's remarks have nothing to do with the debate in hand and I ask him to address his remarks to the subject under debate.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: Some shearers are persisting in strike action. I do not believe that they are doing themselves or the industry any good at all. For far too long the image of those people in that industry has been one calling for support and lift. It is a profession and, indeed, a very important profession that requires great skill, and happens to be associated with the most important industry in the country. I believe that the members and associates of the Australian Workers Union ought to be doing everything in their power to promote the image of their own profession, or at least the profession which they purport to represent. To carry on in the way in which some of those people have carried on in recent months is really quite sickening. They are doing more damage than good to themselves and to the image of the industry.

I am disappointed that some members of this House and of the Government have backed away from their responsibilities and have failed to use their good offices to convince their colleagues in the trade union movement that they should seek to settle this fruitless argument in a much shorter time than they have been able to achieve. When the subject was raised for several days in a row during the session a few weeks ago, the Premier indicated that he would investigate the matter. He has not been back to the House with even a semblance of a report. No member of his Cabinet has reported to this Parliament by way of a Ministerial statement, or in any other way, on any positive actions that they may have taken.

We saw in the press a few days ago that, following a week-long sickness, the Deputy Premier was having consultations with members of the union and one or two other people in an effort to resolve the issue, but it was a soft-pedal approach if ever there was one to an important and vital situation. I place on record my disappointment and

that of many reliable and responsible people in the community at the lack of attention that this subject has received from the Government. If ever there was anyone in a position to do anything about it the Hon. Jack Wright, our Deputy Premier, was that person. He was closely associated with the industry for a number of years; he was an active party to it; he was an organiser in the field for the Australian Workers Union; more latterly, he has been Secretary of that union; as many members on the other side have come into this Parliament from the trade union movement, he himself became a member; and he now occupies a prominent position in the Government. For these reasons I believe that he has the capacity to have resolved this issue with at least the South Australian members of the A.W.U. had he only wanted to.

I have been urged by a couple of messages to refer briefly to the Hon. Mr Chatterton's recent departure from the Ministry. I do not wish to canvass this issue at length, but I am disappointed that the Premier has not seen fit to declare publicly what we understand to be more evidence surrounding that resignation than has been canvassed or published hitherto. There seems to be an incredible reluctance to come straight out on the issue. No way in the world has a Minister resigned from Cabinet for the reasons so far given. I recognise that the Minister's wife has had a great influence over his activities for some years and that she has shown, in public and in the newspaper recently over her own name, all sorts of reasons to justify the allegations made over a period in relation to her direct involvement in the affairs of her husband in his capacity as Minister. I know that some members opposite are happy to see him or them go, but it is the responsibility of the Government to lay on the line the precise reasons for the resignation.

However, Government members have backed away from the subject like a crayfish when repeated questions have been asked in an effort to get a reply on the record. Such questions have caused the Premier and his Ministers to withdraw and to shut up on the matter in order to keep the lid on it. In private practice this would be no-one else's affair but in Government the resignation of a Minister of the Crown, albeit as a result of his department's being in disarray, should be a matter on which the Government speaks. Indeed, there is more disarray in this case because the appointment of the new Minister to administer the portfolio could cause a traumatic situation. For these reasons, it is the time that the Premier came clean on the matter. We have reason to believe that there is more to this subject than has been disclosed, and we do not think it will lie down. The opportunity is there now for the Government to speak. This is not a challenge but a fair request that the Premier take the earliest opportunity to lay the facts of the matter before the House so that everyone knows what is the precise position.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I wish to speak on some matters in the Supply debate this evening. First, I shall comment on the financial record of the present incumbents of the Treasury benches. This is the most dishonest Government that has been visited on South Australia at least for a decade and a half, during the time I have been a member of this Parliament. That has been the word used by the Premier concerning the previous Government when he has tried to wriggle or, to use the word used by one of my colleagues, crayfish his way out of the predicament in which he has fairly and squarely placed himself. Before last year's election the Premier (then Leader of the Opposition) placed before South Australians an economic package with

four points. He listed various plans from time to time: he had a wonderful five-point plan, as well as an eight-point plan, but this one had four points. First, he said he would spend more public money. Secondly, he said he would improve the lot of Government workers and put more people on the Government pay-roll. Thirdly, he said he would give public servants more money and require them to work shorter hours. Fourthly, he said he would reduce taxation to do all this. He did not say all these things at the same time, because it would have been patently stupid to do so.

Mr Mathwin: And a bit unreal.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, extremely unreal, but they were the basic prongs of the Labor Party's approach to the economic situation in this State. The Labor Party fronted up to the people at that election campaign with that package, asserting confidently that they had first-class information. When questioned by the media about whether the Premier could afford all those promises, he said that his Party had up-to-date information such as that found in the Auditor General's Report, the blue book which never lies and which one can trust as a bible. He said not only that his Party had a copy of that report but that it had new Budget papers to show that there was no possibility that his Party did not know where it was going. The Labor Party told members of the public not to listen to the gloom and doom of Premier Tonkin who at that time was urging caution. Indeed, our Government was trying to get some realism into the pre-election debate. I understand that one economist advising the Labor Party at that time had charts covering the wall of his office showing how a Labor Government could balance the books. If memory serves me right, one of the gurus advising members of the then Opposition may recently have been promoted to Senator. Be that as it may, the Labor Party said it had up-to-date information that could not possibly be wrong. They advanced their proposals and the people bought them.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: Do you think Bob Hawke might have the same problem?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: They have all gone the same path and he has inherited the guru, who will advise him from the Senate. I have described the package that the Premier sold the public at the election last year. However, when, on election night, he eventually came out of seclusion, when the hospitality was flowing freely, we started to get a note of caution. He must have found another book, because on that very night he started to back-pedal. He started to wring his hands saying, 'It's not going to be easy.' He had previously said, 'We can employ more teachers and public servants.' The recently elected member for Unley's crowd had been bought off, but suddenly there was a need for caution.

What has been the record of the Labor Government since it was elected? It was going to fund its proposals from an enterprise fund. In order to create jobs a fund was to be set up to attract investment that would eventually be used to finance high technology, which became the in word. The basic thrust of a job-generating scheme was to have been this enterprise fund.

Where are we six or eight months down the track? The Government cannot keep its promise in relation to teachers, but the teachers union has gone very quiet on that. If the Liberal Government had been in power, some of the people who are well to the fore in that organisation would have been belting hell out of it, marching up and down King William Street until they were worn down to the knees. The Labor Party has bought off the Public Service union, and for his services, the member for Unley now has got himself a seat in this House.

The SPEAKER: Order! I would like to note the fact that the honourable member for Goyder took his place in the Chair at my request and I thank him very much for the capable way in which he carried out his duties.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am entirely in agreement with the Chair. As I said, that was the package. Of course, the Government could not dodge a lot of it. It was a pay-off to the unions, some industrial legislation is bobbing up in the House at the moment; it gets to be part of the payoff. We are back in fool's paradise again, back in the pace-setting years. Look at the Bills introduced over the last two weeks. I notice that the Public Service union has kept fairly quiet, although I did notice in its journal a complaint or two, but it was fairly muted. Likewise, the teachers: the Government could not quite staff the high schools up to strength and that has been pretty muted. The Government is in the business of enlarging the public sector again.

The Liberal Government, as has been pointed out by other speakers, was prudent and careful in containing expansion; in fact, it initiated some contraction in some areas of the public sector and for very good reason. Why is it that employers around Australia are saying that unemployment is rising? The most expensive component in any enterprise in this day and age is the labour content. By far, the bulk of the education vote goes towards paying human beings; the labour content is 90 per cent. As industry becomes less viable, commerce becomes less viable, and there is no alternative in that sector but to reduce numbers. They have got the flexibility to do it, and they have to do it or go broke. That flexibility does not exist to the same extent in Government because there are certain unwritten rules and conventions that Governments do not hire and fire as the private sector does. The tradition is that Governments do not operate in that way—unless it is the Wran Government in New South Wales, which had no compunction about firing several hundred main roads daily-paid workers when it was in financial difficulties. But then, the Labor Government has a different set of rules.

The Liberal Government did not fire anyone in its three years of government, because it had excess resources. There were areas where there was a gross excess of resources beyond Government and public need. It is all very well for the Premier to talk about cutting back the services. The Public Buildings Department has become the biggest builder in the nation, if not the southern hemisphere. The construction branch of the E. & W.S. Dept, when things were booming in the 1970s, had plenty of work to do but when the down-turn came there was precious little for those people to do, resulting in excess capacity in both departments.

The Liberal Government deliberately ran those departments down. It did not cause any diminution at all in the provision of Government services. It made a saving of between \$60 000 000 and \$80 000 000 to the public of South Australia each year, and that is how the Liberal Government came to terms with those budgetary dogooders. One of the fundamental rules that members opposite would learn if they were trying to run a business is that the labour component is by far the most expensive. If they get into serious trouble they have no alternative but to reduce that component. The Liberal Government reduced numbers, quite significantly and quite deliberately, in areas where there was no effect whatsoever. It meant that these people could take early retirement or seek alternative employment where they would have something to do, because they literally had nothing to do on the Government pay-roll but waste time.

The sob story that the Premier seeks to sell to the public that we are cutting services dangerously is hogwash. That was one element of the programme which has only exacerbated the problems facing the State: the Labor Government would not face reality in terms of what should have been

strict control over the size of the public sector. The other element, of course, is their policy relating to taxes. Blind Freddie, of course, would know that the Government had no hope at all of keeping its promise in relation to taxes. As I have said, and as the member for Chaffey has observed, a child in kindergarten would know that that sum does not add up. If a Government is to employ more people, give them better conditions, pay them more, give them shorter working hours, keep services up, and not increase charges and taxes, that is an absurd proposition. Now the chickens are coming home to roost. Who in Government and who in Parliament really believed that the Labor Party was doing anything but deliberately deceiving the public? Do not let members opposite try to fool us into believing that their election strategy was honest and fair dinkum. No one believed that their propositions had any credibility at all.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Let the chickens rest in the right coop.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: They certainly will come home to roost. Then we have the charade last week of taking out of context confidential minutes of the Premiers' Conference before decisions had been made. It was suggested that the then Premier went over there and cried poverty, saying that State taxes may have to be increased. When Premier Dunstan used to go on this annual pilgrimage (and also Premier Bannon now), he would not say, 'We have got plenty of money in the coffers. All is rosy.' He would have gone to that conference crying poverty.

Part of the bargaining strategy is that the Premier paints a gloomy picture so that the State will get more money. As a result of that, our State did get more. If Premier Bannon intends going to the Premiers' Conference in June saying that South Australia has all that it needs, that is a stupid approach. That was a completely dishonest exercise last week when he sought to nail the former Liberal Government for suggesting that there would be increases in taxes.

Our approach to Government in hindsight was too honest. I am becoming cynical about politics. I believe that the approach of the Liberal Government was too honest. We sought to come to terms with the budgetary realities; we sought to take the public into our confidence. The Labor Party has successfully conned the public. It is our intention to see that it does not get away with it. Areas in this Supply debate which are a great distress to me, as a former Minister of Mines and Energy, relate to what has happened in the mining industry and the development of our resources as a result of the change in Government.

I believe that we managed to achieve some significant developments for South Australia. I would recommend that members opposite read the book on Sir Thomas Playford which was launched today. It was written by Sir Walter Crocker, and I believe he puts the relative achievements of the Playford and Dunstan years into proper perspective. Sir Walter Crocker makes the statement which, as I think one of the newspapers observed, may ruffle a few feathers that, in effect, there was no significant development during the Dunstan decade which added to the pool of wealth and development in South Australia. If one takes the long view, to me, that is a pretty damning indictment of successful Labor Administrations. I believe that during the three short years that the Liberal Government was in office in South Australia (from 1979 to 1982) there were some significant developments. We had an international airport that the former Labor Government talked about having established. That was successfully negotiated and built during those three years. We used to hear a lot of talk about an international hotel. That was successfully negotiated and built. Of course, that has generated a great deal of employment.

If one thinks of only one item in connection with the international hotel, just carting the rubbish away from the

hotel is worth \$500 a week to a contractor who has taken on an extra employee. One can go through the whole gamut of the multiplier effect of employment. In other areas there are significant achievements; tourism ran against the national trend. In one year there was a 16 per cent increase (a significant increase) in tourism during the life of the Liberal Administration, because that was a priority established by the Government because it believed that it could generate employment. Employment trends in South Australia were running against the national trends. Although our figures were high, we were holding the line while others were climbing. In the areas for which I was directly responsible, there were significant developments. Against bitter opposition we managed to get, only by dint of a defection from the Labor Party, the Roxby Downs indenture through the Parliament. That was because one Labor member stood up for his principles in another place and let it through. We successfully negotiated a multi-billion dollar liquids scheme and the benefits of that are flowing. The financial benefits will be flowing increasingly in the coming years to every man, woman and child in South Australia.

Let us look back to the Dunstan decade. Where are any of these developments to be seen? Nowhere. However, what did we have? We had those years of pace-setting. However, the pace-setting certainly was not in the area of securing the long-term future, economic health and development of this State which is the only way we ensure growth, security and job security for the rising generation. We saw none of that.

Mr Mathwin: We saw the pace-setting in pink pants in Parliament House.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: We saw all sorts of pace-setting, except in those fundamental areas that would generate wealth and activity. I have used this example before, but I will use it again: we saw an emphasis on cutting up the cake but no emphasis on making the cake any bigger. If there is to be growth in an economy, there has to be development, and that was stifled.

Therefore, as I have observed, any fool can splash money around, but to encourage enterprise, effort, industry, commerce, and to develop the resources in this State, it requires some entrepreneurial skills and some definite policy directions which the Labor Party just does not have because it is hell-bent on redistribution, regulation, and stifling anyone who has a bit of get up and go and who would generate some activity and wealth for himself and his fellow man. We see a plethora of this redistributing legislation before the House at the moment. We have workers compensation legislation before the House which gives added benefits at a time when the benefits are not there to be added. It is legislating for unemployment.

We saw another piece of legislation introduced today to give the Arbitration Commission a freer rein so that it will not have to take account of what is happening nationally. We are legislating for increased unemployment because, as sure as the sun will rise tomorrow morning, it will add a burden to the cost of employers (that race hated by the members opposite), and they will employ fewer people.

I have become quite convinced in the last year or two that unions do not give a damn about unemployment. I have a far greater faith in the average John Citizen and the average unionist in Australia than I have for the people who lead many of the unions. However, the Carmichaels, the Apaps, and the Scotts do not give a damn about unemployment. All they are interested in is securing added benefits for the people in their union, come hell or high water, and they do not give a damn about the bloke next door. They do not care what union he is in, what he is about, or whether he is unemployed. They have only one charter, and that is

to secure added benefits for the people for whom they claim they are responsible.

Mr Mathwin: And flexing their industrial muscles—

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: —to do it, yes. The new Prime Minister, with his reforming zeal, can talk all he likes about consensus. However, unless he can instill in the hierarchy of the unions with which he has to deal (he has Mr Carmichael on his back at the moment) a broader vision than that of merely securing more and more for less and less effort for one group, there is no hope in terms of improving the output and the competitiveness of this nation and of improving unemployment.

I wanted to deal with a tragedy that has overtaken our mining industry in South Australia as a result of the advent of the Labor Government. It is nothing short of a tragedy, and it will be a day which this State will rue for many years. In 1973, the Labor Government encouraged the uranium industry and set up a uranium enrichment committee to capture this important billion dollar industry for the State, encouraged people to explore, encouraged them to find. When they got to the point of developing a pilot plant merely to prove up some production, \$10 000 000 down the track in the case of Honeymoon, the Government banged the door. What does that do for the credibility of a State and, if this spreads to other States, to a nation? Members opposite who were not born in this country but have come from other countries might go back to their place of birth and see how they would get on. Let them go back and stay if they want to.

The SPEAKER: Order! I rule those remarks very definitely out of order because they have not only a very definite national flavour, but a racist flavour. I do not think that the Deputy Leader intended that. I hope that he will withdraw them.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I say let them go back to their nation of birth and have a look where their energy sources are generated.

Mr Ferguson: Windmills.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: If I know the nation of the honourable member's origin, I think that if he went back there he would find that windmills are not being used to generate electricity.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Henley Beach will cease interjecting, and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition will not respond to incorrect interjections.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am not responding to interjections: I am simply telling these members to go back to their country of birth and look at how electricity is generated in those countries. Electricity in those countries is generated by the burning of nuclear fuel. Members opposite should go to England, for instance, and they would then understand what would happen there if there was a refusal around the world to supply England with uranium for fuel. Let members opposite go to Holland, Germany, socialist France, or Italy (I do not know which flavour the Italian Government is at the moment, but it is often socialist); let them go to enlightened Sweden or Japan, Canada, Korea or India. Why is it that members opposite think that we are an island divorced from the rest of Mother Earth? Nuclear energy is an indispensable part of the world scene and has been for 30 years.

Mr Mayes: What about Three Mile Island?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: That is another story, and I will be quite happy to talk about that.

The SPEAKER: I will not be.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: What about the 16 people who crashed in a coal mine a fortnight ago? The use of nuclear energy will do nothing but increase. It is increasing at this moment. Nuclear reactors are being put up in an

escalating capacity at this very moment. Members opposite should try telling those people around the world that they are going to cut off their supply of fuel. That is the absurd position adopted by the A.L.P. to the great disadvantage of South Australia and this nation. Here we are at the forefront (the pacesetters being here in South Australia) and the Government has closed down the first mine, after we have been struggling for 10 years to establish the industry. We had a \$10 000 000 industry when the door banged shut a month ago on that disgraceful, sad and tragic day.

The members of the Labor Party would have us living in a fool's paradise. The fact is that we live in a world where nuclear energy is an essential component, and we are absolute idiots not to supply that fuel. We are seen as such by any of those nations that I have named—socialist, communist and the rest of them. In Russia, for example, they must be laughing their heads off, saying, 'You know what they are doing in silly little South Australia—not selling uranium.' In South Africa they would also be laughing their heads off because they would be selling more. The Labor Party was entirely deceitful in its economic strategy document that it put out in relation to the absurd and tragic decision to close down our mines. It was a deceitful document and, if my reckoning of the intelligence of the average South Australian is correct, the time will come in the not too distant future when the Government will get its marching orders.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): It must be becoming painfully obvious not only to the press in South Australia but to the majority of people in this State that since the presentation of the Appropriation Bill by the Premier yesterday the level of expertise within the Government as regards financial management is disastrously low. We have only to look through the document highlighted by the Leader earlier this afternoon to find evidence of over-runs and the absolute lack of stringent control. Until such time as the Government adopts the proposals and recommendations put forward by the Leader (in particular, the immediate appointment of a Budget Review Committee) the situation will continue to go from bad to worse.

During the three years of the previous Government's administration the Budget Review Committee played a vital part in the stability of the finances of this State, and that cannot be denied. The existence of that committee and the vital work that it carried out was very much appreciated in the long term by senior officers of the various Government departments. The committee played an important role in the day-to-day management of Government departments. The Directors of many of the major departments greatly appreciated the assistance provided through that committee. In the short term it might have been an easier life for those in the departments, the Ministers and the Directors, to not have had to contend with the Budget Review Committee. However, I am quite certain that as time went on the Directors certainly saw the value and appreciated the assistance that came from the committee.

Until such time as the Premier is prepared to adopt that approach and set up a committee comprising people with the ability and strength to gain control of the budgetary situation in this State, which is now completely out of control, the position will continue to deteriorate. We could well finish up with a deficit build-up of something like \$400 000 000, which is something that this State could not tolerate, and we could not exist under that sort of financial burden.

Upon examination of what the Premier is putting forward as a remedy to his problems, the first thing that one finds, which particularly concerns me, is the approach that he has adopted to the proposal to cut Government spending in the major capital works currently being undertaken in South

Australia. The Leader referred to these works earlier this afternoon. In the main, we are referring to rehabilitation of the Cobdogla irrigation area and the establishment of the sewage treatment works at Finger Point in the South-East. I point out that, in regard to the Premier's harping on the need to employ personnel in Government departments, the work of rehabilitation of the Government irrigation areas in South Australia has been going on for the past 10 years and has been mostly carried out by Government employees. In fact, during the past three years of the Liberal Government, the rehabilitation of the Government irrigation areas continued to be undertaken by E. & W.S. employees and only a very small complement of employees worked in that area.

One major area of capital works undertaken by a Government department in South Australia concerned rehabilitation of the Government irrigation distribution systems. We now have a situation occurring again which is the same as that which occurred during the time of the Dunstan Government when rehabilitation works had been undertaken in the Chaffey area in five stages. At that time four of those stages had been completed, and the final stage remained to be done. The Labor Government at that time took the decision not to proceed in that area with the final and vital stage that had not been undertaken. Quite obviously, anyone who has had any involvement with any engineering undertakings would know that, in most instances, until such time as a project is completed it is a virtual impossibility for that system to work efficiently. That is exactly the situation concerning the Chaffey area.

A large amount of money was spent in that area on the rehabilitation works. The final stage was not complete, and subsequently the new irrigation system in that area has never worked properly. In fact, the supply of water to irrigators in that area is actually worse than it was before the work commenced. Workers left the Chaffey area and commenced work on rehabilitation work in the Waikerie area of the Riverland. Exactly the same situation applies now as applied previously, as a result of the announcement made yesterday by the Premier about the Cobdogla irrigation area. I would point out to members of the Government who are probably unaware of this fact that it is not the deletion of a major project that has not commenced; the project is half completed.

Once again, we have a scheme where the Government is half way towards providing a rehabilitation scheme which will cost somewhere in the vicinity of \$20 000 000 to \$23 000 000. Half of that money has already been spent on the new pumping station in the installation of the pumps and the rising main. We now have that new pumping facility which will continue to pump into the antiquated, open and, in many instances, earth channel distribution system, a system which cannot provide growers with an efficient water supply.

Since there is not an efficient supply of water to the grower, modern irrigation practices cannot be implemented in the Cobdogla irrigation area. It is recognised throughout the world that modern irrigation practices probably reduce the inflow of salinity into major river systems of the world to a far greater extent than any other single factor. I am quite sure that the Minister of Water Resources will agree with me that poor and inefficient irrigation practices have been recognised throughout the world as being the major contributor of salinity in the major river systems of the world.

This was certainly recognised in the United States in relation to the Colorado River, where there are many similarities to the Murray system. They embarked upon a rehabilitation programme of assisting growers to convert to modern irrigation practices. It was realised that it was far

better to treat the cause of the problem than to treat the problem after the damage had been done: in other words, it was better to stop the groundwater movement back to the river which was carrying the heavy salt load. It was better to eliminate the problem on the irrigation property rather than being confronted with the ongoing cost of trying to collect the highly saline groundwater moving back to the river, treating it and disposing of it in the sea.

I emphasise that rehabilitation of the Cobdogla irrigation area is not a project that is about to commence: it is in fact half completed. We are going to be placed in exactly the same position as that existing under the Dunstan Government some 10 years ago when the decision was made not to proceed with the final stage of the Chaffey irrigation area. That has resulted in many aggravated situations developing, where police have had to be called in at the height of the irrigation season in order to settle arguments between growers. I can well appreciate the frustration of growers who have spent 12 months trying to produce a viable crop and then the system with which they are being asked to irrigate their properties does not have the capacity to provide the water that will size up the fruit sufficiently to make it a proposition where it can be delivered to the canneries (in other words, the cannery will not accept the fruit unless it is of a given size.)

Whilst the irrigation distribution system that exists in that area at this time is four-fifths of a modern closed pipe system, it cannot operate efficiently until such time as that fifth stage is completed, because it is designed to work on a given head of pressure to get the volume of water through the pipe system and, as long as part of that system still remains open channel, there is no way that the design head can be placed on that system to deliver the quantity of water for which it has been designed and which is required by the grower to effectively produce a viable crop. We have exactly that same situation again.

As I said, the work being undertaken in the Government irrigation areas in rehabilitating the irrigation systems involved Government day labour. The contract component included in the rehabilitation work was extremely small. Even during the last three years that contract component has been very small, so the Government has made a decision to eliminate a major capital works project that was in fact being constructed and has been in the process of being constructed for the past 10 years by the Government work force and not by contract.

The Premier's argument that it is necessary to direct more work to Government employees within Government departments completely falls apart when we look within the E. & W.S. Department at the major area of construction employment which is now being terminated, and that is where the majority of the Government employees are actually working. Either the Premier has no concept or idea of what is going on within his own department or, if he does, it is in complete conflict with what he has said on numerous occasions in this House. Not only do we have a situation where Government employees will be out of work or once again left idle because of the closure of this programme, but I do not think the Government realises the implications of this type of project being closed down. The implication to South Australia is that it is a major component of the salinity control programme in this State, and I believe that it is the first step the Government has taken in its abandonment of the fight to control salinity in this State. The Premier's second reading explanation states.

My Government hopes that the support announced by the previous Commonwealth Government under the water resources programme will be confirmed by the new Labor Government in Canberra.

The Premier only hopes. If the indication given to me yesterday in this House by the Minister of Water Resources is any indication of the pressure that the Premier is bringing to bear on Canberra to make sure that the resources that were promised for the national water resources development programme are made available, I have no faith whatsoever in the statement that those moneys will be forthcoming. If they are not forthcoming, not only will we see the Murray River salinity control programme in South Australia virtually grind to a halt but it will largely grind to a halt in Victoria and New South Wales. It is critical that the salinity control programme be carried out on a three-State basis, because much of the problem we have in South Australia is inherited from the Eastern States where something in excess of 1 000 000 tonnes annually of salt is crossing the borders from Victoria and New South Wales into South Australia. Unless the Premier is prepared to stand up and be counted and bring some weight to bear on the Federal Government, quite obviously the Prime Minister will brush him aside and the project will grind to a halt.

If that occurs, the consequences for South Australia are beyond description. We only have to look at the dependence of South Australia on that supply, particularly in the Riverland and other areas of South Australia as well as the provincial cities in the State and the metropolitan area of Adelaide. The Minister of Water Resources recently indicated to this House that in the past year Adelaide obtained in the vicinity of 90 per cent of its water from the Murray River. Could anyone imagine what would happen to metropolitan Adelaide if it were not for the 90 per cent of water coming to us from the Eastern States? We have had the ability and capacity to pump it from the Murray River into the Adelaide Hills and metropolitan Adelaide. Not only would the residential area of Adelaide suffer but also industry would grind to a halt as a result of that.

What I am extremely frightened of coming to pass is that not only will we see the first major collapse of the salinity control programmes as a result of the Cobdogla area rehabilitation programme being abandoned and falling apart but also, if the Federal Government does not come to the party with national water resources development programme funds, the situation would deteriorate very quickly.

The current situation has developed over a period of about 140 years. It is not a situation that can be corrected overnight. The capital works that will have to be undertaken will take many years and will need a constant input of funds. Large resources will have to come from the Federal Government if we are to effectively come to grips with this problem. For example, there are works in Victoria and New South Wales of equal importance to the works in which we are currently involved in South Australia. It has been indicated to this House by the Minister that the work between lock 2 and lock 3 is vital.

If I remember correctly, the consultants estimate that some 90 000 tonnes annually come into the river system in South Australia through groundwater movement. They believe that 60 000 tonnes of that groundwater inflow in the form of salt can be intercepted. If that is so, it will have a significant reduction in the salinity level at Morgan, which means a consequential reduction in the level of salinity in the area as far away as Whyalla.

I do not have to dwell on the fact any longer that the decision of the Government at this time not to proceed with the completion of the Cobdogla irrigation area rehabilitation programme is a clear indication that the salinity programme is of comparatively low priority. If that is the case, the repercussions in years to come will be absolutely devastating, and not only for the irrigators in that area: the fact that we are going to create two classes of irrigators is a problem in itself, but the overall effect on the total scene

in South Australia will be devastating. We will have to bear that burden in years to come.

The Minister of Water Resources is probably aware of the statement which emanated from Sydney only a few days ago in relation to what will happen to the citrus industry in South Australia with the continued deterioration in the quality of water. That is a factual statement. With continued deterioration, the citrus industry as well as other horticultural industries and agricultural crops in South Australia, will suffer to the extent that they will become non-viable. The massive resources spent in those industries in years gone by will be a complete write off. The effect on secondary industries of increasing levels of salinity, particularly through corrosion, amounts to millions of dollars annually.

It is a very short-sighted approach by the Government to chop off in mid stream a \$22 000 000 or \$23 000 000 rehabilitation programme when it is only half completed. It may have been necessary for the Government to reschedule, to some extent, that important capital works programme, but to delete it or chop it off completely at this stage is an absolute waste of money and a disaster.

I trust that what the Opposition has had to say on a number of matters raised in the Premier's second reading explanation on the Appropriation Bill will cause the Government to rethink its position. I recognise that it is difficult for anyone to be fully appraised of the problems which occur within different industries and of the effects which certain decisions will have. On this issue, I am merely trying to highlight to the Premier the long term consequences of what the action described in his second reading explanation will be, not only for the irrigators in the Riverland but also for the whole of South Australia. It will be a compounding problem and one which will grow from year to year.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I suppose it would be common sense for me to comment on the nonsensical approach of the Government towards this debate and towards the management of the House over the next two weeks. We have the Parliament coming in on two successive Fridays, starting early and finishing at 6 p.m. when we might well have worked through tomorrow night, had it not been for the fact of an A.L.P. dinner—

Mr Groom: Are you coming?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: No, I was not invited. If I were to come along I might give members 'what for'. It would not be a peaceful evening, any more than it is going to be a peaceful 30 minutes ahead of members. It is nonsensical. A number of Opposition members have fallen asleep.

Mr Mayes: Government members.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Members Opposite are Opposition as far as I am concerned—they are sitting on the wrong side of the House. The number who have fallen asleep is due testament to the fact that they disagree with the management decisions.

Mr Mayes: Fallen asleep?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The member for Newland has departed the House. His head was back and his mouth was open. He will be back again. I was not speaking at the time, the honourable member may recall. The real reason we are being subjected to this high pressure treatment is that the Premier is reluctant to keep on facing Opposition members week after week and having the weaknesses of his policies highlighted and brought to the notice of the public. During the recess a Government tends to sublimate all sorts of things and get away with them. If members new to the House think that they can sit there and laugh, I can tell them that they can be better occupied in preparing notes and speaking in the House rather than doing what the Premier has told them to do, namely, shut up and get this

Bill through as quickly as we can and with a minimum of fuss.

We want a minimum of fuss. The Government did not even speak of one of the most important Bills to be brought before the House for a while in education and, of course, when in Opposition the present Minister said that it was a very important Bill. He was on my back for about three years, asking when it was going to be introduced. Members opposite did not even speak on that because they were told to get things through quickly. Members opposite are weak-kneed. The Premier has been alleging that the former Tonkin Government had mismanaged the State. What did the Premier do on being elected to Government? He ordered an immediate review of the budget position. On 14 December the Treasurer tabled a report in the House saying that the situation was far worse than one could possibly have imagined.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. H. ALLISON: This sounds like echoes, first of Victoria, where almost identical statements were made by the Cain Government after promises of vast improvement in services but no increases in taxes. The Cain Government then increased taxes within a few weeks by 33-1/3 per cent. What are we going to expect in a very short time? It is also echoes of what Hawke is doing in Canberra, reiterating the same words, so that it sets the scene for vast increases in taxes. South Australia is not Victoria, it is not Canberra, and the setting that we had here in November last year was quite different from the setting in those other places.

Mr Groom: That is three Labor Governments that have had to clear up that messy business.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The member for Hartley will have his turn if he wants to speak later. He will have an opportunity, and I will lay down the challenge for him to stand up and put up, but not to interrupt me.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. H. ALLISON: There is a setting where obviously we are being primed for massive increases in taxes which simply cannot be justified. We all claim that there is no justification because on page 9 of this rather specious document the Premier gives what he calls a precise breakdown but what is really the minimum amount of information to get this Appropriation Bill through Parliament. He gives a list of figures, the vast majority of which point out two things: the natural disasters have put South Australia in an invidious position, and the present Government's mismanagement have contributed largely. I say 'mismanagement' because, turning to page 1, in November last year he ordered an immediate review of the State's finances. By December that report was handed down, and yet it is rife around Public Service circles that immediately upon the accession of this Government to office there was a spending spree after the previous Tonkin Government's three years in office when the Budget Review Committee kept affairs managed very precisely.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: You don't believe that, surely?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: If the Minister does not believe it then he should look at page 9, where there is a \$26 000 000 overspill. If we had an overspill of that size in the Murray River the honourable member for Chaffey would not be very happy, neither would the Minister for Water Resources. It is not in the Murray River where there is an overspill but in Government expenditure, and the taxpayer has to meet that bill. The Premier has failed completely in his attempts to blame the former Government for the present financial dilemma. Rather than support his argument the figures on page 9 of the Appropriation Bill exonerate the former Government from blame. They sheet home the responsibility where it really belongs.

We all admit that the bush fires, the floods, and the drought, too, are responsible in both the short and longer terms for a problem to which Governments of any political favour would have had to address themselves. However, that is only one aspect and only one half of the problem. What this Government should be doing is reappointing (as the Leader of the Opposition challenged this afternoon) the Budget Review Committee—not at this late stage; it should have been done in December when the issue was brought to the Premier's notice. That is why he asked for the report surely. He did not ask for the report to do nothing, instead of going along and complaining about what the Opposition had done to him.

As I have said, over the last few months the Public Service has been rife with news of over-expenditure, wondering when the heavy hand of responsibility was going to be placed on it once again. Of course, the Premier is hoist by his own petard; he has had to enter into a series of pay-offs. The member for Unley, who was smiling a little earlier, has need to smile. He was one of those who offered massive support to the former Opposition to get it into office.

Mr Mayes: You would know that.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I know that because I know what the honourable member threatened me with and I ignored him, which was the proper thing to do. One cannot be screwed down into a position like that when one is in Government. That was tried by all members opposite. The Institute of Teachers made the same offers of support and canvassed the whole of the State.

Mr Mayes: You were hoist by your own petard.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I was not. I was not hoist with my own petard. I had one of the smallest majorities to be whittled down. I was the only member on this side of the House who took on the Institute of Teachers and the Public Service Association headlong in my localised election campaign and came out with a smaller swing than any of the others. I think there is a message in that for members opposite.

Mr Mayes: You lost Government, admit it.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I did not lose my seat and everyone said that Mount Gambier had gone—even the Liberals were pessimistic.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Chair is going to lose its patience in a moment if the interjections do not stop.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I thank the Chair for its protection; and I appreciate that very much. The real point is that these pay-offs have been made and had to be made, otherwise the Premier would have lost credibility with the people who backed him so strongly. In doing that, however, he lost something. He made a large number of promises before the election saying that he would reduce taxes or keep taxes as they were, and now he cries crocodile tears and says that he has to increase taxes because of what that naughty Government did prior to November 1982. That is a lot of codswallop!

The Premier's comments about David Tonkin, the former Premier, would stand a little examination, too. He produced a document marked 'Confidential', something which former Premiers have never done in my experience, and I understand from people who have been in this House far longer than I have that they have never seen one of those confidential documents produced in the House as the Premier did. He pillories David Tonkin for going to Canberra, and telling the then Prime Minister how difficult things were going to be for dressing the shop as badly as it could be, just as every other Premier does in Australia when he is trying to get the maximum benefits from the Federal Government. The Premier produced a document in the House which says that David Tonkin did a naughty thing by trying

to get the maximum possible grant from the Federal Government by painting a bleak picture for the State. Every Premier does that, and Premier Bannon did the same thing when he went to Canberra. If he did not then he is not working in the best interests of the State. Its just common sense. We are being naive if we think that a Premier does not tell the Federal Government that he is having trouble. Joh Bejelke-Petersen has \$80 000 000 to get from somewhere to pay for his free health scheme which is now massively in debt. Is he going to tell the Prime Minister that he is having a good time with finances? Of course not. Every Premier goes to Canberra and paints a gloomy picture, but he does not expect to have it thrown up in the House subsequently.

Mr Groom: Was Tonkin telling the truth or not?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Yes. It is a doubled-edged question and I have given a single answer.

Mr Groom: That is too subtle.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: It is too subtle for the honourable member at this time of night. The public works programme, the Premier said in his pre-election campaign, should be expanded and would be expanded when the Labor Party came into government. The Labor Party was very critical of the public works programme when we were in Government for three years. What he has done? Instead of increasing it he has decimated it. He has reduced a programme which he previously said was too small anyway. He has been telling us that he would reduce the programme by tens of millions of dollars over three years. He has done that even further while increasing Public Service enrolments. How he is going to find work for those extra public servants and Public Works employees when he has decimated the public works programme; I literally do not know.

If any one member doubts that he should inquire of the Public Works Standing Committee members, to see what they have been doing over the last few months. The answer is zilch, absolutely nothing. They have done very little. There is little evidence around town of any work. If anyone opposite is looking for major works, like the \$20 000 000 D.F.E. complex, they should not use that to their credit because I negotiated that with the then Liberal Minister in Canberra and received an extra allocation of Federal funds for it.

Therefore, that is Federal money and not State money, which is going straight into the programme, and I have no doubt that credit will be taken for that in due course by people on the opposite side of the House. The Mount Gambier sewerage programme is a parochial issue about which I feel I have to talk. I am bitterly disappointed and thoroughly disgusted with the Government's attitude towards the Mount Gambier, Port MacDonnell, Finger Point council effluent disposal system and its cancellation of the scheme.

Mr Mayes: You got your high school down there.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The member for Unley must have confused me with 10 other members in the House. I did not get a new high school. I have not had a new high school in Mount Gambier since 1968, and that was the replacement of an old high school. Therefore, whatever he is thinking of, he is so far away that it does not matter. If he is thinking of the Kingston Area School, which is in the district of the honourable member for Mallee, then that is another issue. That is 100 miles away and if that is the closest that he can get to the South-East I will invite him down to smell the effluent at Port MacDonnell.

Earlier today a question was asked about the leaks from the waste disposal system. I think that I interjected by saying that it was a massive leak at Finger Point and Port MacDonnell which could be fixed first. That was the \$7 000 000 sewerage scheme and the threat at Port MacDonnell. Look at it realistically: we have the foremost pro-

vincial city in South Australia discharging its effluent. A scheme has been necessary for well over a decade. However, the former Minister of Public Works (Des Corcoran) said that it would be 10 years down the track before they get it and all the present Government has done is to simply reaffirm that former policy.

However, the local people in the district (the people of Mount Gambier) are ashamed to be passing the effluent on to people at Port MacDonnell. We have a tourist industry which the Minister of Tourism tells us is one of the most important money earners in this neglected State of ours, and it certainly has the greatest and quickest potential for earning a dollar; we have a fishing industry, the shell-fishing industry, the crayfish and abalone industry, which is in grave danger. One has to have only one tainted crayfish dumped on the U.S. market, where literally millions of dollars worth of fish is being sold, for the whole of the Australian export market in crayfish to collapse. It has happened before.

Mr Plunkett: They have not got a system like it—

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The honourable member's reputation in the South-East is not too good.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mount Gambier has the floor.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: It is the first time in several years that I have had the privilege of having the honourable gentleman interject on me.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: He seems to believe that his own reputation is a sound one in the South-East. He is referred to as 'Bully Plunkett' by the shearing community. He used to stand over them, as the shearers are being stood over today, with wide and narrow combs. His reputation in the South-East is not too good. I would like the honourable member to come down there, and next time he is talking about the shearing industry I might have a few things to say to him. However, that is another issue.

Mr PLUNKETT: I rise on a point of order. The member for Mount Gambier said that I have a name as a standover merchant in the South East, and I would like him to show some proof of that or withdraw the remark.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chair does not recognise the point of order. I point out to the honourable member that it is not regarded as seriously unparliamentary to use the remarks that the honourable member for Mount Gambier has used. However, I would point out to the honourable member for Mount Gambier that there have been far too many interjections during his speech and the Chair has some suspicion that he is baiting people to get the interjections. I ask him not to do that.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Mr Deputy Speaker, I have to take issue with you on that point. Any member in this House can say anything that he wishes to say, within reason. There are restraints, but I refuse to accept the suggestion that these people have woken up simply to interject on me.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mount Gambier is completely out of order, and the Chair would suggest that he is doing exactly what the Chair has said not to do, that is, baiting Government members to interject. I would doubt very much whether any Government member on the Government side of the House has been asleep at all during his speech. They have been generally interjecting on the honourable member, and it has to cease.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Mr Deputy Speaker, I thank you for your reassurance. However, it is a pleasant experience for me to speak in this House because, almost invariably people come back to life. The fact that they are prepared to interject indicates that a few barbs are getting home. The honourable member asked me to retract. I will retract in part. I refuse to give any source of information because I

am quite sure that, in that industry, if I were to do so, there would be some serious bodily harm done. One has to only look at the—

Mr PLUNKETT: I rise on a point of order. I think that the implication of the member for Mount Gambier concerning retaliation that may come if he named anyone is a complete insult to me. I ask him to withdraw that statement.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order and, once again, I would say to the honourable member for Mount Gambier that the Bill that is being spoken to is the Supply Bill. Admittedly, it has some areas of expansion with the usual trends of debate in this House. However, I assure the honourable member for Mount Gambier that the Chair has been very lenient with him. He is not dealing with the matter before the Chair, and I ask him to get back to the Bill.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I have far more important things to discuss. However, I would remind members that even the Mafia leaves its women alone.

Mr PLUNKETT: I rise on a point of order. I will not sit here and be insulted by this rat from Mount Gambier.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. However, I would remind the member for Mount Gambier once again that such remarks are certainly not within the debate on the Bill that is before the House. Once again, and for the final time, I would ask him to get back to the Bill.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Mr Acting Speaker, I ask for your ruling on whether the word 'runt' is Parliamentary.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: If the honourable member said 'rat', I ask you to rule on that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I take it that the honourable member for Torrens is suggesting that the member for Peake used the word 'rat', and that it was unparliamentary. The Chair does not recall the word. However, I would ask the honourable member whether he wishes to retract that word.

Mr PLUNKETT: Yes, I will withdraw. Probably it should have been associated.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The issue that I was debating much earlier this evening, before the spate of interruptions took place, was the Finger Point issue. One of the matters which I would call on the Government to take up is the release of the environmental impact statement which I believe was made available to the Government late last year and which contains direct reference to the adverse effects of the discharge of raw sewage into the sea at Finger Point.

The effect that that would have on the abalone and crayfishing industry is outlined, and I feel that that document should be made available for public perusal. The people of the South-East are already well aware of the contents and nature of that report, but I feel certain that, if the Government were to have a very careful look at it, it might encourage the Minister of Public Works to reconsider his present approach to the sewerage scheme in the South-East. I refer to the proposal to shelve that work. The Minister may wish to reconsider reinstatement of that scheme. Certainly, the tourist, health and fishing industry aspects are very important to the people of the South-East, and always have been.

In the short time I have now left to me, I must make reference to the problems associated with the salvage of burnt timber in the South-East. Recently I was invited by the Director of the Woods and Forests Department to discuss with senior officers of that department the problems about which I had been quite critical on a radio programme some two or three weeks ago. I am referring to a talk-back programme. Perhaps it was not a talk-back programme as such, but it was simply a request from radio 5SE to make immediate comment on a pressing problem. That problem was

that there was a bottle-neck at Lake Bonney. The roads were in a bad condition; heavy rains had made them worse and the local district council was coping a little more slowly than we would have liked it to do with the problem of making an access road to the lake.

Further, the equipment which had been leased or which was owned by the Woods and Forests Department was rather antiquated, and two out of the five heavy pieces of equipment used for taking timber into the lake had broken down. One can understand their breaking down because in fact they were Caterpillar 988A models, which machines are 20 years old. Production of 988B models ceased in about 1970. So, the fact that they were using the older available machinery for one of the most important salvage operations that Australia has ever seen is an indication of how easy it is for a bottle-neck to occur.

I asked the Government to make absolutely sure that the whole of Australia is ransacked for new pieces of equipment, because if they cost a few shillings extra that money will be well saved in ensuring that what is absolutely necessary, that is, speedy movement of burnt timber into the lake is achieved—otherwise the timber will be spoiled.

The age of the equipment is one of the main problems together with shortage of equipment, and the fact that pine fallers in the South-East (the local people and the interstate people) are felling at a very rapid rate. The State has been unable to keep up with the amount of trees felled by the local contractors, and so far Lake Bonney has been unable to absorb the trees felled by the interstate and Tasmanian contractors who have come to South Australia. That is a very important point, and I will ask the Government to make absolutely sure that modern equipment is made available to ease that bottle-neck and to ensure that everything goes into the lake as quickly as possible.

I took some objection to one of the comments made by the Director of the Woods and Forests Department. He suggested that I should be more constructive; he implied that I should know more about what is happening in the South-East. He also said that next time I was in the electorate I should consult with the Woods and Forests Department.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: He sounds like a pretty perceptive person to me.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: He is not really. I have spent far more time in the South-East since the Liberal Party lost Government than I had ever done in preceding years, so he was wrong on the first point. He asked me to consult with the Woods and Forests Department and I had to remind the senior officer that in fact I was instructed in writing by the former Minister of Agriculture and Minister of Forests (who no longer holds that office) to forward all matters through his Ministerial office and to not go to officers higher up. That of course was an instruction that was fairly commonplace during the time when the Labor Government was in power from 1970 onwards. One was expected to go through the Minister's office and not through other officers.

I have religiously followed that edict: I have always gone through the Minister's office, either by way of the House here or straight through to the Minister's secretary, rather than embarrass the Minister by asking questions that the Minister may not wish to respond to. I make no apology about that matter. Nor do I make an apology for having complained about the Director's invitation for interstate logging hauliers to join in the salvage operation, because I believed that the problems that were confronting the Woods and Forests Department were such that they should have been worked out a little better before these interstate people came in to further compound the problem, namely, the creation of an additional bottle-neck. There are all sorts of

issues facing the Woods and Forests Department in regard to salvaging timber at the moment.

During the brief time I have left available to me I will not be able to enlarge upon those matters, but they include the state of the roads, the heavy rains, the need for good, new and reliable equipment, and the need for an extended ramp into the lake to remove a bottle-neck. Further, there is a problem concerning the mills being unable to cope with the large volume of timber being produced by the local people, and there is the need for local people to be given some priority.

As the local member I must protect my local work force. It is pointless to get an \$11 000 000 loan from the Federal Government and then spend a large proportion of that money on interstate hauliers, on interstate workmen coming in, when the local people have been unemployed prior to the bushfire disaster, and they will be unemployed in eight or nine months time when all of the salvageable timber has been salvaged. It is the local people who will be faced with long-term unemployment problems when this immediate salvage operation has been completed.

If I do not protect the local work force, no one else will. It was obvious that the Minister himself, before he resigned, was under the impression that local contractors were being given preference. That is not strictly so. I would suggest that the Director of the Woods and Forests Department and his staff must pay attention to that aspect of the salvage operation. Our people in South Australia are the ones whose livelihoods we must protect first and foremost before we start thinking about the well-being of interstate log hauliers. There are a number of matters that I would like to address to the Premier, but obviously there is not time, and I would simply say that I make no apology for any action that I take on behalf of the people in my electorate.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Murray): In speaking to the Bill, I must express my concern and absolute disgust at the subject material expounded in the Premier's speech to the House in regard to this most important Bill. We have learned from the Premier of a deficit projection of some \$400 000 000 for 1986. We have become aware of the scrapping of major capital works projects that had been committed, projects that would have meant jobs in the building and construction industry. The scrapping of those jobs denies those communities important projects, projects that had been promised. There has been no mention at all of recognition of the need to reduce the size of the public sector or to reverse some of the other commitments made by the Premier to avoid massive tax increases. Over time we have seen the setting of the stage for tax increases in this State. I would suggest that the Premier's credibility is in a shambles.

Before the election the present Premier said repeatedly and consistently that he would not increase the rate of existing taxes or introduce new taxes during his first term of office. A report in the *Advertiser* in March of this year described it as the great deficit deceit and I quote from that article:

Deficit deception appears to be the in-vogue political excuse for new Governments attempting to come to grips with tough economic times in Australia. Last year, the Cain A.L.P. Government swept to power in Victoria, using a no-tax-rise promise as the basic platform in its bid to counter any Labor odium, particularly among small businesses, of a big-spending, big-tax Party.

Within a short time Treasurer Jolly announced tax rises were inevitable because his Party had not been aware of the parlous state of the Liberal Treasury books when it made its no-tax promise. They then bit deeper into the broken promise bullet by introducing the controversial new transactions tax which places a percentage levy on every deposit, withdrawal or other transaction made at a bank or building institution.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I cannot have these discussions continuing in the Chamber.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The article goes on:

Enter the Bannon Government, John Bannon promised not to raise taxes or bring in new taxes during his first three years in office. The promise was a key part in the State A.L.P.'s successful campaign to woo the cautious support of SA's business community—a tactic which was so well executed it became a model for strategists seeking an A.L.P. Government in the Western Australian elections. Within weeks of gaining office Mr Bannon warned Parliament tax rises were now an option because of the Treasury mess he had inherited from the former Tonkin Government.

We saw an incredible performance on the part of the Premier when, in December of last year, he released in this House a Treasury document, a document presented to him only the day before it was tabled, a document that was based on rough figuring, a document based on possibilities, on assumptions, on projections, forecasts and variables between \$30 000 000 and \$55 000 000, in other words, a 50 p c tolerance factor. That document was seen by the public for what it was, a tear-jerking attempt to set the scene for tax increases in this State. So the play has continued up until and including the presentation of the Appropriation Bill in this House yesterday. As I said earlier, it really gets down to a situation where the Premier's credibility is in a shambles, because time after time we have seen attempts to evade the responsibility for breaking a fundamental election promise. Just how stupid does the Premier think the public of South Australia is? How long does he think he can go on blaming the previous Tonkin Government?

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: For his own incompetence.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: For his own incompetence, even with his use of confidential minutes from a recent Premier's meeting. In the statement presented to the House late last year, the Premier alleged that the former Government had seriously miscalculated the timing of the impact of movements in wages and salaries. The Premier stated at that time that salary and wage awards had operated from earlier dates than were expected when the Budget was framed. As was indicated by my Leader at the time of that debate, the Budget was framed on the basis of advice available at the time, and in consultation with Treasury officers and all Government departments as well.

Of course, at that time the Premier referred to the impact of the drought in South Australia and suggested that the Budget should have provided more for drought relief. We recognise now the cost of the drought to the State of South Australia, but did the Premier believe we had a glass ball to tell us what the full impact of the drought was going to be when he looked at framing the Budget? Everybody knew at the time of the debate in this House that the full impact of the drought had not become apparent until well after the Budget was presented to Parliament. What about the Labor Party's record in Government prior to the Tonkin Government? We have heard much from the Premier about the problems he has faced as a result of the Tonkin Government. Many falsehoods have been brought forward in this House by the Premier in that regard, but what about the Labor Party's record in Government?

We note how the Premier has continually side-stepped or overlooked perhaps the very significant financial liabilities which the former Government inherited from the disastrous decade of the Labor Government. Let me remind the House of some of these liabilities, because they in turn resulted, as we now know, in huge debts, debts which the taxpayers were in the end expected to face and repay. What about Monarto? The Monarto project cost a further \$3 100 000 in the 1981-82 financial year to redeem semi-government borrowings as they fell due on top of the \$5 100 000 paid earlier by the Tonkin Government in full settlement of outstanding obligations to the Commonwealth. I know personally the effort that went into those negotiations in regard to the

settlement as far as the Monarto land was concerned between the Commonwealth and the State.

What about the Land Commission? In the Tonkin Government's Budget, provision was made for a payment of \$25 000 000 to the Commonwealth with respect to the former Land Commission. Again, I know of the personal effort on the part of the then Premier David Tonkin, who negotiated at length with the then Prime Minister Malcolm Fraser, and the effort that was put in by senior officers who worked around the clock to finalise the negotiations between State and Commonwealth in regard to payment on behalf of the former Land Commission. I refer to these two examples, particularly, because of my personal involvement as Minister responsible at the time of those negotiations.

As the public of South Australia knows, there are many other examples. There was the Frozen Food Factory, the Riverland Cannery, mismanagement of the Health Commission, and so we could go on, but as I said earlier, the debts left behind by the Labor Administration were massive and it was the Tonkin Government that reduced the State's liability for these projects, the liabilities that the taxpayers of South Australia had been left to bear. On top of all that was the need to restore efficiency and eliminate waste in the public sector to again reduce the burden on the taxpayer.

In contrast to the present situation with the Bannon Government, the former Government exercised very strict control over State finances. Mention has been made by other speakers in the House this evening in this debate in regard to the Budget Review Committee, which was set up under the Tonkin Government, made up of senior Ministers of that Government.

The Budget Review Committee expected all departments, (I suggest quite rightly) to justify every line of expenditure in the preparation of the Budget papers. Senior departmental officers regularly appeared before the committee to review the progress of Budget estimates and they responded magnificently. I, as a Minister in that Government, was involved with the senior officers at the time that they appeared before the Budget Review Committee. Many of them worked very well indeed with that committee. Where spending was running above estimate, explanations and remedial actions were also sought. The Budget Review Committee was not the most popular committee: we all know that. However, it served the people of this State very well indeed as it went about its responsibility of monitoring and reviewing expenditure. What about the current situation?

It is interesting that, at the time when the Premier, John Bannon, was attempting to lull the public into a sense of belief that the Government had suddenly found itself facing the need to increase taxes to pay for the cost of recent bushfires and floods (and I am certainly aware of the massive cost to this State of such disasters as they relate to part of my own area in the case of the fire), he was circulating a document to senior public servants which made it clear that management control under the new Bannon Government was deteriorating alarmingly. That document said in part (and this was only last month):

It is disturbing that some agencies appear to have adopted interpretations of the Government's policies and acted on them without specific Cabinet authorisation. This has already led to unauthorised cost over-runs and further difficulties are likely unless a consistent approach is followed in future.

Again, so much for the credibility of the Premier who must accept the full responsibility for that situation. As I have said before, the Premier has been hoping that the people of this State would accept that the Government suddenly found itself facing the need to increase taxes to pay for the cost of recent State disasters, when the Premier's memo to senior public servants shows that, a fortnight before the bushfire

disaster, the Premier was aware that the Budget deficit was estimated up to \$104 000 000. We have now learnt that the Budget deficit has been increasing every day since December last year. The Premier has given no adequate explanation, even in the Appropriation Bill introduced into the House yesterday, for this Budget blow-out. As has been constantly stated by my Leader, John Olsen, it is also clear that, after six months in office, the Bannon Government's Budget strategy is in total disarray.

It is not good enough for the Premier, like a bleating lamb, to continue to blame the Tonkin Government for problems that he, as Premier and Treasurer with the responsibility of administering the State, has got us into. The Premier's second reading explanation on the Appropriation Bill indicates quite clearly that all South Australians are going to pay the price for the manner in which the Labor Party bought Government at the last election.

When we were in Government, the then Premier, David Tonkin, warned constantly that State finances were very tight and that extravagant election promises of the type made by the now Premier and then Leader of the Opposition, John Bannon, and by the Labor Party, could not be afforded without significant increases in State taxation. Of course, when challenged during the election campaign, on the costs of A.L.P. policies, the present Premier said he had accurate financial information on which to base those promises. Once again, so much for the credibility of the Premier of this State.

I referred earlier to a financial statement handed down in this House in December last year by the Premier, Mr Bannon. On the day that statement was delivered by the Premier, the *News* editorial stated, in part:

Mr Bannon is in danger of becoming known as yet another politician to whom the promise is a negotiable thing.

Some, such as pledges to teachers, will be kept; others such as assurances of no tax increases, are to be hedged, fudged or perhaps even abandoned.

The Premier dismayed taxpayers with his statement that, because of the Budget review, tax increases must henceforth be an option for consideration.

The editorial continues:

It must frankly be said that it is beginning to appear as if the Premier is either out of step with the national mood or out of his depth.

Whilst that was a December editorial, I am sure it sums up the current situation, except perhaps that things are now far worse than they were last December as outlined in the Appropriation Bill for this year.

Add to these serious matters the growth of compulsory unionism in this State in both the private and public sector; the Government's obvious preference for the public sector to become involved in areas traditionally undertaken by the private sector; the growth in the size of the Public Service under Labor Administration; the A.L.P.'s lukewarm support of the wages pause; the Labor Government's closure of the Honeymoon and Beverley mines projects with the resulting loss of many jobs and business confidence in this State; the collapse of the Ramsay Trust showing Labor's economic policies to be unsound; the inevitable sharp increases in taxes and charges to pay for Labor's election promises; and the obvious lack of credibility on the part of the Premier of this State, and we see the results of the first six months under the Bannon Labor Government in South Australia.

In talking about election promises, I referred earlier to an article in the *Advertiser* in March of this year. I will refer again to that article which stated:

As one of his first acts, he kept on 300 teachers and about 700 public servants who were to have been pruned by the Tonkin Government in 1982-83.

Would it be cynical to say he honoured a promise to two powerful lobby groups in the Public Service Association and the South Australian Institute of Teachers—groups which provided

major backing to his election success—possibly at the expense of honoring a broader, and tougher to deliver, promise to the whole community?

As an alternative, my Leader, the member for Rocky River, has tonight put before the House a Budget strategy calling on the Government to change the direction of its financial policies to avoid tax increases. Let me repeat for the benefit of the House the basis of the Opposition's strategy. First, the immediate appointment of a Budget Review Committee to keep firm control on all Government spending; secondly, reducing the size of the public sector; thirdly, scrapping Government proposals which will significantly increase spending; fourthly, no halt to capital works programmes already approved; and, fifthly, any revenue that the Government decides to raise should be on a one-off basis to recover the cost of drought, bushfire and floods.

I do not intend to go over the detail that has been provided by my Leader tonight. The Leader has the strongest support of all members on this side of the House because that support goes behind an approach which is reasonable and manageable. It is consistent with our policies put to the people of South Australia at the election in November last year. As I said earlier, it is not good enough for the Premier and his Government to make excuses for broken promises. The Government has no alternative but to change direction. I hope that the Government will take note of the warning that has been handed down to it by the Leader of the Opposition tonight and that it will change the direction which is very much needed for the betterment of the State of South Australia.

Mr ASHENDEN (Todd): It is not with a great deal of pleasure that I rise tonight, as I find absolutely nothing worthy of any commendation in the speech which the Premier gave to the House yesterday when introducing the new financial measures that his Government intends to undertake. I will, however, say something about what constituents throughout Australia are finding is happening time and time again immediately after the election of an A.L.P. Government.

First, some years ago we had Mr Wran, who was the pacesetter. On achieving Government and shortly after his election, he attempted to blame the previous Government for the financial difficulty which he so rapidly put himself into. Of course, we do not have to go back into the very distant past to find that about six years after he had been elected Premier of New South Wales his Government did not even have funds in Treasury to pay for petrol for the Government car fleet. For some weeks we find a ridiculous situation where a Government could not even afford to run the cars that were being used by its personnel. The situation was so disastrous that he, as the then Premier, sacked the public servants.

We had our Premier here in South Australia stating today that it was the alleged intention of the Opposition to sack public servants. This, of course, is completely false and I am sure that the public of South Australia will treat that with the disdain that it deserves. We then find that after Mr Wran came Mr Cain, who did exactly the same thing. As soon as he gained office, Mr Cain blamed the previous Liberal Government for the situation that the State was in. Of course, by that time we got Mr Bannon, who now has a couple of pretty good teachers, running for office in South Australia. I could imagine Mr Wran and Mr Cain saying to him, 'Look, promise them the world; go out there and tell them that you will not have to increase any taxes. Just say whatever you like because all you need to do when you are elected is turn around and blame the previous Government. It worked for us and I am sure it will work for you.' By this time, or very shortly after, we had a Labor Federal

Government and a Prime Minister doing exactly the same thing. One thing about Labor leaders is that they follow each other like a mob of sheep. There is not very much initiative in the whole lot—except for Mr Wran and Mr Cain, who were the originals.

However, we find that we have to live in a situation where we have a Premier who is attempting simply to blame the previous Government and saying that everything is outside his control. Let us look at his speech yesterday, and see whom he is blaming for the situation that he is in now. First, the Premier blamed the previous Government. At various times he has blamed the national economy and the international economy. He goes on and blames everyone except himself or his Government. At one stage the Premier attempted to blame the natural disasters in South Australia for his problems. Therefore, as well as the national and international economies and the previous Government, the Premier also found it very convenient to blame the bushfires, floods and the drought.

However, when one looks at page 9 of Mr Bannon's speech which he made yesterday, one finds that the biggest single item in the Budget is the overrun with which he is now faced. He said (it is, in his own words), 'Spillovers in departmental expenditures and advances'. In other words, the single biggest figure that is leading to the budgetary problem is of his own Government's making. I wonder whom he will blame for that, because the point is that the Premier will obviously try to find a scapegoat. He will not come to grips with the fact of his own incompetence and that of his Ministers that has led largely to the situation that the Government is now facing.

Let us look at the comments that the Premier has made since October last year. When he was running the campaign that he hoped would lead his Party into Government, the Premier stated quite categorically that he had been appraised of the true state of the budgetary position in South Australia. He stated that he knew exactly what the deficit was going to be, that he knew the full details of South Australia's financial position, and that with that full knowledge he was able to make the promises that he made in relation to his election if he were to become Premier of South Australia. Mr Bannon said that more than once and it was repeated in many sections of the media: that he was fully aware of the financial situation in South Australia.

Based on that information, Mr Bannon was quite confident that he was able to make promises to the people of South Australia, that he would be able to meet and that, based on this information of which he was absolutely certain, he could assure residents of South Australia that they would not have to pay any increased taxation. He made that promise many times. However, Mr Bannon found that on the night of the election, when it first became obvious that he was going to win (even with the slenderest of margins), things suddenly changed. One of the first statements he made was, 'Well, now that we have achieved office, I think that we had better warn the people of South Australia that things might not be quite as good as perhaps they were going to be and that perhaps because of various difficulties, we will not be able to meet our promises.'

From that night onwards, time after time, the Premier has attempted to soften the blow that he knew well before the election he would have to bring as far as South Australians were concerned. He would have known full well before the election that the situation was such that he, or whoever was Premier after the election, would have to increase taxation. Since then, the Premier has tried to fight the promises which he gave prior to his election.

We have found statements emerging which have ranged from the complete promises of no increases in taxation, to taxation might have to be increased, after which the Premier

said that we will have to increase in taxation but that it will not occur while a wage pause is on. The most recent statement was that the situation now is so bad that the Government will shortly have to announce an increase in taxation, even with the wage pause. I am quite certain that the Premier is hoping against hope that the wage pause will not be continued to the end of the year because he has made a categorical statement in this House that he would not increase taxation while the wage pause was on. However, he now realises that the wage pause may go on too long and it will be yet another promise that he will have to break. I imagine that by now the Premier would not even bat an eyelid if he broke any more promises because his credibility at the moment in South Australia could not be any lower.

It is well known by electors that the Premier has broken his promises, and that it is expected that he will break more of them. This is the man who is leading our State. He certainly will not be leading our State for very much longer. The incompetence that Mr Bannon has shown since becoming Premier and the incompetence of his Cabinet is becoming more and more widely known every day.

Another point I make about this Premier relates to how unconscionable he really is. I wonder how many times he criticised the previous Government for transferring funds from the capital area to the recurrent area? This man has been in office for almost six months and already he has transferred more funds in that manner (a matter about which he was so critical when he was in Opposition) than the previous Government did in three years.

The point I take is that it is not a criticism of what he has done: it is just the sheer hypocrisy of the man who stood here so often and criticised the former Government for transferring such funds and, as I said, he has transferred even more within six months. For goodness sake: one could at least expect the man to be consistent. However, it is just showing that the only thing in which he has been consistent is his hypocrisy and the willing way in which he goes about breaking promises at the expense of the people of South Australia. I have already mentioned the 'no tax promise', and the criticism that he levelled in so many areas against the previous Government for actions which he himself is now taking and which, from his own mouth and on his own admission, he will do even more.

I am also concerned to find in the speech that he made yesterday that a number of major projects in South Australia will get the axe. Every one of those three projects is in a Liberal electorate. I do not think that anyone can tell me that that is a coincidence. We have as Premier a man who is determined to cause even more division in the community than has existed in the past. Obviously, he and his Cabinet have one aim in mind, and that is: 'Let us punish as much as we can those persons who dared not to vote for the Labor Party in the 1982 election. We will teach them a lesson they will never forget. Let us make sure that the people we hurt are the people who voted against us.' I can just see the way in which Cabinet made that decision to get rid of the plan to rehabilitate the Cobdogla irrigation area. I can just imagine it saying, 'That used to be an area that had a member who represented the A.L.P. However, they now have a member who, through sheer pain and hard work and sheer ability and good representation of his people, has cemented that area to become a safe Liberal seat. Let us take away the irrigation area in Cobdogla.'

Members interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: I would have thought that the honorable member, having been in Parliament previously, would have known that Cobdogla was in the area of Chaffey and that that is the district to which I was referring. Similarly, I know how much the then Labor Party desperately wanted to win the seat of Mount Gambier at the last State election.

Therefore, how can we punish that group? Let us take away the vital sewage treatment plant at Finger Point.

The point is that this sort of treatment will not be missed by the public of South Australia. Those two major developments, which are the only major areas of cost reduction, have been taken away, I would say, purely and simply because of political expediency. Coming much closer to home, we also find that yet another promise given by the Premier and his Government from his Party when in Opposition in relation to the O'Bahn system is now broken. The then Leader of the Opposition made a categorical statement in the north-eastern suburbs. He also made statements to the press and in the advertising material which his candidates circulated in the electorates of Todd and Newland. He stated that there would be a review of the rapid public transport system, to service the north-eastern suburbs. This is the man who then assured the residents of Todd and Newland that, if elected, despite the review and whatever decision was made as far as a public transport system was concerned, whether it was to continue with the O'Bahn guided busway, whether it was to be a conventional busway, or whether they were to revert to the light rail system—the work would be fully completed by 1986, to match the work that was to be carried out by the then Liberal Government. That was a categorical statement, with no ifs, ands or buts. The crocodile tears of the member for Newland now that his Government has determined that the O'Bahn system will proceed only as far as Darley Road by 1986 do not wash with anybody in the north-eastern suburbs.

The member for Newland is only too well aware of the invidious position in which his Government has placed him with the electors of the north-eastern suburbs because, if his phone has run half as hot as my phone has run since this announcement, he will be extremely well aware of the anger of the people of the north-eastern suburbs at the fact that this Government has welched at yet another promise. This time it is one which is very close to home.

The Minister of Transport himself (and I will give him full marks for this) has had the decency to come out and state quite categorically that the O'Bahn system is one that undoubtedly will work and work well. He has written to the Tea Tree Gully council to assure it that, following the investigation that he and his department have undertaken, it was completely viable, and that there is no doubt whatsoever. If the Deputy Premier would like it, I can send him a copy of the letter that was written to the Tea Tree Gully council in which the statements I am now making were made by the Minister. All he has done is to tell the truth.

Of course, before the election the members of the Labor Party would not wear the O'Bahn system in a fit. They said that it was hopeless and that it would never work. However, now that they have come into office they realise that what we were saying as a Government is perfectly correct. It is a modern, viable, comfortable, ideal public transport system and the people in the north-eastern suburbs think: 'Okay, that is tremendous. The new Government agrees with the old Government, and we will get our guided busway system.'

However, yesterday the Premier came forward and announced that the work will stop at the Darley Road intersection and that will be completed only in 1986, which was the time that both the previous Government and the present Government, when in Opposition, promised that this work would be completed right through to Tea Tree Plaza. Again, I would suggest that if the Minister doubts that his Premier made these statements, he should look at the material distributed throughout the electorates of Todd and Newland prior to the election when a categorical assurance was given that this work would be undertaken right through to the Plaza by 1986. Now we find that it will be completed only half way. It will not even reach the electorates

of Newland and Todd, the areas which this system is supposed to service. It does not even get to those two electorates. Therefore, we will have a guided busway system which goes from the outer areas of Adelaide through to Darley Road, and it will not go any further.

The Government has said that it will subsequently announce what will happen after 1986. However, once again I believe that the tactics that this Government is using in relation to the O'Bahn system are identical with the tactics that it was using in relation to tax. They are softening the blow; just as they changed from a promise of no tax to, 'there might have to be tax,' to, 'there will have to be tax,' now we find that they will review the section from Darley Road. 'We will tell you later on what will happen after 1986.' I have no doubt that this Government, if it is still in office (which I certainly doubt), will be announcing that the busway will be proceeding no further than Darley Road. This will mean that the residents of the north-eastern suburbs will just not get the vital rapid public transport system that they so desperately need.

The Government made categorical assurances before its election not only on the O'Bahn system but also on improved public transport in other areas, particularly to the south. I wonder how those people feel about the announcement that the Premier made yesterday. However, the point is that we find time and time again that the Premier's word is worth absolutely nothing. I am sure that the question that the member for Newland asked in the House earlier today indicates that he is aware of the difficulty in which his Government has placed him. He is a member of the Party which is now in Government and a member of the Party which has made a deliberate decision to slow down the work on the O'Bahn system and a deliberate decision to cease it at Darley Road. He cannot even get an assurance or a time-table from his Minister as to when the work will proceed through to Tea Tree Plaza.

The only assumption that can be made from that is that at this stage there are no plans to proceed with the work beyond Darley Road. If the Minister, the Premier or the Government wants to deny that that is the truth then let them get up and say when the work will proceed from Darley Road to Tea Tree Plaza. At least that will be something, although in view of the credibility of the Government I should imagine that the residents of Todd and Newland would not listen very closely to any such statements. I feel quite certain that this will be a major issue in the north-eastern suburbs at the next State election. I am certain that we will find that the member for Newland will be in very great trouble indeed.

People living in the north-eastern suburbs are only too well aware that it was a Labor Government that promised a light rail system and did nothing about it. It was a Liberal Government that promised a guided busway and set about very rapidly getting that busway constructed. Now it is a Labor Government that has slowed down the work on that project. What sort of reputation does the Government think it has in relation to transport to the north-eastern suburbs? It would not be worth a crummet. It further adds to the lack of credibility that the Premier and his Government have throughout South Australia. I would also point out that the member for Newland can perform and carry on all he likes, because there is no doubt at all that he is tied into a Government that has made a deliberate decision to disadvantage the residents of his electorate.

I would also like to refer to other aspects of the performance of the Premier. I have never known a Premier so capable of fudging an issue. Question after question has been directed to him from the Opposition benches, and I have yet to hear from the Premier a direct answer to any of them. I think that what happened this afternoon is a

perfect example of the incompetence and arrogance of the Premier. The member for Torrens asked a question about Commonwealth funds that were to be made available to assist the Government in its payments for the effects of the fires and floods that recently hit South Australia. The member for Torrens was given an answer of sorts, but the Premier did not provide the factual information that he was seeking.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: He knew how much the total amount would be, but he did not know how much it would be for fire and flood individually.

Mr ASHENDEN: That just goes to show that he does not have his finger on the pulse of things. Shortly after that I asked the Premier a question. I was seeking information about public assets that were destroyed in the fires. It had nothing to do with the question that the member for Torrens had asked. However, the Premier said that as the member for Torrens had already asked the question he was not going to give a further answer; he then sat down. So, he did not even listen to the question I asked. If he did so, he may have thought, 'Heavens above, again, as in my answer to the member for Torrens, I have no idea of the true situation; I cannot admit once again what the answer is, so I will make out that I misunderstood the question.'

Perhaps that is why he did not answer the question. It was either that or sheer arrogance, although I would think that it was most likely because of what I said earlier, namely, sheer incompetence. The Premier does not have a clue about the situation in regard to the funds that South Australia has to spend, the area in which those funds are to be spent and the support that he is getting from the Federal Government in relation to the natural disasters that hit South Australia. The disasters have been a convenient whipping post for him to use in complaining about the Budget overrun that he and his Ministers have so incompetently allowed to occur. Again, I make the point that the single biggest overrun, on the Premier's own admission, is the Budget overrun of \$26 000 000, described in his own words as 'being spillovers in departmental expenditures and advances.' It is the job of the man at the top to control departmental spending. It is the job of Ministers to ensure that each department is kept in control. It is the Premier's overall job to make sure that Government Ministers are controlling those areas. We find that in a short six months the Budget has blown out by \$26,000,000 purely and simply because of the incompetence of the Premier and his Ministers.

The Premier's credibility is just so open to challenge in so many directions that it would take far longer than the 30 minutes allotted to each speaker to go through them. I have already touched on a number of areas. We saw how the Premier carried on today in regard to the excellent suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition that there is one way of saving a considerable amount of taxpayers money, by allowing natural attrition to take place within the Public Service to ensure that its level drops in the way that it should. The Premier was huffing and puffing about the fact that this meant sacking members of the Public Service. I have pointed out already that that is nonsense. The Premier then turned around and said that we must take work from the private sector and give it to the public sector because of public servants sitting there not fully employed. The member for Davenport put the lie to that statement because he pointed out that the work taken away from Hassell and Partners to be done by the Public Buildings Department has meant that the Government has had to employ temporary people in the Public Buildings Department to do that work. It is not true to say that people in the Public Buildings Department were under employed, because in fact the Premier had to make provision to bring in additional staff to cover the work taken away from Hassell and Partners.

Once again, the credibility of the Premier is shot to pieces, although he does not have much credibility left.

Let me refer again to the total disorganisation that the Government finds itself in. Honourable members should make no mistake about that. Senior public servants are only too well aware of the complete disorganisation of the present Government. I think that we have seen here in the Parliament just how disorganised the Government is. We have sat for just a few weeks since the election last year and now, towards the end of this session, we find that the Government is making us sit into all hours of the night. The Government now proposes that we sit for extra hours on Thursday and that we sit for extra hours on Friday. That cannot be called organisation. We have electorate offices where we assist people in our electorates. We make appointments so that they can come and see us, so that we can make representations on their behalf. We have had to cancel appointments because the Government cannot organise the business of the House. This House has not been sitting for months, but suddenly we are to sit for extra days: we have to sit through the night and to come in on days on which Parliament has not usually sat.

This is all purely and simply because the Government cannot organise its business. It has been brought home to people during the short time that the Government has been in power that it is a Government that cannot manage finances or meet its promises, although, as I said earlier, it probably did not intend to keep its promises anyway. Mr Cain used exactly the same technique, and now we find that Mr Hawke and the Premier here in South Australia are using it. It has been used time and time again, and the public of South Australia is well aware of that. If one looks at the *Bulletin* poll, one finds that the lack of credibility of the Premier is confirmed by the number of people who have indicated that they do not expect the Premier to meet his promises. It is a large number indeed. What a shocking indictment to have such a reputation as a Premier who is not expected to meet his promises. The speech that the Premier gave yesterday shows only too clearly that he is not able to manage the finances of this State. On his own admission the situation will get worse. Let us face it, we find that there is sheer incompetence on the part of the Premier and his Ministers. I look forward to the Liberal Party's being returned to the Treasury benches at the next election.

Mr MATHWIN (Glennelg): I support this Bill, because that is the normal procedure with a Bill of this nature. I would like to deal with the explanation which was given by the Premier and which he has made from time to time in relation to the mess that he and his Government have made of the financial situation of this State in such a short period of time. I know that he does have some good examples to follow when he looks at some of the other States, where they have done something similar, except that the deficit in New South Wales is much larger than ours, and I hope we do not ever get into the situation in which Mr Wran finds himself in New South Wales. They are also heading towards a similar situation in Victoria.

But for all the problems that are facing this State, the Premier's excuse seems to be, 'Don't blame me', which seems to be one of his favourite songs that he learned as a small young fellow and he now continues it. At every opportunity he says, 'Don't blame me, blame anybody else; it doesn't matter who, but do not blame me.' As long as it is not him he is quite happy. Goodness knows what happens to his poor wife when she goes to the supermarket and happens to overspend her housekeeping money. I suppose he would scold her to death or blame the Liberal Government for that.

The Hon G.F. Keneally interjecting:

Mr MATHWIN: It is all very well for the Chief Secretary, who was very nearly the Minister of Agriculture after the last spill in Caucus, but we all know the situation in relation to the Chief Secretary. He wanted to be a farmer, because he is out in the backblocks of Port Augusta, so he was a natural choice. As a matter of fact, the Chief Secretary would be the natural choice for Minister of Agriculture in the Government, because at least I know he mows his own lawns.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has had some difficulty already in this debate. There is nothing in the Bill which deals with the Chief Secretary being a farmer or anything else. I would ask the honourable member for Glenelg to come back to the Bill.

Mr MATHWIN: I am glad you pulled me back into line, Sir, because of course I was being sidetracked by members on the other side of the House. On page 4 in his second reading explanation the Treasurer said:

I believe that South Australia has never before had to cope with three major disasters; drought, fire and flood.

Of course he forgot about the Labor Government, which makes it four disasters in a short time. He went on to say that the overall estimated cost of new salary and wage awards has increased further, despite the wage pause. We all know the situation in relation to the wage pause. It was not supported by the Premier and in fact he took some months to make up his mind about it. Using the new word 'consensus', which is the in word at the present time, he said there was a consensus situation. He wanted to find out what everybody thought about it. I do not know how he can blame anybody but himself for that situation, because one does not have to have a very long memory to realise what he did in relation to the increase in salaries, which was between 6 per cent and 10 per cent, to certain people in the community. Of course, included in that percentage is the great pay-off to the Public Service for services rendered.

Mr Baker: South Australia's poor—

Mr MATHWIN: That is the great thing about the Labor Party; they say they support the poor and they look after the little person. They are the ones who need everything, but if they give any increases at all, they give them to areas to which the honourable member for Hartley probably hopes to rise one day, that is, on to the bench. Of course, he will get that with all the increases that have been given.

The Premier has also made much of the situation and was blaming the two election promises, that is to say, first, the holding of a number of teachers in primary and secondary schools to allow a reduction in class sizes. That is a very interesting situation, because I have had some Questions on Notice to the Minister of Education in relation to class sizes and teachers, and the like, which have been on notice since March. On the first day we came here after the Labor Party took office, those questions were put on the Notice Paper, but as yet we have had no answer, even though it was a put-up paper at an election meeting at Christies Beach. I would suggest, with due respect, that the whole thing was worked out by the Labor Party with the full knowledge of the figures, and so on, with which I will deal later if time permits. Perhaps the Minister will be able to give me some off-the-cuff answers in relation to the questions which he finds most difficult to answer after many months of waiting. My people are getting upset. They are wondering when the Minister, as the previous Labor Premier Mr Dunstan used to say, will grasp the nettle and give us the answers to the put-up questions that were asked at a recent public meeting at Christies Beach.

Concessions for pensioners, in relation to electricity, are estimated to cost between \$3 000 000 and \$4 000 000. When the Labor Party was working out its campaign for the election, surely it would have done some costing in relation

to this matter. It ought to have known what the cost of these promises was going to be.

Mr Baker: Perhaps they need some remedial education in mathematics.

Mr MATHWIN: It is quite possible. I give credit to the present Minister of Education. He is rather good with his footwork and he is quite good with figures, too. I would imagine he would have known full well the cost of the promises that were made at election time. The fact that that is one of the problems which has faced the Government seems to wear a little thin when it must have had the costing done before it was put into its policy, unless it was a matter of a pre-election situation whereby you promise them everything and give them nothing. That works from time to time. The Premier went on to say:

Departmental expenses and advances are running ahead of budget estimates in many areas and the overall is likely to exceed the Budget by \$26 000 000 for reasons other than higher levels of cost.

That points out to all Ministers that if their departments are overspending it is the Minister's responsibility. Ministers are there to run departments and not the departmental head, who is supposed to do what the Minister directs him to do. If the Minister is strong enough he must then put the departmental head on the right track and tell him what he expects from him. The Minister should run the department and not play golf while the departmental head runs the department. If the department is overspending, and going haywire and doing these sorts of things, the Minister should pull the department into line. That is what the job is all about. That is why they are fat cats because they are being paid to do the job of running their department and seeing that departmental heads do the job.

Mr Groom: What is a fat cat?

Mr MATHWIN: It is a reflection on all the Ministers who are over-running spending in their departments. They are not doing the job properly and they had better lift their game, otherwise they will be in trouble even with their own Party. The Premier went on to refer to the spillovers in departmental expenditures and advances. He mentioned the figure of \$26 000 000. The other area to which the Premier drew attention is in regard to capital works. He stated:

The review of the programme has regard to the effectiveness and the economic justification of major projects planned for development during the period up to and including 1985-86. Cabinet has accepted in principle the recommendations following from the review which included—

This is the situation where the Government decided that, with some of the major programmes, which had already been investigated by the Public Works Committee and for which recommendations had been made to Cabinet and accepted by the previous Government, it had better do something about it and reduce capital works. The Public Works Committee had very little put before it by the Government until three weeks or a month ago. Until that time the only matters that we had ever had before us was the matter of 24 houses at Cadell Training Centre. Twenty-four houses is a lot but it was to go over a period of years. The actual allocation and work on that schedule was for four houses at Cadell. So, we see a dramatic cut down by the Labor Government since coming to office. Since then we have had a few more to look at. Recommendations have gone in. What will happen to them is entirely up to the Government and Cabinet to decide.

Another of the areas which the Government has decided to prune is the rehabilitation of the Cobdogla irrigation area, which is a large scheme and is only part of a very big scheme. There was also the deferral of a sewage treatment plant at Finger Point in the South-East. As mentioned by another of my colleagues last night, the effects of this on the export industry of crayfish is quite considerable. I under-

stand that crayfish crawl for five or six miles, which comes as a surprise to me. If we have this type of fish being able to go so far away, it becomes a problem. Crayfishing is part of our exports from South Australia and is taken up by good American dollars. It could affect our export of that product.

Mr Whitten: What about crayfishing in Victoria, Tasmania or New South Wales?

Mr MATHWIN: That is not our problem.

Mr Whitten: They also discharge raw sewage.

Mr MATHWIN: That is all right. No doubt there was a time in Adelaide when we discharged it into the Port River and possibly along the coast. I remember that when I was younger, many years ago, in parts of England we had the same situation. It is not pleasant to swim around, removing raw sewage as one is doing the breast stroke. Surely no-one would condone that.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MATHWIN: The other matter which the Premier outlined was the rescheduling of the north-east busway. Some people are directly concerned with that situation, namely, the members for Todd and Newland. I believe that the member for Newland would like to say a lot about this matter although I do not suppose he would be allowed to speak in the debate.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: I am going to say something.

Mr MATHWIN: The previous Minister of Transport will no doubt have quite a bit to say about that. As far as I am concerned, if the Labor Party had proceeded with its programme and with what it wished to do on this project, it would have gone to trams on a fixed rail which are not flexible at all. Nonetheless, it would have had a tram route going out there. If one now calculates the escalated cost, it would be in the region of \$300 000 000. I am quite happy to let the brilliant member for Henley Beach correct me, assuming he is allowed to speak. If any Government members are allowed to speak they can correct my figures. I believe that they have been forbidden to speak on the Bill. If they speak on the Bill they will no doubt be punished for so doing. We all know the situation.

The Hon. J.D. Wright interjecting:

Mr MATHWIN: I will talk about penalty rates later. In regard to the transport corridor, we all remember the Labor Party's promise in relation to transport to the south.

Mr Groom: Tell us about Brighton.

Mr MATHWIN: I am getting to that. I am very interested that the member for Brighton (who is from the south) and the member for Mawson, as well as other members from that area, remember the Labor Party's promises in the area of transport. What they said they would do in the southern area involves upgrading the transport system there. Members who have been in this House for more than 12 years would remember the promises made by the Labor Party. We all remember the promises made regarding the electrification of the railway line down to Christies Beach. The Labor Government was going to install trains capable of travelling at 70 miles an hour to service Christies Beach, so a former Minister (Mr Geoff Virgo) said. He also promised that double-decker trains would be installed on that line.

Those trains would surely have had to be made of rubber, otherwise they would not have fitted under the bridges on the Christies Beach line. It must be very disappointing for the member for Brighton and the member for Mawson to see that none of that has happened. We are in the same situation now with the exception that some super-trains were provided by the former Liberal Government, but we had no increase at all in the service and no upgrading of

that southern line as promised by the former Labor Government. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

RAMSAY TRUST

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

That—

- i. the Ramsay Trust could be a viable proposition and of great value to this State in relation to the provision of low-cost housing;
- ii. in view of the fact that no interest is payable to investors, the element of indexation received by investors of the trust should be treated as capital and exempted from income tax in order to protect the capital of the investors against inflation; and
- iii. the Premier be asked to convey the substance of this motion to the Ramsay Trust for a report prior to requesting the Prime Minister to take the necessary action to ensure that tax exemption as set out in ii. above be introduced for limited liability companies which are either public benevolent institutions under section 78 of the Income Tax Act, or are exempt from company income tax under section 23 of the Income Tax Act.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (WHEAT AND BARLEY RESEARCH) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Education): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The Bill provides for the collection of wheat and barley research funds additional to those raised and distributed by the Commonwealth and has been sought for some time by the United Farmers and Stockowners of S.A. Incorporated. The measure has widespread support within the grain section of that organisation, which strongly argues that it is not possible to sustain appropriate levels of research into South Australia's principal grain crops under the existing funding arrangements. Evidence supporting that argument may be found in the barley research trust fund which is already displaying signs of financial difficulty and undoubtedly will require an early injection of extra moneys.

It provides for payments to be made by the Australian Wheat Board and the Australian Barley Board into the respective cereal research trust funds. These payments will be deducted from growers' returns and each grower will be presumed to have agreed to the arrangement unless he or she gives written notice to the contrary. These proposals will have no direct effect on the State's revenue but the Department of Agriculture, along with Roseworthy Agricultural College and Waite Agricultural Research Institute, will be able to apply for funds from the relevant research committee to undertake research work.

Such committees already have been established in each State under the Wheat Research Act 1957 and the Barley Research Act 1980 of the Commonwealth and it is considered both feasible and appropriate that the committees established for this State should administer the additional funds raised under this Bill. However, it is additionally proposed, in the interests of wheat and barley growers, that there be two

three-member committees, one representative of wheat growers and the other representative of barley growers, whose function it will be to recommend to the Minister the appropriate deduction from crop proceeds each season.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure is to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation but that the operation of specific provisions may be suspended by the proclamation. Clause 3 sets out the arrangement of the measure. Clause 4 provides the new citation for the Wheat Marketing Act as it would be affected by the enactment of this measure.

Clause 5 inserts in the Wheat Marketing Act a new section 28a. This proposed new section provides at subclause (1) that where the Australian Wheat Board (which was established under the Wheat Marketing Act 1979 of the Commonwealth) acquires wheat of a season from any grower, a payment of the prescribed amount shall, with the consent of the grower, be made for wheat research purposes out of the moneys payable to the grower by the board for that wheat. The prescribed amount is defined by subclause (11) to be the amount obtained by multiplying the number of tonnes of wheat of the season acquired by the board from the particular grower in question by the prescribed rate for the season. 'Prescribed rate' is defined by subclause (11) to mean the rate fixed by the Minister by notice published in the *Gazette* pursuant to subclause (10). The rate is, by virtue of subclause (10), to be fixed by the Minister upon the recommendation of a three-member committee appointed by the Minister under subclause (8) to represent the interests of persons engaged in the wheat industry. Subclause (2) provides that the payment for wheat research purposes is to be made by the board to the Minister who is, subject to subclause (3), to pay it to the Commonwealth Government for payment into the Wheat Research Trust Account established under the Wheat Research Act 1957 of the Commonwealth.

Subclause (3) provides that the board is to be entitled to presume that each grower from whom it acquires wheat of a season has consented to the making of the payment, but that, where any such grower indicates to the Minister, by notice in writing given during the month specified in the definition of 'prescribed period' in subclause (11) in relation to the particular season, that he does not consent to the payment, then the Minister is to pay the prescribed amount to the grower out of the moneys that he (the Minister) has received from the board under this provision. Subclause (4) provides that the Minister may bank or otherwise invest the moneys pending their payment to the Commonwealth or to those growers who do not wish to contribute to wheat research and have exercised the right under subclause (3) to opt out.

Subclause (5) provides that moneys earned through the investment of moneys referred to in subclause (4) shall be paid to the Commonwealth for payment into the Wheat Research Trust Account. Subclause (6) provides that payments made by the Minister to the Commonwealth under this provision are to be made upon the condition that the moneys are expended in South Australia. This provision links up with sections 6 and 7 of the Commonwealth Wheat Research Act, which provide for the establishment of separate wheat research accounts for each State and require amounts paid upon such a condition to be paid into the account for the particular State and for the account to be applied only in research expenditure in that State. Subclause (7) provides for the keeping of accounts by the Minister and for such accounts to be audited by the Auditor-General. Finally, subclause (12) provides that the new section is to apply to all wheat of the 1982-83 season of each subsequent season.

Clause 6 makes provision for a new citation for the Barley Marketing Act. Clause 7 provides for the insertion in the

Barley Marketing Act of a new section 19a. This proposed new section corresponds exactly to the proposed new section of the Wheat Marketing Act explained above apart from necessary changes so that it applies to barley instead of wheat. As with wheat, there is a Commonwealth Act relating to research, the Barley Research Act 1980 of the Commonwealth, which corresponds almost exactly to the Wheat Research Act of the Commonwealth. This new section is also to apply to the 1982-83 season and subsequent seasons.

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

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARIES OF THE DISTRICT COUNCILS OF BALAKLAVA, OWEN AND PORT WAKEFIELD

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's message.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's amendment.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

A message was received from the Legislative Council agreeing to a conference, to be held in the Legislative Council committee room at 9 a.m. on Thursday 5 May.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Minister of Transport): I move: That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the conference on the Bill to be held during the adjournment of the House, and the managers to report the result thereof forthwith at the next sitting of the House.

Motion carried.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS: OFFENSIVE REMARKS

Mr PLUNKETT (Peake): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr PLUNKETT: A short time ago the member for Mount Gambier clearly implied criminal conduct by me as an A.W.U. organiser. I am proud of my record in industrial affairs and strongly object to remarks which would merit legal action by me if repeated outside the House by the member. He implied that I was a standover merchant, saying that I was a bully-boy who used standover tactics in the South-East.

After I took a point of order on that, he made a remark that even the Mafia leaves women alone which clearly implied that I would treat women with violence. I also consider that to be a slander against my character. I have never been involved in standover tactics anywhere. The only violent incident in which I was ever involved was one in which I was the victim. This was in Naracoorte several years ago when I was attacked. On instructions from the union, I later took legal action against the people who attacked me and was exonerated by the legal processes. I

would hope that, as a matter of honour, the member for Mt Gambier will apologise and withdraw. However, I want to make this personal explanation to set the record straight after making those smears on my character.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I have studied my earlier comments in *Hansard* in response to interjections from the member for Peake and I am prepared to acknowledge that they were inappropriate to debate in this House. I have discussed the issue with the honourable member and I think that I now have a better understanding of his actions in the South-East. I offer to withdraw those remarks without reservation.

However, more importantly, my remark regarding the Mafia was related not to the honourable member but to an interjection from the member for Todd. That remark was related to action by shearers who attacked a lady during the current dispute and that was publicised. I assure the House that I have no wish whatsoever to impugn the honourable member's reputation and also assure the House and the public that his integrity is beyond reproach. I withdraw those remarks which he considers to be offensive.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1)

Second reading debate resumed.

Mr MATHWIN (Glenelg): I will continue with matters in relation to public works and the withdrawal of certain projects by the Government. Of course, it is not unique that this Labor Government is doing this because this happened previously under the former Labor Government. That Government did similar things in relation to public works in its time. In fact, I am quite sure that the member for Peake and the Deputy Premier would well remember the situation in relation to the Thebarton school; the Liberal Government finally went into a rebuilding programme—of course, the Labor Government kept putting it off for many, many years. I am sure that that was much to the relief of the member for Peake and the Deputy Premier. Of course, we all remember the situation as regards the Liberal Government in relation to massive upgrading in the areas of correctional services and, in particular, in the prisons. Although we were only party in part to the workshop situation at Yatala, as members would know, it has been completed. Of course, it has never been used since. It is still empty and is not being used.

The Premier also went on to say that the Government would give greater effect in connection with stage one; he was talking about the museum redevelopment project. He said that the Government would give greater effect in stage one to the most urgent needs of the museum and minimise as far as practicable the recurrent costs associated with redevelopment.

Of course, this was an area which the Liberal Government had put before the Public Works Committee. That committee made investigations and came up with a recommendation that this project be proceeded with. Of course, in cutting the project down, I presume that it will mean that the Government will allow the rebuilding of part of the museum because of the critical situation there in relation to space not only for the display of artefacts and articles within the museum but, indeed, in relation to the acute storage situation at the museum. Their very valuable pieces are stored all over the place and, indeed, it is imperative that that part of the project is upgraded or rebuilt. I do not know where

the Government intends to put a stop to the proposed development of the museum. However, the whole project was to upgrade and provide the public with better facilities and a restaurant area. Indeed, it was to assist in bringing forward the history of this State by renovating and rejuvenating the historic barracks into a military museum which the Police Department was to use for some of its museum pieces. I believe that this would have been of great benefit to the citizens and, indeed, to tourism in this State.

I think that those who know anything about tourism would acknowledge that that is one area from which the State derives a great benefit. It covers a number of people in business and the like. It provides a lot of jobs and the like, and the more we have to show people, the more people will come over here to see these features. I am very disappointed that the Premier has seen fit to make cuts (as he said he will do) in relation to the redevelopment of the museum. It is well on its way. A lot of demolition has been done on that site and the larger, very well built but very old fashioned buildings (in relation to modern buildings) were very substantial but unworkable in relation to what was needed. All that demolition work has been done and, to me, it would be a shame to stop it and not proceed with it. I would hope that the Government would give further consideration to that matter. In part, the Premier then went on to say:

Clearly, the former Government was planning either major increases in taxation or major cutbacks in services if it had survived last November's election.

Of course, here the Premier is taking on the role of a clairvoyant who will look into the future and may profess to know what we were going to do. Of course, the difference is that the Liberal Government is a Government of good management and of people who know what they are doing and who have business experience and know how to run a business. Of course, government is the biggest business in this State. Of course, that is the difference between the two sides of the House, and during the time that we were in Government we proved that we were certainly good business managers. The Premier would do well to take heed of what the Leader of the Opposition has said today.

The Leader of the Opposition stated that the Government should immediately appoint a Budget Review Committee to take a firm control of all Government spending, and that the Government should also reduce the size of the public sector, which I suppose it would find most difficult to do. However, it ought to do that. The previous Government did that over a period of time and it did not sack one person. People say, 'Who are you going to sack?', but that is an entirely ridiculous statement, because the former Government reduced the work force without sacking one single person. The Leader went on to say that the Government should scrap Government proposals that will significantly increase spending. He also advocated that there should be no halt to the capital works programme already approved. That is good advice to the Government. I hope that the Premier will look at those matters.

Unfortunately, there is little time for me to deal with the matter concerning some Questions on Notice which have not been answered by the Minister of Education. The questions were placed on notice on 15 March and I had hoped to get some indication from him concerning a matter that arose in regard to school classes in the Kingston electorate, where 67 per cent of the classes have more than 25 students and where 17 per cent of classes have more than 30 students. The answer to that question would not have been difficult to find out. However, it seems that it has taken the Minister many months to consider whether or not he should give an answer to that question. I am concerned particularly about the local government area. The type of legislation that the

Government might introduce worries me: will it provide that there will be a mandatory age limit for people going into the local government area?

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): When the people of South Australia opened the *Advertiser* on Wednesday morning I am sure that they were greatly concerned about the headline that greeted them—'Government slashes public works programme'. I can assure members of the House that the headline caused great disquiet in my electorate. I had several telephone calls before I came to the House this morning. I received calls from councillors and from some officers of the Sea Rescue Squadron. During my remarks tonight it is my intention to be a little parochial and to address myself to the concerns expressed by those who contacted me this morning.

Quite clearly, the size of the deficit and the massive cuts in the public works programme are of concern to every person in this State. The main cause for the deficit is the size of the public sector and the uncontrolled over-runs that are occurring in departments. I believe that the Leader and other members on this side of the House over the course of this debate have highlighted that problem. Obviously, the size of these departments must be reduced by attrition and not by sackings. I think it was quite ridiculous of the Premier during Question Time today to try to suggest that the Liberal Party would resort to sackings. It certainly did not happen during the three years when the Liberal Party was in Government. There is no way that the Government of the day can suggest that between 1979 and 1982 the Liberal Government sacked even one public servant. However, I would suggest that the Government has no intention of reducing the public sector; I would suggest that quite the reverse is the intention. I put the proposition to members of the House that once the increase in taxes and charges have been brought in to offset the deficit the Government will carry on with its normal Government socialist programme.

Before I came into the Chamber tonight I read at page 34 in the *Public Service Review* a letter from the Premier to the Acting General Secretary of the Public Service Association (Mr Feagan). In part that letter states:

As you will recall from our discussions, prior to the last election, and from my letter to you on 22 October last, the Government is committed to restoring overall employment in the Public Service to the level existing before the introduction of the previous Government's Budget for 1982-83 . . . Despite the difficult financial position, we are determined that this commitment shall be met. (Signed) J.C. Bannon.

That is a very clear indication of the intent of the Government to raise taxes and charges. It has been preparing the public ever since it got into office, and having raised taxes and charges and cut the deficit the Government will then carry on as it did in 1979, and we will see a blossoming once again of the public sector and the involvement of the public sector, which in the past was a matter of policy.

As I mentioned earlier, members on this side have devoted their allocated time to the effects of the Government's slashing of the public works programme. I want to refer to this in regard to my electorate, and I will refer to projects affecting the city of Glenelg. Fortunately, there will be no massive cuts in that area like those that will be experienced in Chaffey in regard to the Cobdogla irrigation area in the Riverland—a project that is absolutely vital and essential to that area. It might interest members opposite to know that homes in the Cobdogla area still get their water from open drains. In Adelaide we are used to having reticulated water and all we have to do is simply turn on a tap, but in the Riverland area involved the people were living in the hope that very shortly they would have water coming to their properties, reticulated through pipes. At the moment

they still have to take their washing water out of an open agricultural drain. Also, the area that I represent does not have projects such as the Finger Point project in the South-East, which has just been axed.

However, on the drawing board at the moment we have a very vital project affecting the city of Glenelg, one which will have a major impact on the finances of Glenelg if it has to pick up the whole of the tab. I am referring to the upgrading of the lock and the regulator gates on the Patawalonga Lake. Concerns of councillors were expressed to me this morning before I came to this place. For the benefit of members opposite who are not familiar with the history of the Patawalonga, and also for those who read *Hansard*, I would like to give a brief resume of the background of the Patawalonga prior to the erection of the existing lock. Also, perhaps I should brief honourable members on the cost-sharing arrangements which exist between the Government and the council in regard to maintenance of the area, because this is topical and applicable to the remarks that I will make about what should happen in the future as a matter of urgency. Some dates may be of interest to honourable members. Back in 1836 the land was proclaimed for the first settlers. In 1887 a weir was constructed at the outlet with movable gates to create a boating lake. So, quite obviously, the area has been used as a boating facility since 1887. In 1888 that particular wooden outlet was destroyed by flood. Nothing was done in the area after that time until 1960.

As honourable members know, the Patawalonga is situated just north of Anzac Highway. It serves primarily as a boat haven and a recreational area, although members may be interested to know that five individual drainage systems use the basin as an outlet for stormwater run-off. I think it is very topical to this argument that some 12 councils and one Commonwealth Government instrumentality rely either solely or partially on the Patawalonga outlet for stormwater run-off. People seem to believe that the Patawalonga is purely for the benefit of the Glenelg council in controlling the stormwater drains. That is not so. As I have said, 12 councils and one Commonwealth Government department use it on a run-off basis. It has a catchment area of some 20 000 hectares and covers an area from the Torrens River in the north to the Happy Valley reservoir in the south, the Mount Lofty ranges in the east and down to the coast. That is a vast catchment area covering the stormwater that runs into the Patawalonga lake.

The operation and control of the Patawalonga Basin are conducted by the Corporation of the City of Glenelg, which provides a lockmaster at great expense on a 24 hours a day basis. He is responsible for the operation of the regulator gates when storm flooding empties into the basin. I assure honourable members that it does not take much of a rain-storm in the catchment area to cause flooding in the lock within a few hours. Honourable members may be interested to know that 152 mooring sites are available in the Patawalonga boat haven. I think that fact is fairly applicable to my later remarks.

The section of the basin above the King Street bridge is used for water skiing, so we are not only looking at mooring sites but a combination of mooring sites south of the King Street bridge and a catchment area for skiing, sailing and canoeing. The Patawalonga Boat Haven was opened in 1960 with a lock and five regulator gates. To prevent flooding, the boat haven banks were straightened and reconstructed, and three additional regulator gates were installed in 1974.

In relation to costing, the original boat haven was opened in 1960 and was funded by the State Government (75 per cent) and the Glenelg council (25 per cent). The extensions to the Patawalonga carried out in 1974 were fully funded by the State Government. In both cases, the operation and

maintenance of the Patawalonga on an on-going basis fall on the shoulders of the Glenelg council. The existing equipment is now more than 20 years old. While in a generally sound condition the reliability of this equipment is now causing the council some concern. The exposed nature of the metropolitan coast and beaches, and the lack of an alternative port as a refuge for small craft sailing off the coast, are also causing concern because, if there is a failure in the lock mechanism, there could be a serious situation whereby boats could be caught outside of the lock and if the weather suddenly deteriorates small boats would be unable to get into the lock.

Another problem that is developing involves costing and the problems associated with the Patawalonga sand bar across the entrance to the outlet preventing boats moving through the outlet at low water. The financial aspects of the Patawalonga basin and associated facilities have caused me great concern. It is a huge financial burden that is forced upon one council, when in actual fact it should be shared by the whole of the metropolitan area.

I now refer to some of the problems that the council raised with me this morning. They are individual problems that are associated with the Patawalonga basin and the operation and, particularly, the need to upgrade the lock and the regulator gates. Some of the proposals include the replacement of the lock operating mechanism with an oil hydraulic system, the replacement of the original motors, the installation of remote control for the regulator gates, the replacement of cable and switchgear, and the replacement of the time switches on the regulator gates. All in all, this work will cost some \$160 000. The council is of the view, and I support it, that the State Government should pay for that expense because, as I pointed out earlier, virtually half the metropolitan area drains its stormwater through into the Patawalonga basin.

As I have said, 12 councils use the Patawalonga, yet the ratepayers of the city of Glenelg are expected to pick up the tab for the upgrading of the lock. I refer to a study conducted by a firm of consulting engineers, B.C. Tonkin and Associates. Technical officers from that firm have been in contact with Glenelg council officers, and a meeting is to be held between the Glenelg council and the Minister shortly. The result of that study indicates that the replacement of those gates is a matter of high priority. If they are not replaced there could be serious safety problems in the future. I believe that it is quite unreasonable, and I expressed this view to the former Government, that for a facility such as the Patawalonga (which is used by all and sundry across Adelaide) the Glenelg council should suddenly have to foot the entire bill for this work.

I believe that the Government will probably propose that the Glenelg council pay 50 per cent of the cost; the Government will say that that is a compromise. I do not believe that that compromise goes far enough. I believe that in matters such as a major upgrading the State Government should pay all of the bill. I would like to raise some further matters on behalf of the Glenelg council, and I refer to the cleaning of the banks of the Patawalonga. That is an ongoing expense every year, and it should be discussed in relation to the financial constraints that apply at the moment.

In the past, the council has been pleased to receive 50 per cent of the maintenance costs from the Government, and we hope that that will continue. I also refer to the installation of flood gates. Whenever there is a high flood there is a risk of water back flooding into Glenelg. The provision of these gates will cost some \$15 000. Another cause for concern is that the Patawalonga is silting up all the time. In fact, currently, the Patawalonga has silted up to the extent of over half a metre (nearly 2 foot), which means that it is extremely difficult to manoeuvre boats

around the marina at times. B.C. Tonkin has estimated that the dredging of the Patawalonga will cost \$15 000. Once again, while it is expected that the Glenelg council should pick up the tab, as silting is coming down from the other 12 council areas I believe that the only equitable way of resolving this matter would be for the State Government to step in and bear that cost.

I keep coming back to the fact that a major upgrade in this area should be paid for by the State. There was agreement, as I said earlier, in 1960 when an arrangement was entered into whereby the State Government paid 75 per cent and Glenelg Council 25 per cent of the cost of having the original lock built. The ground rules set down in about 1958 do not necessarily have to apply in 1983, when we examine the uses of the lake. One has only to go to the milk carton regatta to see the tens of thousands of people from all over Adelaide who use this facility. There are also hundreds of thousands of people scattered around Adelaide from whose properties stormwater flows through this facility. I believe that the time has come to relook at the formula and to say that if we have a major upgrading of that facility the State should pay the capital expense, and that it should not be borne by the ratepayers of Glenelg.

I turn now to the matter of the Sea Rescue Squadron, which is extremely concerned about the sand bar at the entrance to the lake. It is well known that studies have been made of this sand bar for several years. It is patently clear to those who have made this study and who understand sand movement up and down the coast that, once a channel is cut through an existing sand bar, that channel must be serviced continually in the form of a sand bypass. Such a channel can be dug out, a strong south-westerly can blow for a few days, and it will fill that channel again. It is a major expense to keep it clear. The last costing that came from the Marine and Harbors Department for such a job mentioned an amount of \$1 300 000.

There are numerous aspects to be thought about when talking of keeping this channel clear. Not only are we talking about the use of the channel by recreational fishermen and those with pleasure boats, but there is the aspect of safety in the event of an aircraft coming down in the sea nearby. When there is a boat in distress, if the Sea Rescue Squadron is activated during a low tide or when there is no water across the bar its members have to put their boat in the water at North Haven, adding about half an hour to the time it takes the squad to respond to a call, which could be disastrous. The Sea Rescue Squadron is extremely concerned that the Patawalonga problem has been allowed to languish in someone's 'too hard' basket. I appreciate that the Minister heard from a deputation on this matter about three weeks ago and is having the matter investigated by his department. I suggest that this matter has been investigated in full and that we have reached the stage where the only way to resolve it is by way of a decision by Cabinet about the expenditure of money on it. This is what is concerning us, that the massive slashes in public works and capital works programmes will mean that money will not be set aside to clear away this sand bar. If it is not cleared and there is a tragedy at sea then that responsibility rests upon the shoulders of the Cabinet, which did not take a decision to spend this money.

We know what is wrong with this sand bar, as all the relevant studies about it have been completed. It is now a matter of a decision being taken to spend money on the proposals put forward by the Department of Marine and Harbors. It has the answers to this problem and should be allowed to implement them. I will be extremely disappointed if financial constraints being implemented at the moment affect these two projects, namely, the replacement of the regulator and lock gates at Glenelg at Government expense

and a fast move to recut this channel and install an efficient bypass system at Government expense. The longer this matter goes on the more costly the exercise will be to dig this channel and install a suitable bypass.

My speech tonight has been a parochial one on purpose. I do not propose to spend any more time canvassing the points raised by my Leader. However, there is concern in the State about the way in which the Bannon Government made at the time of the election certain promises which it had no intention in the world of keeping but which it thought were appropriate things to promise to get into Government. It is now in Government and carrying the can for goods it promised to deliver but cannot deliver. I have mentioned my concern about Glenelg because I believe that it is my role, as a back-bencher, to highlight the areas in my district where I know any financial restraint will have a big impact on the ratepayers. We have a deputation meeting the Minister about these two proposals next week. It is doing so with an open mind, and we trust that we will get the utmost co-operation and sympathy from him and that he will have these matters attended to.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): The Premier yesterday introduced a document and the Appropriation Bill into this Chamber and set out to give a detailed explanation of the budgetary and financial position of this State. Members have been given prior warning of this document's coming forward and they, and all South Australians, looked forward with some expectation to some guidance and lead being given in the Premier's speech. Regrettably, that did not happen. The Premier presented a document that exposed to the general public the serious situation that the South Australian Treasury Department is in and the matters of financial consequence facing this Government.

My initial reaction was one of 'The Government asked for it and therefore it should wear it.' However, I have some reservations about this now because I have grave concern about what has been happening with Governments in recent years, not only the present Government but the Government before it, in the handling of Loan funds and the way in which those funds are being transferred into the general revenue account. I cannot go into all the finer details because the intricacies are quite complex. However, in basic terms, one always knows that if one sells off one's capital items one is going downhill. I think that analogy would apply to every person in a small business or on a farm, for example, or to any other business enterprise: one cannot use one's capital for day to day and recurrent expenditure and stay in front. I believe that the same analogy applies to Governments, and I do not think that I am alone in this belief.

It is my understanding that this situation has arisen in recent years in the United States of America. I have been informed that every State in that country has now passed legislation placing budgetary measures in the hands of the Parliament. If a Government of the day has to use Loan funds to balance its expenditure for a particular year it is obligated by law to make up those funds in the very next financial year. That can be done either by a reduction of expenditure or by an increase in taxation. Whichever way it needs to be done, it has to be done and is enforced by the Parliament of the day. I believe that it is a necessary and vital part of the budgetary measures, because one does not need much imagination to appreciate what could well happen if a Government goes ahead willy nilly making election promises and not shouldering responsibility for them.

That situation is building up. If, for example, a Government spends \$50 000 000 or \$100 000 000 from Loan funds and puts that money back into recurrent expenditure just to bolster up the day-to-day expenditure, that sum is a cost

to future generations. What Government has the right to commit future taxpayers' money and future Governments to an expenditure that it knows full well those Governments will have difficulty meeting?

I do not really know how far one could go. The mind boggles as to what the consequences to the State would be. We only have to multiply what has happened over the past three or four years and relate that to future projections to realise the consequences. What I am saying now, and what the Treasurer has said in his statement, is that we must take stock of what is going on and we must take a very firm stand, even though it may be unpopular, to control that type of expenditure. The Treasurer, in introducing the Appropriation Bill, stated that the deterioration of \$73 000 000 is made up of an overall increase in gross payments of \$145 000 000, partly offset by an increase in gross receipts of \$72 000 000. He indicated where those increases have taken place.

Naturally, the natural disasters that we have suffered are regrettable, but I do not believe that any individual (any member on this side or any Government member) is being critical of the Government for the stance it has taken in endeavouring to find the finances that are necessary to cope with this situation. In fact, I believe that every citizen of the State is fully behind the Government in its seeking financial measures to help those who are in serious need. The Treasurer's report also states that pumping costs will exceed the Budget estimate. It was only a few days ago that the Minister of Water Resources stated that he could save costs because of the early break in the season and that as a consequence less water would have to be pumped. One could only guess what the figure might have been if the situation was carried forward. A number of other matters were referred to.

Only \$8 000 000 is attributed to election promises, and that is where the document is not totally accurate. Much of the spill-over and the blow-out of the Budget is a direct result of election promises, and I do not believe that the Treasurer was strictly correct when he claimed that only \$8 000 000 could be attributed to election promises. If the Government of the day chooses to introduce measures which are costly and which increase the Budget deficit, then it must wear that. The Government must shoulder the responsibility.

I refer now to the natural disasters that have occurred. Because of the fires and the floods in the Mid North, a natural disaster fund has been set up, and many people have access to those funds. Last weekend about six people in my district were very seriously affected by flash flooding. One farmer lost 280 hoggets. The mind boggles as to how that could occur, but it was due to a natural disaster, and there is no doubt about that. The sheep were moved into the pasture the day before the flood occurred; they were on high ground when checked, but after the rain they had gone, and it was thought that they were all right. However, there was a flash flood 10 miles away; in the meantime the sheep had wandered and in no time they were surrounded by water. The sheep were faced with a 5 foot wall of water, and obviously they had nowhere to go. Consequently, many of the sheep finished up in the sea.

That natural disaster affected that farmer as much as other farmers in the Clare Valley or in the South-East were affected by natural disasters. I make the point that disasters can occur in isolated pockets of the State, and a disaster is just as devastating to an individual as it is to a collection of people. I do not know the answer to the problem. Normally, in a situation such as this the proclamation of a natural disaster involves the combined efforts of the State and Federal Governments and the declaration of a disaster area. Obviously, one would not consider that a few square

miles would constitute a disaster area. I do not know the answer, but I believe that there is an anomaly in the present system whereby some people are affected quite seriously.

Another person in that same area did not lose any sheep but, as a result of the situation, he has no stock-proof paddocks. All of his fences have been broken. When I called at that man's property on Monday night, I learned that he had to round up his sheep and put them into the sheep yards so that they could not stray overnight. While that situation may not sound dramatic, it constituted a quite serious problem, and it will be years before that farmer gets his farm back into some sort of operational shape. Yesterday, the Treasurer presented his Financial Statement, and the Leader of the Opposition presented an alternative Financial Statement. I was quite dismayed when I read the headlines of the *Advertiser* this morning. I do not know whether the Leader of the Opposition was reported accurately, but the headlines are quite clear. There was an acknowledgement by the Leader of the Opposition that some tax increases are necessary. It was stated:

The Leader of the Opposition, Mr Olsen, conceded yesterday that tax increases were needed to cover some of South Australia's Budget blow-out. He suggested that higher bus, train, and tram fares and an increase in the levy paid by fuel resellers and passed on to consumers could be considered.

That is where the Leader of the Opposition and I part company, because in no way would I contemplate supporting any scheme that would add a fuel tax, particularly in country areas. Of all the possible potential taxes that could be imposed by a Government, the most feared by country people is a fuel tax, because the further into the country one lives, the more one is taxed. As a consequence, my district would be seriously disadvantaged, as it is a long way from the metropolitan area. Every commodity and every item of produce that is taken to and from the market would be taxed again and again as a result of this form of taxation.

I cannot support that suggestion, and I am quite concerned that the Leader of the Opposition should seek to suggest that this is a way in which the Government could raise funds. I do not believe it was the place of the Leader of the Opposition to suggest taxes, because the Government went to the people in November and sought to gain their support on a programme of no increases in taxation. The platform of the Government of the day provided for no tax increases. In no way will I support that suggestion, particularly in relation to fuel tax, because it has a flow-on effect.

Not only do we have all of these taxes being added on and mounting up, but one of the matters which I do not believe has been mentioned of late is the concern for the small person (or the housewife and the every-day wage earner). There has been an attempt to bring in a wage pause. In so doing, we are restricting the income of that fixed-income person, but what has not been fixed are the prices. As a result of that, all the incidental charges are sneaking up. Many Government departments come into that category: their charges are sneaking up. So, the cost of living of the average family person is growing, but its ability to cover those extra prices is not. As a result of that, we are getting some very dissatisfied people who do not have the knowledge or understanding of what the wage freeze is all about.

Not enough leadership has been given to the businesses of today, the larger companies and the public bodies, to take heed of the spirit of the wage pause. That was blown wide apart when the fat cats (and I use that term which the *News* used yesterday in an editorial) were given a 10 per cent pay rise. Obviously, everyone would know that if the big boys can get an increase then everyone under them is going to be clamouring for a like increase. If there was ever a case to be made for anyone being left out of an increase,

it is the people on the very top salaries. Let us start on the bottom. In fact, there is a good case for a flat rate increase; if there is going to be a \$10 increase, let it be a flat rate so that those on the bottom of the income grouping can get equal benefit as a result of that \$10 amount. I believe that there are some problems there.

I would just like to go on to a couple of other matters, if I may. Before I do, there are one or two minor points that I would like to make about the comments of the Leader of the Opposition, because they were not all bad. His idea of the retention of a Budget Review Committee is good. The more people we can have who are involved in the political scene, who have to work with that, and who can be involved in that Budget decision making, the better. It may well be that there is a far wider and broader input into that decision making: I do not know. There is not an official Budget Review Committee and I believe that the suggestion is well worth while. It is a difficult job; the finances of today are becoming even more difficult because the average person (not only the individual but the companies and Governments) is living beyond his means.

We are living in a paradise which cannot be substantiated in real, basic terms. If we can get back to that basic living standard, maybe our finances would fall into place a little more easily. All of these costs that have been mounting up over time—and I mentioned the difficulties that the smaller wage earner and the housewife are in—are added to by Government instrumentalities. Telecom has just introduced further charges in an underhand way; that is, in an indirect way from the point of view that it is not coming out and saying that it is increasing the cost of a call, but all the incidental charges that did not previously attract fees will now attract fees. It has even got to the stage now where it has made some areas available for international direct dialing; if one wants that facility removed from his telephone he has to pay to have it removed. So, instead of having to pay to have that service put on one has it put on and pays to have it removed. So, it is an indirect and almost underhanded way that makes one a little cynical of the whole operation of Government charges and those of semi-government departments and instrumentalities.

Without doubt, one of the greatest concerns of country people, particularly those in my area, relates to roads. It is an on-going thing that has been going on for as long as I have been involved in a country area. I would like to read into *Hansard* a small document prepared by Mr Colin Chilman, Secretary of the Eyre Peninsula Local Government Association, giving his assessment of the position of Eyre Peninsula in relation to roads and some of the costs associated with them. Some of the comments obviously need further expounding, but time will not permit to do that. For the purpose of this exercise, I will read it into *Hansard*, and comment where I can a little more at a later time. It is the Secretary's report to the Eyre Peninsula Local Government Association, delivered to the Local Government Association at Ceduna at its recent annual general meeting. It states:

Finance to local government generally and in particular the area of road funding is rapidly losing ground in real terms, and we must be forever vigilant to correct this situation. For many years South Australia has been treated as a poor relation of, and without doubt been done by the Commonwealth and just as surely, possibly to a greater extent, Eyre Peninsula has had to accept being done by the State, to the point of being treated like second class citizens. The main reason for this is because of our small percentage of population in this State (2.7 per cent in Eyre Statistical division, plus 2.5 percent in Whyalla which totals 5.2 percent). However, Eyre Peninsula has:

17.9 percent of the State's road length.

Consumes about 20 percent of the State's auto distillate and 6.3 percent of its motor spirit (including Whyalla).

Is a large primary production area. In the 10 years to 1980-81 wheat, wool and barley production was worth over \$1 000 million.

In recent years, the area has been producing about 40 percent of the State's wheat, 15 percent of its wool and 25 percent of its barley. Eyre Peninsula waters yield about half the State's fisheries catch. Production of this primary produce was worth about \$200 000 000 annually in recent years.

I do not know how many million dollars Whyalla is worth to the State on an annual basis, but I would suggest that area deserves to have a greater proportion of the available funds spent on its roads. Eyre Peninsula with its 2.6 percent of State's population produces up to 30 per cent of the State's primary production in several commodities and is responsible for constructing and maintaining 17.9 per cent of the State's road length.

This is a very heavy commitment, especially when a levy on fuel is imposed on 2.6 per cent of population, who because of vast distances and high commercial use, are responsible for 20 per cent of the State's usage of distillate and 6.3 per cent of its motor spirit. The burden is unfairly borne by the sparsely populated areas of the State and to regain some justice more of these funds, raised by the levy in particular, should be channelled back into the unsealed arterial and major local road system on Eyre Peninsula.

Grants Commission Grants: Eyre Peninsula received 6.48 per cent of the State Grant in 1982-83; Eyre Peninsula received 9.94 per cent of the State local road grant in 1982-83. Not only is Eyre Peninsula getting a raw deal but the State as a whole comes into the same category. To illustrate this I make the following points:

1. Commonwealth road grants are inadequate, in that they represent only a small proportion of Commonwealth petroleum revenues. According to *Oil and Australia 1981* (page 21), Commonwealth revenue from petroleum in 1980-81 was \$4 044 400 000 million, while Commonwealth roads grants to the States in that year totalled \$657 200 000 million (only 16.25 of petroleum revenue). Other Commonwealth revenues could also be taken into account, such as import duties and sales tax on motor vehicles, parts and accessories.

2. South Australia's share of Commonwealth roads grants is inequitably low.

The source cited in the last paragraph shows that South Australia received 8.6 per cent of Commonwealth roads grants to the States in 1980-81 and 8.5 per cent in 1981-82. South Australia's share is now down to 8.2 per cent of Road Grants Act funding and is proposed to be only 7.2 per cent of A.B.R.D. (Australian Bicentennial Roads Development programme) funding. This compares with the following South Australian proportions of the nation.

	Per Cent
Motor Vehicles	9.4
Vehicle Kilometres	9.21
Fuel Consumption	9.35
Area of South Australia	15.5
Road Length	12.2
Population	9.0

3. The distribution within the State of South Australia's allocation of Commonwealth roads funds warrants revision.

The share of A.B.R.D. funds allocated to local roads is much lower than the share thus allocated of Roads Grants Act funds (12 per cent). It seems to me that the whole question of distribution proportions warrants review.

Some further statistics are of interest:

Eyre Peninsula—general rate revenue \$52 per head.

South Australia—average \$27.60 per head of population.

Eyre Peninsula—98 per cent of roads under council control unsealed 11 721 km.

South Australia—85 per cent of roads under council control unsealed 56 763 km.

Eyre Peninsula population 33 750—2.6 per cent of State.

Whyalla population 31 150—total 5.1 per cent of State.

Facts on Fuel Levies—of the 100 per cent of moneys collected from these levies, 52 per cent is used to purchase the oil and to refine it and to service the fuel companies and their distributors. The other 48 per cent goes into general revenue. Of the 48 per cent, 20 per cent comes back to roads while 80 per cent stays in general revenue as a fund raiser for the Commonwealth.

The document then goes on to refer to the hard work that has been put into the road formula by Councillor Des Ross. I would like to take that up later, because I have a grave argument with that. Thanks are then made to the Hon. Arthur Whyte, Des Ross, Mrs Ilsa Mathews and David Stokes, of the Parliamentary Library Research Service. I have read that extract to the House, but I intend to refer to it again and comment further on the statistics which need further elaboration about what is really happening to our road funding system.

I refer to the road funding formula in regard to funds for councils throughout the State. That formula was imple-

mented by the previous Government and the factors considered include the areas of population, road length, council contribution, and one or two other factors. Although it is a good formula, if all district councils were starting off on an equal basis it would be fine, because the formula would work well but, as they do not start off equally, I find that some councils have 18 per cent or 20 per cent of sealed road content while others have only 1 per cent or 1.5 per cent of sealed road content. In such circumstances the whole formula breaks down.

I will take up the matter subsequently. In the meantime, I emphasise my warning and concern about the way in which Governments, not only the present Government but previous Governments as well, tend to look to Loan funds in order to carry on their day-to-day expenditure. That action leads to disaster. If the Government that can put that practice in check and get back to expenditure on an in-and-out basis it will protect future generations from expenditure that they cannot get over.

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

A quorum having been formed:

Mr BAKER (Mitcham): I am pleased to be addressing the Supplementary Estimates, because it gives me a chance to express some opinions about budgeting and the operations of the Government. I suppose that I am in a unique situation, having spent some years with the State and Commonwealth Governments, having worked in Adelaide and Canberra, and having had some experience of various Administrations, both Labor and Liberal. The same malaise grips both Parties in their inability to come to grips with the fundamentals of budgeting. I now have the attention of two Ministers and one economist, and I am sure that they will appreciate what I say.

The budgeting measure that we have used in the State and Commonwealth Governments over a number of years have failed to meet the needs of government. It is fairly clear that a number of devices have been used and a number of people have looked at the problem of budgeting. No-one has satisfactorily answered some of the major questions that have to be answered. I would like to go through a few of these before I address the Supplementary Estimates.

As we are all aware in the post Second World War period we had incremental budgeting; that is, if you had a programme that needed maintaining, you added a certain percentage for cost increases and if one needed a new programme it was added onto the list and one waited until the Executive of the day cut it back to reasonable proportions. As we moved into the 1970s, finite resources became somewhat limited. There were suggestions that zero based budgeting was the most appropriate means of coming to grips with the limited amount of money to be spread around. That philosophy also fell on hard times, because it was too difficult to start from nothing and approve every programme that was within the realms of the departments themselves. More importantly it took much time. During the period of the last Liberal Government we had programme performance budgeting, which again tried to come to grips with the essential elements of good management of Government funding.

It required many resources and, like many of the other programmes that had been undertaken previously, it failed to reach its ultimate objectives of managing the resources in the most efficient way. Having been in Government service for some time, I know that there are some massive deficiencies in the thinking of the Executive of the day. Much is based on the premise that the advice of advisers is good and reasonable. Such advice, however, is given by

people who, although well meaning, have a vested interest in the area that they serve.

One thing that has always astounded me with Governments over the years, whether Liberal or Labor, is that no reward has ever been given for thrift. I recall that, when I served in the State Public Service, we had programme items for various pieces of equipment. If I did not spend the money allocated for a particular year, that money was lost.

Mr Evans: And you received less next year.

Mr BAKER: Yes, I received less next year. That was the bottom line. It was felt that if one could manage with less in a year, and one failed to meet the Budget estimate, the budget for the following year was retarded. The ultimate outcome is that everyone spends up to their budget. There is no reward from State or Commonwealth Governments for good management. I would like to see the present Government, which happens to be the Australian Labor Party in this State, think about the mentality of budgeting and good management. Until the Government realises that there are people who can use resources efficiently, provided they are given some sense of responsibility in the process along with a reward for thrift and good management, we will continue to have the budget over-runs that South Australia is experiencing at the moment.

It is counter productive to say that, if one does not spend up to one's budget one will lose it. I know that on several occasions I brought forward items of equipment so that I could ensure that my budget for the following year was not affected. This is an area where money is wasted, because everyone makes sure that they keep up to their budget allocation. No executive can be fully aware of what each item actually contains. They cannot be expected to know how each branch of their department is spending its money in relation to the small and large items: they must rely on the advice of their departmental heads. When Budget time comes around everyone bids for the highest possible amount, knowing that eventually they will be cut back but hoping that in the process they will be better off than in the previous year. That is the mentality of budgeting in the State and Commonwealth Governments. It is counter productive and inefficient and it is a system which has been perpetuated for too many years and which needs tremendous redress.

Mr Mathwin: It's very disappointing.

Mr BAKER: It is disappointing. It is disappointing that continually we have people who cannot understand that we need to save money and that we need to use money wisely.

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

Mr BAKER: Not at all. The second item that I wish to address is the vexed question of Commonwealth funding. Having been close to people involved in making submissions to the Commonwealth Government for funding, I can only say that we are not proficient in extracting money from the Commonwealth.

Mr Meier interjecting:

Mr BAKER: I think that remains to be seen. He must now share the money with four other Labor States. Of course, when Mr Dunstan was Premier he had the ability to be used as a sounding board, and South Australia was an area where Commonwealth funds could be spent. That money will now have to be spread much further.

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

Mr BAKER: He certainly did. We had the Railways Agreement that he used to extract money, but he failed to actually sign the agreement. That is the major reason why we took a massive cut in funding during our last term in Government.

In relation to approaches to the Commonwealth, at one stage I studied submissions from all the States, and I am sure that members opposite would be delighted to know

that the best submission was always made by Queensland. Whenever Commonwealth money is forthcoming Queensland is the most adept at extracting it. That is not because it has greater relative need; it is because it is totally proficient in understanding the mentality of the people handing out the money and knowing how to obtain it. The point of the exercise is that, if we are going to the Commonwealth for money (and we sorely depend on Commonwealth funds), we must be totally professional in our approach.

We have not been professional in the past and we will not be professional in the future unless we have people with sufficient expertise to take up our case in Canberra. We have not done as well as we could have, and that will continue. We also need to look at the programming of our resources. We need stringent programming. If towards the end of the financial year we find that we have additional funds they should be either returned to the taxpayer or used in employment generating projects. We do not indulge in project over-run one month after being elected to Government! Any Government that does that is obviously incompetent; on the other hand, there must be some feeling amongst administrators in a State Government that they have an easy mark in the Labor Government. To be able to over-run their budgets and spend beyond their means without any controls must reflect on the Government of the day.

Mr Mathwin: Ministers in particular.

Mr BAKER: Yes, and that is a matter that will be brought up in Committee. It is inconceivable when the circumstances are so difficult, and the disastrous effects of the bush fires, the floods and the droughts have already been pointed out. Even though money is so tight we are still seeing over-spending by the Government. We have seen the incredible amount of money that will be required for rehabilitation, yet the Government is quite happy for its departments to over-run their budgets.

Mr Mathwin: Ministers cannot control their departments correctly.

Mr BAKER: I can only draw that conclusion. Government departments are not living within the budgets allocated to them. They are failing to meet their own requirements. The Government must manage its departments properly, because it is accountable. I am sure that in the Committee stages we will find out which areas have been affected. I draw honourable members' attention to the item of capital expenditure.

Much has been made tonight about where savings can occur. We have a difficult situation in South Australia. We have already had some admissions that extra measures will be needed to overcome that difficult situation. One of the measures is the curtailment of capital expenditure. Some of my colleagues have already pointed out that that will occur in some very sensitive areas: areas of need and areas which have been needing attention for some time. As an economist, and I know that there is at least one other economist opposite, I am aware—

Mr Meier: Who are you referring to?

Mr BAKER: The member for Unley. I am aware that if savings are to be made they should not be made on the capital expenditure side. Anyone with a basic knowledge of economics would understand that one of the most important employment generators is in the area of capital expenditure: expenditure on buildings, equipment and things that create employment. There is a flow-through effect into the economy and, even with the slack capacity of today's State economy, we can expect that the initial employment generated can be repaid two or three fold. If the economy was in a tighter position the multiplier effect would be higher. As can be seen, this area is an important generator of employment. It is important for bringing South Australia more opportunities.

The next item I address concerns the options available. We heard in a reply to a Question on Notice that the rule of thumb used by Treasury is that a 1 per cent increase in wages costs the State recurrent Budget \$13 000 000. If one takes that to its end conclusion one finds that if there is a 4 per cent increase in wages deferred there is a \$52 000 000 saving on the Budget. When one looks at Budget figures, that becomes very significant. It is important that we understand what options are available to us, and this is one such option.

After 30 June this year we must seriously consider what is going to happen to wages. The figures provided by Treasury indicate that unless wages are kept under control a serious situation could arise, particularly if there is an attempt to catch up after the wage pause. One is talking about an expensive item when talking about salaries. When we reach the stage of arbitrating on wages I hope that the Commonwealth commission will ensure that wage rises are kept to a minimum and that the South Australian Industrial Commission will follow suit, because that will be of great value in this area. It will make the Government's programme much easier.

Another Budget item alluded to in another debate concerns the fact that in New South Wales they show strong preference for State-produced goods. There are sound reasons for this, although I do not wish to create further trade barriers like the ones that have grown up around the world. In simple terms, the more we buy that is produced in this State the better off our economy will be. For instance, if a house is built and everything from the bottom up is made in South Australia the employment multiplier is four-fold. When the percentage of South Australian-produced goods used falls, the multiplier effect falls dramatically. The member for Fisher has already pointed out inadequacies in the roofing area and there are other areas where we cannot provide all the goods needed. The principle is that the more we produce from our resources the better off we are.

I am not recommending that the Government implement a policy excluding interstate and overseas competitors, but it must seriously consider the impact on the State of where it buys goods and where contracts are let. South Australians should benefit from expenditure in South Australia, something often forgotten, particularly when Government contracts are handed out.

I recap by saying that, in terms of budgeting expertise, we have not begun to grapple with these issues. I am hoping that this Government will look at the way in which it constructs its Budgets, the way in which information is fed to it, and the way in which it can improve the system.

I turn now to the heart of the matter before us, the Supplementary Estimates. These items have been already taken up and will be further taken up in this session this morning and later today. I find it incredible for a House that has to look at financial matters to have incomplete information before it. Also, I find it incredible that we have figures that are so gross that they cannot be adequately grappled with. For example, the first item is the natural disaster programme involving drought, fire and flood relief. It shows an estimated figure of \$81 000 000, of which \$58 000 000 will be contributed by the Commonwealth Government, leaving a net cost to the State of \$23 000 000. We have no indication here of how much has been spent, or of the areas in which it has been spent. There are just a few weeks left until the end of the financial year, so the rate of expenditure will have to be far greater than I have perceived to date, yet we have this bald figure that states in one line that the State has to find \$23 000 000. We have been given no substantive information that this amount is a realistic assessment of the liabilities to be met before 30 June 1983. I hope that the Minister will provide further

information on this matter, because it is important to this debate how much of this amount will have to be met this year.

The second item concerns additional costs of pumping water from the Murray River, which is expected to exceed the Budget estimates, including the amounts provided in the round sum allowance for price increases by some \$8 000 000. We have recently seen improvements in that situation because the need for pumping has declined. The Premier pointed out that some of these costs are one-off items. Certainly, the first item, drought, fire and flood relief, we hope and trust will be a one-off situation to be met in a one-off way. The same applies to the additional costs of pumping water from the Murray River. The expenditure involved for this year has been extraordinary because of the drought. There are predictions that this situation will not last, so in 1983-84 we could see a turn-around in this figure and a surplus being generated in this area. Because of this season's water rating, that \$8 000 000 could become a surplus figure in relative terms. This has not been taken account of and has to be considered as a one-off situation where we must meet extraordinary costs due to the drought.

I turn now to wage awards, which have increased further despite the wage pause, the wage bill being some \$14 000 000. I have had a brief look at the estimates of salaries and wages for the 1982-83 year and cannot substantiate this figure of \$14 000 000 unless there have been areas of increase of which I am not aware. However, it has been pointed out that the Estimates relate to such a large figure that a percentage deviation one way or the other could increase or decrease this amount considerably, so although the \$14 000 000 mentioned here is substantial in terms of Budget over-run, I cannot comment on it in terms of its final impact. I do not believe that the Premier will be able to do so, either, because of the large bill we have before us today. I hope, however, that he is going to be able to give details on how much is being spent today on salaries and wages and how much the remaining weeks of the year will cost.

The job creation programme, it has been admitted, will be offset by Commonwealth funds. The gas levy is a one-off cost situation. It is applicable to the 1982-83 financial year, and we trust that that situation will not be repeated in 1983-84. No doubt, the gas levy will not have the same predominance in the Estimates next year as it received this year. That was an extraordinary circumstance, and that matter has been discussed in the House previously. The election promises were met, and a figure of between \$3 000 000 and \$4 000 000 has been attributed in that regard. I do not wish to comment on those items, because they related to promises that were made and kept. What worries me considerably (and I trust that the Treasurer will provide details in this regard) is that departmental expenditures and advances are running ahead of Budget estimates in many areas and overall are likely to exceed the Budget by about \$26 000 000 for reasons other than higher levels of costs. Of course, the Health Commission figures very prominently to the tune of \$17 000 000. Further, it is stated:

... there has been an increase in the number of uninsured patients receiving hospital care. This, and a reduction in the overall number of bed days utilised, means that receipts of the Health Commission are now likely to be \$21 000 000 below the original Budget estimate, despite an increase in hospital fees from 1 February 1983.

I undertook to approach the Minister of Health in regard to the bad debt situation of the South Australian Health Commission over the past three years. The Minister stated that he required notice of the question. I am sure that the Treasurer will be able to inform the House of the historical situation in this regard and why there has been an extraordinary explosion in bad debts. It has been stated that the

economic situation has been particularly cruel on those who have fewer means, and I certainly accept that. It has also been stated that many of these people were not insured and were not paying their hospital bills. I can certainly accept that there is an element of that.

However, the massive figure with which we are presented suggests that there must be some other reason, given that hospital fees increased from 1 February 1983. Until I obtain figures on the bad debt situation, I cannot really assess how well the Health Commission has operated its budget. It is inconceivable to me that the \$17 000 000 over-run is very largely due to the bad debt situation. It is an astronomical figure, and one which must be reviewed. Members can be assured that I will put questions on notice on what areas have been affected. Likewise, a number of small items are referred to in regard to health units and workers compensation agreements.

In summing up my conceptions of the Supplementary Estimates, I point out that they are very short on specifics. They do not give sufficient information on which to base judgment, and it is the judgment of this House that is important. Whatever measures are provided, there will be a fundamental effect on the State's finances over the next few years. Whether the Government intends to increase taxes on a one-off situation to meet the extraordinary needs

of the 1982-83 financial year, or whether it intends to increase taxes so that there will be additional revenue and additional imposts on the people of South Australia, are very important questions. I know that the Leader has referred to this situation. I am concerned that South Australians will be treated with respect and that the Parliament will be given sufficient information on which to consider the Bill in the Committee stage. I am sure that the Bill will not be rejected, and that is what tradition demands. However, I also suspect that some very pertinent comments could be made on the way in which finances must be managed over the next few years, because we will be considering the Estimates that apply over the next two years before we return to Government.

Mr BECKER: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House, which I consider a disgrace.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 2.57 a.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 5 May at 10.30 a.m.