

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 18 October 1984

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

PETITIONS: ANTI DISCRIMINATION BILL

Petitions signed by 139 residents of South Australia praying that the House delete the words 'sexuality, marital status and pregnancy' from the Anti Discrimination Bill, 1984, and provide for the recognition of the primacy of marriage and parenthood were presented by the Hons Jennifer Adamson and H. Allison and Mr Mathwin.

Petitions received.

PETITION: OPEN SPEED LIMIT

A petition signed by 98 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to reject any proposal to reduce the open speed limit from 110 km/h per hour to 100 km/h was presented by Mr Gunn.

Petition received.

PETITION: VIDEO TAPES

A petition signed by 753 residents of South Australia praying that the House ban X rated video films in South Australia was presented by the Hon. H. Allison.

Petition received.

PETITION: COMMUNITY WELFARE ACT

A petition signed by 1 685 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to amend the Community Welfare Act so as to prohibit the removal of children from their parents without parental consent or direction of a court was presented by the Hon. H. Allison.

Petition received.

QUESTION

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the written answer to a question, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

LAND AND PROPERTY TRANSFERS

In reply to Mr **FERGUSON** (18 September).

The **Hon. G.J. CRAFTER**: Since my response to the honourable member's question on 18 September last, I have had a chance of discussing the problem outlined further with my colleague the Attorney-General.

The Attorney advises that most justices of the peace, proclaimed bank managers and proclaimed members of the

Police Force would have experienced this problem and been frustrated at having to refuse to perform a service, found it difficult to explain why, and to give advice as to whom the person should turn. A number of justices of the peace probably consider the 'well known' clause is a pointless bureaucratic imposition. However, if carried out conscientiously it does, as I have already said in this House, act as a safeguard against forgery, or fraud, by ensuring that the person executing the document is in fact the person named therein and that the document is not obtained by fraud or otherwise involuntarily.

Where a person executing a Real Property Act document is not known to a justice of the peace or proclaimed bank manager, the commonly referred to 'long form of proof' should be used. Section 268 of the Real Property Act provides:

Such witness, whether the instrument be executed within or without the limits of South Australia, may also be any other person, but in such case the execution of the instrument shall be proved before one of the officers or persons specified in the last preceding section by the witness acknowledging his signature to the instrument, and declaring that the party executing the same was personally known to him, that the signature thereto is in the handwriting of such party, and that such party did freely and voluntarily sign the same, in the presence of the witness, and was at that time of sound mind, and such officer or other authorised person shall thereupon endorse on the instrument a certificate in the form of the nineteenth schedule hereto.

The form of the certificate is:

Appeared before me at _____ the day of _____ 19____, C.D., of _____

_____ a person known to me and of good repute, attesting witness to the instrument and acknowledged his signature to the same, and did further declare that A.B. the party executing the same, was personally known to him the said C.D., that the signature to the said instrument, is in the handwriting of the said A.B., and that the said A.B. did freely and voluntarily sign the same in the presence of him the said C.D., and was at that time of sound mind.

(Signed) Registrar-General, J.P., etc.

The Attorney does not consider the best interests of the public would be served if the 'well known' clause were dispensed with. It could result in a lax attitude being adopted in respect of the witnessing of Real Property Act documents thereby increasing the avenues for fraud, etc.

QUESTION TIME

LAND RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr **OLSEN**: Will the Premier seek an assurance from the Prime Minister during his visit to Adelaide at the weekend that a Federal Labor Government will not attempt to override South Australia's land rights legislation? During his visit to Darwin this week, the Prime Minister refused to clarify the Federal ALP's intentions on proposals for national uniform land rights legislation which would override the States and give Aborigines a right of veto over exploration and mining. At present, the position of the South Australian Government is also unclear.

When the Federal Minister, Mr Holding, threatened earlier this year to intervene in the Maralinga land rights legislation, the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs in this House said (and I quote from a press statement of 12 March):

The Commonwealth Government has a clear constitutional responsibility for the welfare of Aboriginal people in Australia.

That suggests the South Australian Government is sympathetic to Mr Holding's desire for uniform legislation which would take away the rights of the States in areas like access for exploration and mining. On the other hand, the West Australian Premier, Mr Burke, has recognised this issue as

fundamental to States' rights. Mr Burke has called on the Prime Minister to spell out the Federal ALP's policy before the election and to guarantee the rights of the States, and I ask the Premier to seek a similar commitment from Mr Hawke during his visit to Adelaide this weekend.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: We do not have the same problems as Western Australia has in this area, because since the mid 1960s we have led the rest of Australia in our comprehensive land rights legislation, legislation which has been introduced under successive Governments: in fact, former Premier Tonkin cites as one of his greatest achievements in the three-year period he was in office the Pitjantjatjara land rights legislation. There has not been the same conflict in South Australia as there has been in other States because in this State there has been a basis of community understanding and consensus on this issue.

The statement referred to, made by my colleague at the time of the Maralinga land rights Bill dispute, was simply a statement of fact that the problems that were being experienced in relation to the passage of that legislation were attracting the interest and attention of the Commonwealth in such a way as to perhaps threaten some sort of intervention in South Australia. It was an appeal by the Minister in fact to behave in a manner which would ensure that South Australia as a State had control of the land rights question, and that is the position of our Government. We have had discussions with the Western Australian Government. We understand the position. We have no problem at the moment with the Federal Government's stance or the land rights position in South Australia.

TOURISM HEALTH SERVICES

Mr MAYES: Will the Minister of Tourism ask his Department to make inquiries of local accommodation houses—hotels and motels, in particular—to see whether they would provide for visitors details of fitness and health services available in-house or in the area, in particular, details for joggers and general runners? Recently a representative of the Hyatt Hotel chain in Adelaide for this year's Tourism Conference told a gathering that his hotel group, being fully aware of the new community emphasis on fitness and health, would be building into all its new hotels and special convention facilities special provision for fitness and health services.

He suggested also that it would be considering looking at gymnasiums and jogging facilities for patrons of the hotels. Can the Minister say how widespread in the community is this commendable attitude and check the facilities available to local hotels and motels for joggers and those people who generally wish to maintain their fitness and health? I know the Minister is interested in this aspect; I have had discussions previously with him. Certainly, with his experience recently in the City to Bay run I know that he is keen to have these facilities extended.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: That is a very good question on a very important matter. I regret that the honourable member has drawn my attention to that very slow trip I made from Adelaide to the Bay just recently. The honourable member has reminded me of an issue that has struck me when I have been in hotels elsewhere, particularly overseas and more recently in Japan, where jogging and health information was part of the normal tourist kit provided to residents at that hotel. South Australia, particularly in the Torrens Lake and the parklands, has some of the best jogging tracks in the world. I doubt whether anyone would disagree with that. I know a fair bit about the Torrens

running track because I take longer to get around there than anyone else I know, so I have a better look at the facilities.

The provision of fitness and jogging information to tourists is vital. I would like to see South Australia promoted (Adelaide particularly) by the hotels and motels as a centre for fitness and health for visitors to come here, knowing they have access to gymnasiums, jogging tracks and to good parklands, etc. This is a matter I would have to take up with my colleague the Minister of Recreation and Sport, who I feel certain shares a similar interest. I will also need to take it up with the hotels, motels and accommodation houses in Adelaide. I do not know how widely or how well that information is provided. It may be that the Hilton, Oberoi and other hotels are doing it already; I do not know. Certainly I will check it out. I expect that they do, because their chains elsewhere provide that type of information. Adelaide is ideally situated to cater for those people who want to visit the city and who want to participate in healthy active sport and recreation, and jogging and gymnasia are part of that.

I give an undertaking to my colleague that I will discuss the matter with the Minister of Recreation and Sport, with his Department and with the tourist industry generally, and I shall provide a report for the honourable member on just how well we provide for those people, as well as on what we perhaps ought to be doing in the future to provide for the needs of visitors.

UNDERGROUND POWER CONNECTIONS

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Because of a new Electricity Trust policy on underground power connections, which could add up to \$500 to the cost of a new home, will the Minister of Mines and Energy ask the Trust to not apply this policy in relation to homes for which contracts have already been signed for overhead power connections? During recent weeks the Trust has advised electrical contractors and home builders that power connections to new homes must be placed underground. This requirement is being made of homes already under construction at fixed price contracts. I have been informed that there was no consultation about this policy, and also that there is confusion about whether it applies only to bushfire areas or to new homes in any area. In a letter dated 11 October a builder wrote to the Trust about the impact of this move in the following terms:

This causes us great concern on behalf of our clients who have contracted to have houses built on the basis of an overhead electrical supply. The majority of these clients are first home buyers, assisted by the Government grant, and are stretched to the very limit of their financial resources. The extra cost of an underground supply is currently \$220 plus extra costs across the footpath and three metres up the pole. We believe that in some cases it may cost our clients an extra \$400 to \$500.

This policy appears to conflict with the position that the Government has taken on the Scott Report, which reviewed electricity distribution in bushfire prone areas. Whilst that report has recommended undergrounding of power lines, the Minister has asked for public comments before any decisions are made. That report refers to undergrounding of high tension supply lines—which is where fires start. In view of the confusion in regard to the potential additional cost to home buyers, that will follow if the Trust decides to proceed with the policy of undergrounding power connections, I ask the Minister whether he will take up with the Trust the matters I have raised.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: My understanding of the arrangements that apply in relation to undergrounding of powerlines in circumstances similar to those outlined by

the Deputy Leader does not coincide with the allegations made by the honourable member. However, I will certainly take up with the Trust the matter that he has raised. I can understand the honourable member's concern in relation to the position with fixed price contracts, and I will see what can be done about the matter.

STUDENT TRANSPORT

Ms LENEHAN: Will the Minister of Education tell the House whether he plans to provide transport for students from the Trott Park and Sheidow Park areas to the Seacombe High School in 1985? I have been approached by parents living at Trott Park and Sheidow Park who have complained about the inaccessibility of, and therefore the time taken for students to travel to, Seacombe High School. In conjunction with the ALP candidate for Fisher, Phil Tyler, I recently made a submission to the Minister requesting that he examine the possibility of providing Education Department transport to Seacombe High School for the students involved.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for her question. It is true that I have received approaches from both the member for Mawson and Phil Tyler, the candidate for Fisher. The approach was made because initial approaches on this matter made by the community to the Education Department resulted in their proposition not being accepted. The reason was that, according to official policy, the route that was closest geographically between the residential area and the school in question was .2 km short of the required cut-off point.

The point that was argued by the residents and taken up by both the member for Mawson and Phil Tyler was that the shortest geographical route was not the most practicable traffic route for residents of that area and that, if one took the most practicable traffic route, that was over, by about .2 kilometres, the cut-off point. I had a Ministerial officer of my Department travel the routes in question to determine the degree of difficulty involved in travelling each of those routes. The advice I have received is that indeed the geographically shortest route is not the most practicable route and is not being used by the vast majority of parents who are presently transporting their children privately from the area.

So, as a result, I have had the matter reinvestigated and have advised the Department that there should be a bus service from the Trott and Sheidow Park areas to transport secondary students to Seacombe High School from the start of 1985. The bus service which currently takes students from the Aberfoyle Park and Flagstaff Hill areas to Seacombe High will be diverted along Majors Road through the communities of Trott and Sheidow Park on a route to be determined in consultation with those communities.

The bus will then proceed down Ocean Boulevard, Brighton Road and along Seacombe Road to Seacombe High School. Because that is the most practicable route to go along from the point of view of parents, that is the route that the bus will take. We could not expect the bus to go along the other route because it would suffer the same degree of inconvenience that parents are presently suffering privately.

When the R-10 facility at Hallett Cove is completed, the service provision will have to be reviewed, because there is naturally no guarantee of this being a continuing service. One must remember that Seacombe High School is the zone of right school for students from Trott and Sheidow Parks. At present they do not have access to adequate public transport to service those areas.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: A few members opposite are making a few interjections. I suggest that they list the number of times on which I have given favourable consideration to bus routes in their districts to take account of the same degree of problems where the policy made at the margin failed to take natural and equitable account of the problems that applied.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: A number of members have to admit that that is so. The member who is now interjecting has to admit that that is so. That situation is no different from the situation in any of the other cases. This will be a *pro tem* service until the Hallett R-10 school comes into existence and it will provide for the needs of the residents of that area.

DREDGE AD VICTORIA

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Can the Minister of Marine say what was the cost of refurbishing the dredge *AD Victoria* and how much of the cost was over budget? I have been informed that it cost the Department of Marine and Harbors \$2 million to refurbish the dredge *AD Victoria*. I have also been informed that the original refurbishing was bungled by the ordering of incorrect equipment, necessitating costly variations to the original specifications. This has caused a large cost overrun, meaning that a new dredge could have been purchased for the same money.

I have also been informed that Treasury has required the cost overrun to be financed out of the Department's deepening programme, which has meant that the programme has had to be curtailed. This has meant the laying off of at least 25 employees. Finally, I have been informed that this inefficiency has caused so much dissatisfaction among Marine and Harbors employees that a petition of no confidence in the Minister is now being circulated amongst the employees.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I do not have that detail on hand at the moment, but I will undertake to obtain all that information for which the member has asked and bring down a detailed answer.

GRAFFITI REMOVAL

Mr HAMILTON: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy provide the House with information on the research project being undertaken by Amdel into the most effective methods of both preventing and removing graffiti? My question is prompted by an advertisement which was inserted by Amdel on page 79 of last Saturday's *Advertiser*, and which provided some details of the project and invited potential sponsors to approach Dr Alan Spry, of Amdel.

There is no doubt that graffiti has become a most serious and costly problem in our community and, whilst some graffiti may have funny asides such as 'Make your MP work: don't re-elect him', much of what I have seen on places of public entertainment, buildings, universities, railway stations, etc., is of a racist nature, plain unadulterated filth, and a denigration of womanhood in this country. I understand that chemical testing laboratories have spent many years trying to find solutions to removing wall writings, and I have no doubt that all members would appreciate receiving from the Minister information on this effort to tackle the problem.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I appreciate the honourable member's continuing interest in this topic. He was kind enough to let me know in advance that he would appreciate information on it. Consequently, I have quite a comprehensive amount of information that I will be able to give to the House, particularly those honourable members, of whom there are many, who would like to hear it.

Amdel informs me that some research has been conducted in the United States, but there is a great shortage of practical information in Australia on how to deal with the problem of wall writings to which the honourable member referred. The research project now being undertaken by ASPECT, the environmental investigations division of Amdel, is designed to rectify this state of affairs.

The research is being financed by more than 20 sponsors obtained by Amdel, but there is no doubt that additional sponsors would greatly assist the completion of the project by the scheduled date of mid-1985. A pamphlet produced by Amdel states that the research will result in the production of a detailed report on protective coatings, removal methods and the availability of commercial anti-graffiti surfaces.

It will specify procedures to be followed when graffiti are encountered, the best cleaning methods for particular surfaces, and recommend coatings for discouraging would-be vandals. The study has already reached the stage where a data bank of information on overseas research is being established. A number of preliminary investigations of cleaning and protection problems have been completed and some principles established for recognising potential problem sites. The future programme will involve:

Laboratory and field studies of techniques for removing a wide range of graffiti from untreated surfaces.

Identification of specific problems of concern to sponsors of the project.

Identification of surface coatings available for anti-graffiti protection in Australia.

Laboratory testing of those coatings.

Identification of and comment on commercial contractors offering services in the field of cleaning and treatment.

As the honourable member mentioned, the contact person for the project is Dr Alan Spry. Dr Spry is the Manager of Amdel's Consulting Division, but he is also considered to be one of Australia's leading experts in the field of building preservation and restoration. Dr Spry has worked on many notable landmarks both in Adelaide and interstate, and it is interesting to note that he is currently consultant to the Parliament House Construction Authority on the use of natural stones in the construction of the new Parliament House in Canberra.

This is a most worthwhile research effort by Amdel and, hopefully, there will be adequate sponsorship to ensure that the project is carried out as quickly and effectively as possible. I trust that, if we are fortunate enough to get some publicity in relation to the honourable member's question, it might result in further sponsors coming forward.

OLYMPIC DAM DEMONSTRATORS

Mr GUNN: Will the Premier say when the Government will show some courage and support the complaints of the residents of Olympic Dam and remove the remaining demonstrators from the area so as to allow those people to go about their lawful business without being harassed by this group of unruly drop outs, professional agitators and professional demonstrators? It was reported in the *Advertiser* of Monday 15 October, when the Premier visited Roxby Downs, that the residents felt terrorised, and I want to quote what some of those people had to say. The report states:

Roxby residents told Mr Bannon they were being denied their civil liberties by the protesters, who entered their camp dressed in camouflage and committed petty acts of vandalism . . . Another employee said his wife and children were 'terrified' when they were accosted by protesters after a visit to the library.

It goes on to more detail. I have had constituents complain to me. It has always been my understanding that it is an offence for outsiders to live permanently on Crown land, such as a pastoral lease. Why have not the provisions of the Crown Lands Act been applied? The time has come to support these people who are lawfully going about their business at Olympic Dam and, if necessary, have the police evict this unruly element forthwith.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I covered this matter fairly adequately in response to a question by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition on Tuesday. I made my position quite clear. I have already expressed my concern and made my attitudes very clear on this matter, but the law must be complied with. In respect of the comment made by the honourable member at the conclusion of his question, I can say that permanent residents and permanent structures will not be tolerated in the area because they are against the law.

Mr Gunn: But they're getting the dose.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The question of whether persons at the demonstration site are in receipt of unemployment benefits is a matter that should be attended to by the Commonwealth Department of Social Security, which has the job of verifying whether or not persons in receipt of unemployment benefits are ready, willing and able to work. I suggest that the honourable member refer that matter to his Federal colleagues.

CONTRACT TEACHING POSITIONS

Mrs APPLEBY: Will the Minister of Education expand on the midday news radio bulletin that a further 300 teaching positions have been converted from contract to permanent positions for 1985?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I am happy to report to the House on this matter. Questions on this matter were asked during the Estimates Committees and it is appropriate that I inform the House of progress. Members will recall that in 1983 the Government converted a total of about 250 positions in both the Education Department and the Department of Technical and Further Education from contract employment to permanent employment and that we entered into discussions with the Institute of Teachers so that we could convert a significant number more. This was all in fulfilment of a pre-election policy given that we would convert a significant number of positions, resulting in a reduction in, although not the elimination of, contract employment in these two major departments. Contract employment is still needed to some extent for reasons of flexibility of personnel.

Those discussions took place. We hoped that they would have been concluded earlier. The argument between the Institute and myself revolved around the claim that it had before the Teachers Salaries Board involving loadings for permanent teachers being posted against temporary vacancies. We asked that they drop that claim and said that, if they were to drop it, we would be happy to do a large set of conversions. In the eventuality of not dropping the claim we had to proceed to the Teachers Salaries Board to contest it. They lost the case. I then offered to reopen the negotiations and we did so. In the process we asked that, since they had lost the first claim, they not reopen the discussions for a certain agreed period of time. As a result of that, we were not able to reach final agreement on the agreed period of time during which claims should not be lodged.

For that reason the numbers that we had hoped might be converted are greater than the numbers that were actually converted because there was not an agreement on the no-claim period between the two sides at issue. We believe, as we always have done, that we had an obligation to do a significant conversion. So, from the start of 1985, 300 full-time equivalent teaching positions will be converted from contract to permanent employment. In actual bodies, that should mean more people, because a number of persons will not be full-time employees of the Department.

We will re-examine in 1985 the possibility of further conversions from the start of the 1986 school year. So, we will have quite categorically adhered to our pre-election policy to significantly reduce the level of contract employment in the Department, whilst at the same time protecting the Department's staffing needs and looking after the best interests of the many teachers in the field who have given valuable service by means of the contract employment method.

I might also mention that we have also made a point of offering permanent positions to ex-contract employees in the normal course of staffing in the Department. At the end of each year we have available about 600 to 700 vacancies in the Department as a result of retirement or resignation, and a significant number of those (over 50 per cent) are offered to those who have undertaken some contract service previously. So quite a number of contract teachers are already finding permanent employment by that means: they are coming into the system through that means. In addition, 300 full-time equivalent other positions will be filled in 1985 from the contract pool.

HOSPITALS

Mr OSWALD: Will the Premier make available urgent additional funds to the South Australian Health Commission to extend the hours of use of existing operating theatres which will also provide for the employment of appropriate nursing staff outside the existing weekday and weekend curfew hours, as they currently apply in operating theatres, so that surgeons can reduce the alarmingly high and ever increasing waiting lists of patients seeking elective surgery in our public teaching hospitals? Earlier this week the Minister of Health and the Health Commission released a table of figures showing maximum waiting times in our teaching hospitals, and I refer specifically to the Royal Adelaide Hospital, as follows: general surgery, one year; ophthalmology, two years; neurosurgery, six months; orthopaedics, two years; ear, nose and throat, three years; plastic surgery, 7½ years; cardio-thoracic surgery, two years; and urology, one year.

It has been put to me by medical staff in the teaching hospitals that the State Government has failed completely to take account of the extra demand for public hospital services resulting from Medicare. Because of this, long delays in the provision of important medical care are occurring. It has also been put to me that the global health budget is a standstill budget in the face of increasing demands and some hospitals have actually had their budgets cut in real terms. For example, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital has received a budget increase less than the expected inflation rate and, in addition, has been fined \$620 000 as a punishment for overrunning its previous budget.

It has also been put to me that some of the figures used to justify cuts are phoney figures in that they do not portray the true position: for example, the use of curfews to prevent doctors operating beyond a certain hour in order to stop

staff overtime. This gives an appearance of under-utilisation of operating theatres whereas in some hospitals it is by regulation that a doctor is not permitted to start an operation if that operation is likely to finish after 5 p.m. This is an artificial under-utilisation of theatres caused by administrative decisions and nurses' overtime, and in no way can be interpreted as a lack of demand for surgical services.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will refer the detail of that question in relation to the position of the hospitals to my colleague. In terms of the extra allocation of funds, as the honourable member would know, we are in a tight budgetary situation in South Australia. The State Budget for this year has only just been introduced, and I certainly do not want to make, nor do I believe we are in a position to make, any major changes in that Budget, either on the expenditure or the revenue side, until we have a much better fix on our position and know just what is going on.

What the honourable member highlights in his question is the increasing cost of public sector services, which are in great demand, and we must find from our revenue the means to meet that demand. Unfortunately, it is an impossible position of dual constraint. We do not want to impose greater burdens on the community in terms of revenue collection; equally, we are concerned that the best possible services are delivered most efficiently to them, and the two sides of that formula do not totally line up.

We must search through our priorities and do the best we can. The particular matters in the health area were the subject of discussion in the recent Estimates Committee. In terms of our general financial position, I would certainly be very pleased if I, as Treasurer, could find money to pump more funds into our health system, but we cannot do so.

I would hope that the honourable member's question signals, at least on his part, the fact that he is not joining some of his vociferous colleagues and the Leader of the Opposition in their opportunist claim that South Australia's revenue raising measures are somehow out of kilter with what is both necessary and possible in our community—that is not the truth. I just remind the honourable member that, in order to address in a comprehensive fashion the need he raises, many millions of dollars would be involved. I would hope that, as we attempt to preserve our revenue base, he does not join in the cries of those who say, 'Cut Government revenue and increase Government expenditure.' Unfortunately, that is the sort of cry we hear from the Leader of the Opposition and some of his colleagues.

SUBMARINE PROJECT

Mr PETERSON: Can the Premier say whether it is anticipated that an announcement regarding the short list of companies tendering for the submarine construction project will be made before the Federal election on 1 December? Such an announcement would give South Australians a much clearer indication of where we stand as a possible site. An article this week in the 'State of the State', in the *Advertiser* of 16 October, states:

With the Federal Government expected this year to choose the final two contenders for the building of the RAN submarine replacement fleet . . .

It is stated there that it will be this year. Further on it states that one contender, Kockums of Sweden, has already declared that it will definitely build in Australia and that it sees advantages in coming to South Australia. It has been put to me that, although there will be a lead time of about 12 months before the final decision is made on the successful tenderer, the odds for South Australia would be greatly

enhanced if certain companies are among the final two contenders.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: We have at this stage no indication from the Federal Government as to whether it will make such an announcement before the election, but with the honourable member I believe that it is most desirable that it does so. I understand that work is sufficiently well advanced within the Defence Department and Commonwealth circles for a fairly speedy issue of the preferred tender choice. In other words, if the decision was made and announced, within a matter of weeks we could be told who were the final two or three companies bidding for the project. That would certainly assist South Australia in that it would narrow, of course the companies with which we have to deal, and if in fact Kockums, for instance, was one—that is a company that has made a clear declaration that it sees considerable benefits in South Australia—there are other companies that would be prepared to make such a declaration if they knew they were to be issued with a final bid opportunity and knew the time scale that they were operating on and what those conditions were.

I have both spoken to and written to the Prime Minister on this matter and also a number of his colleagues. We are very keen that the announcement be made as soon as possible. We are not expecting a decision to be made on the location before the Federal election; that, of course, would be impossible until the exercise has been gone through in terms of who will actually undertake the construction. However, I am confident that we will be able to make our case there. What is important for us in this initial stage is to get the Federal Government to commit to the project and to commit to its being undertaken in Australia. Once that has been done, I believe the challenge is thrown over to us.

COUNTRY BUILDING ALLOTMENTS

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Will the Minister of Lands say whether it is a fact that home building allotments are not available in about 40 country towns in South Australia for which as the subdivider the Government has responsibility? During the Estimates Committee proceedings I asked the Minister whether he could provide me with a schedule of the towns in South Australia for which the Government has responsibility as the subdivider and provider of home allotments. I thank the Minister for his prompt response to my request which I received yesterday, indicating that there are only seven towns in South Australia in which the Department of Lands has land available for sale.

It indicated further that there are two towns in South Australia where construction on allotments is under way and that there are some 40 towns throughout South Australia where it is under investigation. The only conclusion that I can come to is that, in regard to the areas under investigation, no allotments are available for builders to purchase for the purpose of constructing homes on them. During the Estimates Committee proceedings I suggested that an artificial shortage had been created and that it was forcing up the price and value of blocks of land in country towns to an unreasonably high level. If I am correct in my assessment of the reply provided to me by the Minister, this can be seen only as being disastrous particularly for young home buyers in South Australian country areas.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Traditionally, of course, the Department of Lands has been a very important supplier of developed land in country towns where this proposition for various reasons is unattractive to private enterprise.

Therefore, it is important that this function continue, and it will continue. Of course, I do not know that the list that I sent to the honourable member in fact addresses the important question of demand and the extent to which there is significant demand in some of those country areas. I will obtain further information from my Department on that matter and provide it to the House.

VOTING COMPUTERISATION

Mr FERGUSON: I direct my question to the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Attorney-General in another place. Can the Minister inform the House whether any progress has been made towards computerisation of the voting system in South Australia? The electors of South Australia will shortly be voting in a Federal election. Inside the electoral booths there will be people sitting at folding tables crossing the names of people off the roll with a pencil and ruler when they arrive to cast their votes. Cubicles will line the walls and people will vote using pencils attached to a piece of string. The voters will vote using numbers on pieces of printed paper which will then be placed in a tin box. Constituents have suggested to me that in this computer age a better system could be devised and thereby a lot of money saved. We have developed technology to take a man to the moon and back but nothing has changed in the way that we cast our votes.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question. I understand that in co-operation with the Federal electoral authorities the Electoral Office is doing substantial work on computerising the preparation and maintenance of electoral rolls. However, I am not aware of any work being done on computerisation of the actual voting process, but I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister responsible for this matter and obtain a report.

ELECTRICITY TRUST

Mr BECKER: In the accounts of the Electricity Trust I notice that \$3.4 million was paid to the State Government by way of fees for obtaining loans. Can the Premier explain where that amount of money has been credited to? In the Auditor-General's Report for the year ended 30 June 1984, the South Australian Government Financing Authority income statement shows that fees paid by semi-government authorities and the Treasurer totalled \$28 000, yet in the accounts of the Electricity Trust we find that \$3.4 million has been paid for the procurement of loans by the Government.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I would need to obtain a detailed statement for the honourable member on that matter, and will do so.

YOUNG DRIVER OF THE YEAR COMPETITION

Mr GROOM: Will the Minister of Transport consider implementing a proposal for a State-wide young driver of the year competition as a step towards reducing the loss of lives on our roads? The Labor Day weekend toll was again a very heavy one in terms of loss of lives. Many accidents, particularly among young drivers, are related to excessive speed as well as to other factors. A young drivers award

would present the model of the skilled and careful driver, because it could be based on a number of tests involving competence and control such as defensive driving, driving with precision and courtesy (concerning braking), as well as a written test on road rules and techniques. The proposal emanates from Mr Gale, who happens to be the Labor Party candidate in Sturt and who is aware of the apparent success of a similar scheme in New Zealand.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I thank the honourable member for his question. I think that a young driver of the year award is an excellent idea. Indeed, it has been tried in the past with considerable success. I understand that the Road Safety Council will conduct a pilot scheme in Whyalla during March next year and, if that pilot scheme proves successful, it is intended that a similar programme will be implemented within the metropolitan area and throughout the whole area of Adelaide. I know that the ALP candidate for Sturt (Mr Jim Gale) has been extremely interested in this project. I certainly endorse his comments and interest in it. I will do my utmost in supporting such a programme, not only in country areas but also throughout the metropolitan area. It is an excellent idea, which has my full support.

ADELAIDE PARKLANDS

Mr LEWIS: I ask the Premier a question which is supplementary to one that I asked him on 13 September. Will he give the House an unqualified assurance that in no circumstances will he or his Government permit the building of flats, townhouses, penthouses, executive residences, or dwellings for permanent residential occupation of any kind whatsoever on land designated as parklands by Colonel William Light?

As I said, I asked the Premier a question along precisely those lines on 13 September. He simply chose to sidestep the issue at that time by asking 'Where?'—and I have already defined that. I now quote from the *News* of 11 September in which an article written by Stephen Middleton, under the headline 'Plan to expand station complex', reads, in part:

Further, possible residential development along the River Torrens banks was depicted.

This is in a plan referring to the ASER development on the Adelaide Railway Station site and adjacent land. Today I noticed in the *Advertiser* an article by Chris Russell entitled 'Public call to scrap presentation plan', in which Professor D. Sanders of the Architecture Department of the University of Adelaide is quoted as saying:

He said the project set a precedent, which had been described by developers as providing the 'best street address in Adelaide', which would become more attractive for further development.

The report further stated:

He said that despite statements by the Premier, Mr Bannon, to the contrary, it was a 'statement of fact' the City of Adelaide Plan did not envisage development of the scale of the station project or on the site proposed.

A 'qualification' in the plan did provide for consideration of commercial, administrative or residential development in the area as part of a comprehensive redevelopment proposal associated with the station.

I have had considerable correspondence from a number of people about this matter in which one of them has asked how the Premier can be so out of touch with his portfolio as to be unaware of the circumstances to which he referred on 13 September. So, I ask the Premier, on behalf of the people who have been asking me, whether he will give the House that unqualified assurance that no residences what-

soever will be included now or at any time in the future in the ASER development.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I thank the honourable member for clarifying his question. At least I have a better understanding—although I must admit not a complete understanding—of what he is driving at. The ASER project, which was gazetted last week, is as gazetted. I guess that a hotel involves residential occupation, although it is not permanent residential occupation, flat development or whatever. It includes that residential component, but the project as envisaged has always included that. In fact, in most of the great cities of the world there are railway station hotels and hotels associated with or built into railway stations. I believe that in that respect the ASER project is showing a very appropriate use of what is effectively a visual urban blight on parklands long since alienated—and that point has to be constantly made.

I think that a lot of the people one finds criticising this project have not recently walked down and around that area and have not actually had a look over the wall beyond the great signs advertising special cask wines and urging people to repent, to see exactly what has happened to the Torrens bank between the northern border of North Terrace and the river itself. In fact, this project provides the opportunity to open it up to public access, to return it to the sort of amenity that Colonel Light had in mind, at the same time recognising that, as long as we have an urban railway system, we will have an Adelaide Railway Station and train lines going in there. That is a fact of life, and for those who say, 'Well, perhaps we could cover the whole area with a great plaza or underground the railway line,' I make the point that the cost of that is so enormous that we can only do something like this if it is done in association with the sort of development that is there, and that is the development that is contemplated in the plan, as Professor Saunders himself admitted in the extract read by the honourable member.

That is the project that is going on at present. There have certainly been concept plans at different times drawn up for an extension in that area to Morphett Bridge—a second stage that has been talked about—but absolutely no undertaking and no firm plans have been devised for that. I would say that at this stage, anyway, it is most unlikely (I cannot speak for future generations in this State and I do not think that I should) that that development will go on in the near future. It is most unlikely that it will be, and I certainly would not support it being, of the order of some kind of residential development, because there are so many other residential opportunities in the city and suburbs.

MICHAEL HUGHES AND ASSOCIATES

Mr HAMILTON: Will the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs in another place, investigate the *bona fides* of a company called Michael Hughes and Associates of South Perth, Western Australia, and do so through the Western Australian Consumer Affairs Branch? Advertisements appearing in 3 June 1984 and 16 September 1984 issues of the *Sunday Mail*, headed 'Isn't it about time you won the X Lotto?', stated in part:

Wouldn't a few divisional pay-outs be very nice right now? You could pay the mortgage, own a new car, or take that vacation you have always wanted.

Under the heading, 'Start improving your chances', it goes on to state:

After spending many hours with a computer I believe I have a practical solution to giving you a better slice of the winnings. For instance the average pay-out for winning Division 4 is only \$20; by using the solution you can expect to win \$200. Normally if you win Division 3 you would get around \$500. By using the solution your winnings would be nearly \$3 500. The solution increases your chances of winning—and even in the lower divisions you can expect to win good dividends.

Under the heading 'What is the solution?', it further states:

It is a practical evaluation of the numbers game, whereby the staggering odds have been reduced [the solution can be adapted to all number games]. Because of the multiple coupling of numbers your divisional pay-outs far exceed normal dividends. I cannot guarantee a winning of Division 1, or winning anything for that matter, but you will have a better chance of winning much more and more often than you have in the past.

The next heading is 'What some winners say'. We have heard it all before, but we will hear it again. It states:

Mrs B. of Highgate, W.A.: with reference to your solution which we received, enjoyed and started playing, I have won in draw 211, 215, 217, 219, 220 and 226 using the solution. Mrs A. of Herne Hill, W.A.: thank you for the solution which after careful study found it simple to understand. It is now my fourth attempt in using the solution and I have received two pay-outs; thank you once again. Mrs L. of Clayfield, QLD: thank you for the solution. I was thrilled to have won with my third entry.

Under the last heading 'How to obtain the solution', it states:

Your total investment in the solution is \$20. What you then own is a step by step guide through the solution which is very easy to understand. Provided with the solution is a set of rules which must be strictly adhered to. The solution only costs \$8 per week to play using standard coupons, not system entries. It will only take around ½ hour each week to complete your coupons and have them ready for each Saturday's draw. Complete the coupon below and please allow seven days for delivery. MCNS system owners should not purchase this system as there are similarities.

The coupon at the bottom is as follows:

MICHAEL HUGHES & ASSOCIATES P.O. Box 218, South Perth, W.A. 6161
 Mr/Mrs/Miss
 Address P/code.....
 Please send me the solution, enclosed is \$20.
 Money Order Cheque Cash
 Bankcard
 Cardholder's Signature
 M. Hughes & Assoc. 8b Spotted Gum Way, Willetton, W.A.
 6155 (09) 457 1720

The address is Spotted Gum Way, which sounds a bit bodgey to me. My investigations have revealed—

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: Did you invest?

Mr HAMILTON: No. Being the cautious person that everyone knows I am, I did not. However, I ascertained the following information. The Consumer Affairs Division of the South Australian Department of Public and Consumer Affairs has had no complaints about this advertisement nor about the firm. It has no knowledge of the firm or its activities. However, investigation officers of the Western Australian Consumer Affairs Department stated:

There is no person by that name and the person trading under it could not be found. Western Australia Consumer Affairs wrote to the address and all Western Australian advertising ceased. They assumed they had 'flushed him out' and did not pursue the matter.

I am seriously concerned that con men have the opportunity to advertise in South Australia and have an effect upon—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HAMILTON: —on the lotteries in this State. I ask that the Minister investigate this serious matter.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I will have the question referred to my colleague in another place, the Minister of Consumer Affairs, for urgent inquiry. I thank the honourable member for bringing this matter to the attention of the House. It was a substantial advertisement that was placed in the *Sunday Mail* on 3 June this year; I think other advertisements

have also appeared, and maybe similar action by the Department in South Australia can flush out this operator in this State to protect consumers.

SUPERANNUATION TAXATION

Mr ASHENDEN: Will the Premier introduce measures to reduce the financial penalties that are being imposed on South Australian superannuants as a result of his Government's taxation policies? I have been approached by a constituent, a superannuation manager of a major life assurance company, who has pointed out to me that five of the six State Governments in Australia are charging stamp duty on superannuation lump sum payments used to buy annuities. The Premier would be aware that such conversions are now very common following the Federal Labor Government's recently introduced penalties on lump sum superannuation payments.

My constituent has pointed out to me that a person receiving a superannuation lump sum of \$100 000 and wishing to buy an annuity would pay no stamp duty in Victoria; \$2 000 in New South Wales; \$2 500 in Western Australia and Tasmania; \$2 750 in Queensland and a staggering \$3 500 in South Australia—by far the highest of any State in Australia. This tax is taken straight from the life savings and investment of the superannuant. My constituent further pointed out to me that the State Government in South Australia then obtains yet further taxes over and above the stamp duty. His letter states:

You will recall our telephone conversation on Friday 17 August. On that occasion, we discussed this State's iniquitous financial institutions duty in the light of the necessity for superannuation fund managers to now ensure all member benefit payments are made to fund trustees. The trustees then deduct the appropriate tax and complete two cheques: one to the tax office and the other to the member. Governments both State and Federal would be delighted at this 'windfall' at the expense of individuals prudent enough to provide for themselves and not become a burden on the public purse.

He is referring there to the double dipping of South Australia's financial institutions duty. The letter continues:

Not only do I think it wrong for a State to tax an individual for taking an action encouraged (almost enforced) by Commonwealth legislation, but to then have the indignity in this State of being taxed at least 27 per cent higher than any other State is the last straw. Perhaps this State could follow the Victorian example and abolish stamp duty on lump sums being converted to annuities.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I cannot confirm the honourable member's figures or what he says. If he forwards the correspondence to me I certainly undertake to look at it, and if there is a major anomaly I undertake to look at that also.

PLANNING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 5)

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister for Environment and Planning) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Planning Act, 1982-1984. Read a first time.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: 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

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

In April 1984 Parliament passed an amendment to the Planning Act, 1982, to suspend the operation of section 56 (1) (a), the so-called 'existing use' provision, until 1 November 1984. This move by Parliament resulted from an attempt by the Government to repeal the subsection following a series of court judgments, which held that the Planning Act could not control the expansion of an existing land use activity where no change of land use was involved. The court judgments had the effect of allowing the erection of substantial new buildings without any form of planning approval, regardless of the impact of the building, and in the case of the State's vegetation clearance controls, would allow the clearance of native vegetation without approval on existing farming properties, where the clearance was for the purpose of allowing an expansion of farming activity.

In the vegetation clearance case, the South Australian Planning Commission appealed to the Supreme Court against the District Court's decision and, at the same time, the Government introduced an amendment to Parliament to repeal the subsection which formed the basis of the court judgment. The Government was, and still is, of the view that repeal of the subsection would ensure that existing uses could only expand with the appropriate approval, without in any way affecting the right of activity to continue in its present form. The basis for this view is that the Planning Act does not control land use as such, but is only relevant where a person wishes to undertake some change to the *status quo*, by the erection of new buildings, by a change in the use of the land, or for example by vegetation clearance. As the Act is only relevant to changes in the *status quo*, no 'existing use' protection provision is necessary.

At the time Parliament considered the proposed repeal, considerable concern arose over the effect of repeal. Accordingly the Government compromised on the matter and a suspension provision was passed. The Government gave an undertaking to proclaim the suspension only if the Supreme Court confirmed previous court judgments and held that section 56 (1) (a) allowed expansion of existing uses without approval. In May 1984, however, the Supreme Court overturned the previous lower court judgment and confirmed the Government view that section 56 (1) (a) did not extend as far as allowing expansion without approval. Accordingly, the suspension provision has not been proclaimed.

In August 1984 the Australian High Court considered the matter on appeal from the Supreme Court. The judgment of that court is now pending. As the suspension provision is intended to ensure that the Planning Act does control expansion of existing uses, a decision to overturn the Supreme Court judgment would necessitate immediate action to maintain proper planning control. However, the suspension provision lapses on 1 November 1984. This Bill therefore simply seeks an extension of the suspension provision until 1 May 1985 to allow immediate action should the High Court case be lost by the South Australian Planning Commission. In that event, further consideration by Parliament would be required to effect permanent repeal. As with the previous suspension provision, there would be no necessity to proclaim the suspension should the High Court confirm the view of the Supreme Court.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends section 56 of the principal Act. The amendment, if it comes into operation, will suspend the operation of section 56 (1) (a) of the principal Act until 1 May 1985. However, as already explained, the provision will only be brought into effect if the High Court reverses the decision of the Supreme Court.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON secured the adjournment of the debate.

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. J.C. Bannon:

That the proposed payments referred to Estimates Committees A and B be agreed to.

(Continued from 17 October. Page 1232.)

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I was particularly pleased to be asked to represent the Opposition on the Estimates Committees, and I served on five of them, but it was my misfortune to be asked to sit on the Estimates Committees involving the Minister of Health and the Minister of Correctional Services. I use the word 'misfortune' carefully, because it was indeed a misfortune for me to sit on those two Estimates Committees. Although we tried very hard as Opposition members to question the Government and the Ministers and to draw financial information from them, all we got was—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: Fudging.

Mr OSWALD: Yes, fudging and stonewalling. It was a disgraceful exhibition by both Ministers.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask honourable members not to carry on conversations in the corridor.

Mr OSWALD: This happened because both Ministers issued lengthy questions to back-benchers on the Government side which were carefully designed to take up the time of the Committees and to ensure that valuable questioning time would be taken away from Opposition members. Secondly, they both used the technique of providing long-winded laborious questions.

Mr Hamilton: You had the opportunity to ask questions.

Mr OSWALD: It is all very well for the member for Albert Park to comment, because he was one of the greatest offenders during the Estimates Committees for asking long-winded laborious questions so that the Opposition would not have the opportunity of drawing out the Minister. The honourable member knows that as well as he knows that he is sitting in this House. Not only am I talking about attempts to obtain information from the Minister of Health, particularly, but we had to put up with the most vitriolic abuse; we had to put up with the Minister's tantrums and intimidation whenever he got into a corner, and we had to put up with personal attacks on members on our side of the Committee. There was also the paranoia he goes on with whenever he feels threatened in his area of the health portfolio or whenever he thinks he cannot answer a question.

Mr Mathwin: He really has a problem.

Mr OSWALD: Yes, he has a problem. I am sure that his attitude was not appreciated by this side of the House. We came to the Estimates Committees with a genuine attempt to ascertain information about the health portfolio. We had carefully designed questions that would obtain information so that we would know what is happening in the health field, but all we got was a stone wall which I can assure members was not appreciated here and was not appreciated within the health profession. Some members of the health profession were relying on the Opposition to obtain information so that they would know what is going on.

The Minister's tactics were to talk out the time of the Committee and reduce the chances of the Opposition to probe financial matters, and that is what we strongly object to. The Government may be interested to know that from the Opposition's point of view the Estimates Committee on the Minister of Health's lines was almost a complete waste of time.

Mr Becker: Shame!

Mr OSWALD: Yes, as the member for Hanson says, it is a shame. I was the second speaker on my side of the House to ask my first three questions. I put them at about 11.45 a.m., and I asked my second three questions at about

7.30 p.m. If that is not an indication of the filibustering that was going on, with one question and its answer taking more than an hour from the Government side, I do not know what filibustering is. That was a disgraceful performance on the part of the Minister of Health, and I believe it is the most disgraceful performance we have seen from any Minister during Estimates Committees.

The performance of the Minister of Correctional Services was also disgraceful. However, I must say that the Minister was very polite in the way he went about delaying the debate, which was nothing like the way the Minister of Health carried on with his intimidation. At least the Minister of Correctional Services delayed us in a nice way, which I suppose is a slightly back-handed compliment.

Mr Becker: Are they members of the left?

Mr OSWALD: Certainly the Minister of Correctional Services is a committed member of the left, but I am not sure about the Minister of Health. If I can summarise that point about the two Ministers: any Minister who comes before an Estimates Committee with questions that he hands out to his own back-benchers and who then spends an hour on longwinded answers is a Minister who has something to hide—that is an interesting point of view. It would be an indication that in the future we on this side of the House will carefully look at those questions asked to see the reasons why the Minister sought to hide information from us. One thing to come out of the Estimates Committee is that the Health Commission is in deep financial trouble—it is sitting on a time bomb. The Ministers try to hide that (I refer to the Minister of Health and the Treasurer), but with Medicare it will get worse before it gets better—mark my words.

Mr Becker: They were warned about that.

Mr OSWALD: As the honourable member says, they were warned before they brought the scheme in at both the State and Federal level. Now the facts and figures are slowly emerging to prove that what the member for Hanson says is quite right. Looking at some of the things that came out of the Estimates Committee, one sees from the evidence and the Auditor-General's Report a few facts emerging. The first is that the Minister cannot disprove the assertions by surgeons in teaching hospitals that their waiting lists for elective surgery have been dramatically expanding. Surgeons are telegraphing all the time that these waiting lists are getting longer and longer, and throughout the Estimates Committee the Minister was not in a position to deny that. Secondly, there has been a real cut revealed now in 1984 dollars in the Queen Elizabeth Hospital budget.

Mr Lewis: And they're bleeding.

Mr OSWALD: That is correct, they are in big trouble down there; they are bleeding. It has been established that the Queen Elizabeth Hospital budget has received a cut in real dollars. Also the Auditor-General's Report revealed that the Health Commission has big troubles regarding its computer acquisition. Time may not permit me to expand on it, but I can inform members that I put 25 Questions on Notice during the Estimates Committee which will reveal that the Commission has been in big trouble in the past couple of years in its acquisition of computers and in terms of where it is going in that area.

The report also brought out that some 12 per cent of potential patients have now left the private health service and moved across to the public health service hoping to take advantage of Medicare under this public health system. All those people (12 per cent) have moved out with the expectation that if they become sick they will be admitted into one of our public teaching hospitals.

To take the QEH as an example, we found during Estimates Committee questioning that there is an admitted 4 per cent increase in patient traffic at that hospital. The remaining 8 per cent, therefore, are potential patients who in fact are available to go to the hospital and whom, if they cannot get in there the Government will hide on the waiting list. The waiting lists are expanding, getting longer and longer, and the hospital is saying, 'We are not admitting any more.' In fact it is not admitting any more, and those patients are being hidden on the waiting list.

Concerning waiting times, the Minister has in my opinion misled the House and the Parliament by the use of figures which he has quoted off the top of his head, and if I can refer to the evidence I will endeavour to prove that. In the *Hansard* report of the evidence taken from the Minister of Health on 26 September, in reply to a question I asked him about waiting times, he said:

With regard to the 4 per cent, to which the honourable member [referring to me] referred very loosely, that was a specific figure which I used with regard to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I did not say, I am not saying and I will not say that there has been a 4 per cent increase overall because that is simply not true. The increase overall has varied from virtually nothing at Flinders to 4 per cent at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital with an average of about 1 to 2 per cent.

There he says quite clearly that in some hospitals there has been no increase in the waiting lists, and at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital it is about 4 per cent. This is an interesting statement, because when we pressed the Minister during the Estimates he did not have any figures on the increase in waiting times—in fact, he announced at that time that a special task force was setting up to investigate this question of waiting times in hospitals. He subsequently set up the task force to find out about this matter and it was only early this week that he produced a reply to a longstanding Question on Notice from the Hon. Bob Ritson in the Upper House. Some information was supplied, but it took about two months for that information to be provided to the Hon. Mr Ritson.

Mr Becker: He takes up to five months to answer letters.

Mr OSWALD: That is not unusual. This was all fresh information. There is no historical benchmark going back for, say, one or two years. That information provided in the Upper House this week details the figures as they are known now: they do not include last year's figures or figures applying two or three years ago. Therefore, we have no benchmark on which to operate.

So, for the Minister under questioning to say, 'We have not had any increases anywhere although we could have had up to 4 per cent increase at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital,' is not correct, because he has no comparison, as until now there have never been any figures kept of the number of patients waiting for surgery and the number of weeks waiting time. So he could not try to squirm out of it and say that the increase overall varies from virtually nothing at Flinders to 4 per cent at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, because he had no original figures on which to base that supposition. Clearly, they were phoney figures given in an attempt to diffuse an argument at the time on the assumption that we would not have the intelligence to pick it up.

During Question Time earlier today I referred to a table of waiting times issued by the Minister in the Upper House. The table is statistical and I seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Maximum waiting times (weeks)

Surgical discipline	Adelaide Children's Hospital	Flinders Medical Centre	Queen Elizabeth Hospital*	Queen Victoria Hospital	Royal Adelaide Hospital
General Surgery	4	24	5	—	52
Vascular Surgery	—	52	52	—	12
Ophthalmology	—	7	52	—	104
Neurosurgery	—	4	4	—	26
Orthopaedics	4	24	36	—	104
ENT	10	32	52	—	156
Plastic	10	16	6	—	390
Cardio-thoracic	—	—	4	—	104
Urology	—	52	52	—	52
Gynaecology	—	—	4	5	52
Cranio-facial	20	—	—	—	n.a.

Mr OSWALD: If I can briefly refer to part of that table, it gives the maximum waiting times, and this afternoon in Question Time I referred to the Royal Adelaide Hospital's list. Dealing with elective surgery as against urgent cases, I know that if urgent cases arrive at any of our five major hospitals they will be admitted and treated. Elective surgery is that which is not deemed immediately urgent. However, let us talk about hip replacement. A hip replacement may involve a wait of almost up to a year, but in the opinion of the person who is waiting to have that hip replacement it is an urgent case. The person concerned would be in extreme pain and would hope to have the operation performed quickly, and having to wait a year is disastrous.

If any honourable members in their latter years were told that they would have to wait from three to nine months for their prostates to be attended to, they would also consider that it had some degree of urgency and should not just be put off. These waiting lists are in fact expanding now with the advent of Medicare—I know it is a political argument to say that they are not, but the reality is that they are—and I hope that the Government will realise that asking someone due for ophthalmology surgery to now wait two years is just not on. To ask someone due for orthopaedic surgery—and this could include the hip replacement—to wait two years is just not on, either.

Perhaps certain plastic surgery could be delayed. I will not go further into that field. I have mixed feelings about people obtaining certain types of plastic and cosmetic surgery. However, there are other important operations that are being delayed. For example, 52 weeks for urology operations is quite unacceptable in this day and age, especially when considering that in pre-Medicare days these types of waiting lists did not exist. Back in those days when excellence in medical care existed at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, for example, there were larger numbers of surgeons at the hospital performing work. Many of those have moved out now and are operating as private surgeons.

I refer to an article in the *News* of 16 October. In that article referring to surgeons, headed 'Cash cut by 60 per cent', Dr Cornwall was responding to the matter of the expanding waiting lists. Dr Cornwall said that there was 'no waiting for urgent surgery'. He keeps referring to urgent surgery: he does not talk about a woman waiting for 12 months to have hip replacement surgery and does not refer to waiting lists for prostate operations, and so on—all the other operations that are involved including ophthalmology operations that people are waiting for, for example. Dr Cornwall says, 'It is ridiculous and malicious to talk about long waiting lists.' I put it that it is not ridiculous to talk about these long waiting lists, because they are a very real concern. There are lessons to come out of these figures. First, the figures provided do not disprove that the waiting lists are expanding. This set of figures is in relation to 1984: I know that the Minister could maintain that one set of

figures does not prove that the lists are expanding. However, I put to the Minister and the Government that the figures do not prove that the lists are not expanding. Therein lies the fact. We have surgeons in hospitals telling us that they are expanding, and it is no good the Government's saying that it now has figures to prove that the lists are not expanding.

Secondly, waiting times should now be totally unacceptable to the Government, which should be providing extra resources to help clear this backlog. Goodness knows why it is not doing so. I was not satisfied at all with the Premier's response this afternoon. I was particularly interested to hear comments made by the Chairman of the Health Commission, Professor Andrews. He said that waiting times, although a very complex issue, could not be directly related to the Medicare issue, although I believe that he conceded that Medicare was responsible for a small increase.

I remind the House that at the time of the Estimates Committee proceedings the Chairman and the Minister both alleged that they did not know the extent of the waiting times involved. I remind honourable members of that, and I hope that that sinks in: they did not know what the waiting times were and so they were not in a position to tell members of the Committee that there were no waiting lists. Also, they had no previous statistics on which to provide comparisons—no previous bench-marks on which to hang an argument that the lists have not increased as a result of Medicare. Really they were not, and are not, in a position to dispute what the surgeons and the teaching hospitals are telling us. They must accept those figures, because they have no means of disputing them. The correct use of resources is not being made and priorities have not been sorted out correctly.

An influx of patients over and above what the hospital figures indicate is occurring. Those patients are coming from the 12 per cent that I mentioned earlier who left private health funds and who have sought treatment in the public sector only to end up on a waiting list for elective surgery in public hospitals. It is a serious problem out there and a reality. I also remind honourable members that it was the practising doctors who advised us about what the waiting lists are like and how they are expanding. Many patients cannot be treated because of the curfew hours that exist, to which I referred in Question Time. The curfew exists in regard to operating times in theatres because of the refusal of the South Australian Health Commission to allow any nursing overtime in the theatres which would thus allow doctors to operate outside the present curfew times.

I explained earlier in Question Time how the curfew begins at 5 o'clock. If any operation cannot be completed by 5 o'clock it is not performed, and the theatre closes down. They will not bring in additional staff which would allow the theatres to work after 5 o'clock. Taking the Queen Elizabeth Hospital as an example, and accepting that not

all of the 12 per cent that transferred from the private health area to the public health area will be knocking on the door of the hospital at the one time, but that perhaps 4 per cent (which is a figure to which the Minister and the Chairman of the Health Commission admitted) will seek admission into the hospital, any patients over and above that number who come to the hospital will be hidden on a waiting list. This is a serious point.

I also remind honourable members that only this week the Minister, in answering a question from the Hon. Dr Ritson, supplied a very incomplete answer. His reply has no historical basis of fact; there is no bench-mark in regard to comparisons with what occurred last year or the year before that. It highlights the gigantic waiting lists in many cases for beds in public hospitals, and that is becoming of scandalous proportions. The figures provided to Dr Ritson support the argument of the medical staff that the staff is unable to increase its throughput and boost the number of operations to reduce the waiting lists unless the Government removes the operating curfew time and provides extended nursing support for the operating theatres. The Government is causing the problem: it is not the doctors. It is the Government which has the ability to increase the utilisation of the theatres. The doctors are there and willing and happy to ensure maximum utilisation of those theatres. The Minister continues to claim that the figures indicate that the hospitals are not experiencing increasing patient care traffic due to Medicare. However, in that regard the Minister is wrong.

In regard to the health budget, it seems apparent that the State Government has completely failed to take into account any extra demand for public hospital services resulting from the influx of patients due to Medicare. Because of this, long delays in the provision of important medical care are occurring. The global health budget, as I said earlier this afternoon, is a standstill budget in the face of increasing demand. The Queen Elizabeth Hospital has even had its budget reduced in real terms. I remind honourable members that the Queen Elizabeth Hospital received this year a budget increase which was less than the expected inflation rate. In addition, it was fined—of all things—\$620 000 as a punishment for over-running its budget last year. The Minister will not admit to it, but some of the figures he used to justify the cuts, as I have said twice already today, are phoney figures and do not portray the true position.

The theatre curfew to which I keep referring, and which prevents doctors from operating after a certain time (in order to save staff overtime costs), gives the appearance of under-utilisation of theatres, whereas in some hospitals the theatres are not used because by regulation a doctor is not permitted to start an operation if it is likely to go beyond 5 o'clock. By regulation he is not permitted to operate, and I think that that is a disgrace. How on earth can we clear the backlog of operations, which in some cases are running two years behind, if a situation is allowed to continue, say at the RAH where the theatre is closed at 5 o'clock? If an operation is likely to finish after 5 o'clock it is not begun. Of course, if an operation is not performed that means that there could be a period of time from, say, 3.30 onwards when the theatre is not used, but other people cannot be brought off the waiting list at that stage at short notice and so no-one is brought in. I assume that everyone knocks off and goes home, which I think is an absolute scandal.

I think I have said enough about waiting lists. I hope that honourable members start to realise that we have a budgetary crisis on our hands in the standstill budget of the Health Commission. We have expanding waiting lists. We have a Government that has not thought through the whole question of the impact of Medicare. We have health professionals who are absolutely frustrated to their back teeth. They are

trying to do their job and working under extraordinary pressure to achieve those aims without any support from this Government—a Government which purports to have a health policy to return excellence to the health profession. Yet, in fact it is doing the contrary. In the few minutes I have available to me I refer briefly to the tourism Estimates Committee, in which I asked the Minister of Tourism this question regarding recreational fishing:

Is the Minister or his Department co-operating with the Department of Fisheries to declare more non-netting zones around the coast to assist recreational fishermen?

It is a subject dear to my heart. Any of us who have had shacks and the like around the coast can remember that 15 years ago one could go fishing at 6 a.m. or 7 a.m. and catch two or three dozen full market sized whiting, have them cleaned up, be back in at lunch time, have the boat washed down and get to the local hotel by 2 o'clock in the afternoon for a few beers.

It is now very difficult around the South Australian gulf coastline to do that. In fact, one can chase all day with a boat and a line and have very little success unless one knows where some of the holes are. Anyone interested in recreational boating and tourism knows that on many occasions tourists will take a small 12-ft dinghy along and stop at various points along the coast—Port Vincent, Port Hughes, Moonta and others—to do some fishing.

It is now almost impossible to go out and catch fish because of professional netting. Some individual fishermen know where to go and if any members in this House know where to go, I will go with them. However, I have had extraordinary difficulty in finding somewhere to go fishing where I can catch some fish, because the bays have been cleaned out by professional net fishermen.

I received a letter (which I presume other members received) from the Mayor (Mrs Baluch) and the Town Clerk (Mr McSparran) of Port Augusta. I refer to a couple of paragraphs in which the council says, *inter alia*, that the Cabinet will decide in the next few weeks what it will do about breeding grounds in the north of the gulf. The fishing grounds up there are being scoured out by nets and stock is not being replaced. The council is appealing for a ban on netting north of Douglas Bank or Mount Grainger. I totally support that and I would like to see it extended, because if we do not extend zones to prevent net fishing around the gulfs the recreational boater, the tourist who travels around with a caravan and a boat on the top of his car, will arrive at any of our extremely popular seaside resorts expecting to go out and catch a bag of fish only to find that it is cheaper to go to the local fish and chip shop.

That is the reality of the situation. We have had beaches at which in years gone by one could catch a bag of fish. One can no longer do that because the professional net fishermen have cleaned them out. I am not anti the fishing industry. We have a large gulf: surely zones can be created close inshore to allow amateur fishermen like myself and others to have a reasonable chance to catch half a dozen whiting or whatever they would like to catch. The professional netting industry has made it extraordinarily difficult for a person such as myself or other amateur fishermen to catch fish. The City of Port Augusta is on the right track in pursuing this matter and I ask Cabinet to give it a very sound hearing.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I must comment on the remarks of the member for Morphett, particularly in relation to Estimates Committee B on which I served. I point out to the members for Morphett and Murray (if the member for Morphett is unaware) that approaches were made to the member for Murray in the correctional services debate in Committee B to give the shadow spokesman 1½ hours free

run in asking questions of the Minister of Correctional Services. The direct response I got from him was, 'No way.' I have made quite clear since I came to this House in Opposition, and indeed in Government (and my colleagues are well aware of the fact), that I intended to question Ministers, whether I am in Opposition or in Government. I have done exactly that. When I was in Opposition I incurred the wrath of the then Premier because of the number of questions I asked. When I stand in this place and ask questions of the Minister in Estimates Committees I am also criticised. I make no apology for that.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: By whom?

Mr HAMILTON: The honourable member wants to listen and read the debate, because I will not go over that ground; it has already been stated. However, I have been criticised for asking questions of Ministers. If Opposition members want to do some research, they will see that many of these questions relate to matters of great interest to me, and particularly to my district. I will continue to ask questions on matters that I feel so strongly about.

It is a matter of fact and on the record that last year, after the Budget Estimates Committees, the member for Eyre complimented the member for Albert Park on the manner in which he questioned Ministers of his own Government. Indeed, the member for Mitcham has done exactly the same thing, recognising that I intended to ask such questions. I understand that he has told colleagues about the member for Albert Park, 'You know what he is like, he intends to question his own Ministers.' I have done that.

When we were elected to Government I told my colleagues that I intended to carry on that practice, and I will continue in that way. I will ask questions about what I and my district want to know. Whilst the member for Morphett might jest, he is rubbed up the wrong way because they ran out of time. His colleagues did the same thing when they were in Opposition with Dorothy Dixers.

I ask him not to stand there like a pious hypocrite, peddling this garbage, and saying, 'We are holier than thou.' Do not peddle that garbage to me. I know the political scene as well as he does. He wants to get on his bike and get out of here and do what he intended to do before I started speaking. However, while he is here I remind him of the insults that he cast upon the Director of Correctional Services. I asked a very serious question in terms of the Parole Board and its activities. I have had responses from the local branch of my Party and from constituents. Mr Dawes was half way through responding to a serious question I had asked and what did the member for Morphett do? It was an outrageous situation. He took a point of order on a public servant. Quite frankly, that is not on; it is an insult.

If the member for Morphett wants to have a go at the Minister, fair and well; I accept that. However, to have a go at a member of the Public Service who he knows damned well cannot respond is just not bloody cricket, to use a term. It is an insult to those people. If the member for Morphett has any semblance of decency he should apologise to Mr Dawes, either publicly or privately, for what he did. It is not fair. I remember that when we were in Opposition if one of our members had done that there would have been a hell of an outcry from the then Government members who now stand there laughing and jesting about it. However, it is an insult to those members of the Public Service who he knows damned well cannot respond in this place.

Another matter I consider equally important is the question of crime that was debated in the Parliament. It is very interesting to note the sorts of problems we are experiencing in South Australia in the incidence of crime, particularly break-ins and burglaries.

I refer to a matter that has concerned me recently. A very close friend of mine only yesterday morning telephoned me and said that her house had been broken into for the third time. This lady had just purchased a video recorder and was out of their house for only a short time, when it was broken into. Apart from personal belongings, the video recorder has been stolen. I refer to an article in the *ICA Bulletin* of May 1984, which states, in part, in terms of crime:

The 20 companies report a total of almost 6 000 claims against domestic policies in a period from 30 November last year to the end of February 1984, at an average cost of \$1 400 per claim.

No sooner had ICA's survey of the 20 member companies concluded, when the Victoria Police Force announced that 26 600 video cassette recorders valued at \$21.3 million had been stolen from Victorian homes since 1 January 1982. Very few of these VCR's—

that is, video cassette recorders—

(that's an average of 200 a week) are ever recovered according to police. And, while ICA and insurance companies have been trying to educate consumers for many years to record serial numbers of electrical appliances, the Victorian Police claim that only 16 000 of the 26 000 stolen VCR's had their serial numbers recorded. . . . Widespread publicity and education programmes would appear to have failed to curb the spiralling rate of burglary which insurers estimate will cost them more than \$150 million this year.

Burglary and theft claims now account for more than 40 per cent of all the domestic claims against the Commercial Union Assurance Company in Victoria and the losses represent some 75 per cent of all losses in that class.

Meanwhile NRMA Insurance in New South Wales reports the frequency of claims for VCR's has doubled in the past year, but of the \$4.12 million it paid out in burglary claims in the survey period, 40 to 50 per cent was to compensate for stolen jewellery.

The incidence and cost of burglary is a matter of grave concern to all of us in the community and the police are working flat out to try to solve this problem. I now refer to information, which I sought from the Minister and which states in part:

Victimology surveys conducted in Australia and overseas indicate that from 30 to 50 per cent of break and enter offences are not reported to police. Therefore, the trend in the incidence of reported crime can be influenced by both changes in the trend in the incidence of crime or by changes in victims' attitudes towards the reporting of crime. This has been highlighted by research conducted by the British Home Office which suggests that the increasing trend in crime reported to police in Britain may be due to an increasing propensity for the public to report crime and that the trend in the incidence of crime in that country has remained relatively stationary. . . . The preliminary estimate for 1983-84 indicates an increase of 16 per cent in the incidence of break and enter offences from 1982-83 to 1983-84. However, it is not known whether these trends are due to a change in the proportion of crime reported to police by victims or due to an actual change in the underlying crime trend.

The prevalence of break and enter offences is of concern to police and is being given consideration in the development of crime prevention strategies and priorities by the Department. The Department also recognises the critical role that the public has in enhancing the effectiveness of crime prevention activities. For example, in more than one-half of break and enter offences reported to police, the offender gained entry to the dwelling through an unlocked or open window or door. Therefore, the public can reduce the potential for an offence to occur by ensuring that security devices are adequate and put into effect. The crime alert campaigns conducted by police and the crime prevention programme developed by the Department have focused upon this issue. The importance of community involvement in crime prevention—

and this is very important—

has been emphasised in the Department's strategic plan for 1984. The concept of community policing is being developed as the basis for the future organisation of policing in this State, and will optimise the relationship between the communities and the police responsible for servicing those communities. The new Community Affairs and Crime Prevention Branch is a commitment to developing programmes and specific campaigns to promote public education and awareness of crime problems. The Department will adopt a co-ordination role in crime prevention which must have

the active participation of the community to effectively impact upon the current prevalence of crime.

I seek leave to insert in *Hansard* without reading it statistical information on breaking and entering offences reported to the police from 1973 to 1984. I can assure the Acting Chairman that it is purely statistical.

Leave granted.

Break and enter offences

Financial year	Reported Offences
1973-1974	6 318
1974-1975	6 456
1975-1976	6 413
1976-1977	6 649
1977-1978	7 329
1978-1979	9 055
1979-1980 ¹	12 550
1980-1981	11 502
1981-1982	10 365
1982-1983	11 517
1983-1984 P	13 720

P = preliminary estimate based upon the data for the first nine months of the financial year.

¹This increase is in part due to processing problems experienced during the latter part of the 1978-1979 financial year which resulted in some crime reports, relating to 1978-1979, being processed during the 1979-1980 financial year. The 1978-1979 data is correspondingly less than the actual level of reported crime.

Mr HAMILTON: I do not want to take up too much time of the House, but I think that it is very important to pursue this matter a little further. I refer to an article in the 16 October edition of the *News*. Headed 'Break-ins hit new peak', it states:

An alarming increase in burglaries in Australia will cost the insurance industry an estimated \$159 million this year in payouts, according to the Insurance Council of Australia . . . In South Australia, more than 8 000 burglary claims were made in 1979-80 at a cost to insurers of \$3 million. This increased in 1982-83 to 14 000 claims which cost \$18 million.

I know from speaking to members of the Police Force that it is interesting to hear the sort of problems we have in regard to video cassette recorders. Market research reveals that by 1985 one in every three households will own a video cassette recorder. Therefore, given the Victorian experience, one in every three households can expect to be broken into and a video recorder will be stolen. I am aware that professional criminals are knocking off these video recorders. One of the means by which they do it is to telephone and falsely pretend that they represent a particular video recorder servicing company.

They obtain those addresses, go around and knock on those doors, and, when the people are not home, they gain access and in a matter of a couple of minutes the video cassette recorders are taken. As an aside, I would ask that members of the public, and indeed the members of this House, if they see, when talking to their constituents, people walking around with suitcases to watch them very closely because one of the tactics that these professional burglars use is to carry an empty suitcase, break into a house, fill it up with cassette recorders and then leave the house. Most people think that they are a couple of nice people coming home off the train or heading off somewhere, but in actual fact they have been knocking off the local neighbourhood.

I would encourage members of the community, if they see anything suspicious at all in relation to their local neighbourhood or their neighbour's home, to ring the local police station to let them know. I feel sure that the local constabulary and indeed the Government would be most appreciative of the community's involvement in this crime prevention programme. Let us face facts: one way or another the community will pay for these costs, whether it is in terms of higher insurance premiums, costs in regard to

courts, keeping people in gaol, etc. I would hope that more and more people come to understand the problems being experienced in the community in terms of breaking and entering.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I am pleased to take part in this debate, although I do not intend to delay the House at any great length this afternoon. I am concerned about some matters that I wish to bring to the attention of the House. I believe that the committee system of handling the Appropriation measures is a good one, although it needs some refinements. It is unfortunate that certain Ministers deliberately filibustered, which did not do a great deal to assist the Committees. The Committees give members an opportunity to obtain information about the Appropriation Bill votes in relation to the programmes and plans of certain Government Departments. Earlier this afternoon I raised with the Premier the problems that people at Olympic Dam are having with this unruly group of protesters who are still camped outside the area. I understand that my colleague the Deputy Leader of the Opposition raised this matter last Tuesday and also received a quite unsatisfactory reply.

The situation has gone on for far too long. The Government has been spectacularly weak in this matter. The time has long since passed when the Government should have given the necessary direction to the police to remove this irresponsible group of people who are interfering with the civil liberties and rights of a group of hard-working, decent, South Australian citizens who are doing something useful. I want to know why this group of professional agitators and drop-outs who are occupying this area—most of whom, I understand, are on the dole—are allowed to permanently camp on Crown lands. Why have Commonwealth inspectors not been out to check whether those people are receiving the dole and, if they are, what job prospects are available there? I also want to know why the Minister of Community Welfare has not had his officers up there to inquire into the conditions under which a baby is being brought up there. I understand that the baby was born up there and is now 14 or 15 weeks old. The situation is unsatisfactory, to say the least.

I do not wish to say more at this stage, but I call on the Minister of Community Welfare to direct his officers to investigate whether the conditions under which the child is being brought up are considered to be adequate. I am not particularly concerned about the adults, but I am very concerned about the baby, as I have had complaints about the situation. The people of Olympic Dam have been very tolerant and understanding.

Mr Lewis: That is the permanent residents there, not these goofs?

Mr GUNN: Yes, and they have been under severe provocation with people knocking on caravans and creeping around with blackened faces and camouflaged uniforms. These people have deliberately set out to interrupt the lifestyle of the residents, who are only doing good. The time has come for the Premier to ask the police to arrest these characters, ship them out of the area and not allow them back again. It is absolute nonsense and complete weakness on behalf of the Government to idly sit by and allow people to continue to demonstrate. We all know that the majority of South Australian citizens support the Roxby Downs venture. If these people are opposed to it, they have the opportunity at the forthcoming Federal election and at the next State election to stand and oppose it and to let the people of the State judge.

The people have clearly spoken and the majority support it. The time has come to protect the taxpayers from having to shell out a lot of money—I believe close to \$1.6 million or \$1.7 million—to have the police on hand to protect the

demonstrators and maintain peace. It is a disgraceful set of circumstances. In a democracy people have the right to make their views known and to participate in the electoral process. However, it is obvious that these people would not win a seat. The majority of law abiding citizens should not have to pay taxes to allow this nonsense to continue.

Mr Plunkett: What about the 'bottom of the harbor' ones with the millions of dollars that they didn't have to pay in taxation? Do you agree your Federal colleagues shouldn't have gone on with that?

Mr GUNN: The member for Peake needs to read the last report of the Taxation Commissioner to see what he had to say. The report gives the lie to the sort of nonsense about which the honourable member and Mr Keating were going on about. We have not had a word from Mr Keating since the Commissioner released his report and gave the credit to Mr Howard for fixing that.

An honourable member: What has that got to do with it?

Mr GUNN: It has plenty to do with it.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Ferguson): Order!

Mr HAMILTON: On a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker, what relevance has this Federal issue to the recent State Budget Estimates Committees?

The ACTING SPEAKER: I do not accept the point of order, but I ask the honourable member not to reply to the interjections and to return to the debate.

Mr GUNN: I know that the matter strikes a raw nerve in the member for Albert Park, but I am not a bit concerned about the sort of idle interjections and chatter that occasionally flow from him or his colleagues. I like nothing better than a bit of a fight or box-on in this House, so he can interject as often as he likes. I have plenty of time to make the few comments that I wish to make on this matter. We know that most of the Labor Party members have been gagged and therefore cannot speak.

I raised the matter of the Roxby protesters because I am sick and tired of having the people living in my area interfered with and their civil liberties infringed by this group of professional drop-outs and by people who have no intention of getting a job. What is the situation in relation to the camp that was set up there? Are these people using marihuana? It has been suggested to me that they were, and I would like to know whether the police made any inquiries. I would also like to know the situation in relation to these irresponsible people who have been participating in this futile exercise in my electorate. I am amazed at the weak attitude of the Premier who went up there and said that these people are very naughty but that he cannot do anything about it. If this had taken place in Queensland these people would have been evicted and common sense would have prevailed.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

Mr GUNN: No, they would be arrested and removed because one is not supposed to live permanently on Crown lands. They cannot claim that they are not attempting to set up permanent residence, because one group lived for over 12 months very close to the Whenan shaft and the Government did not have the courage to have them shifted. Nobody else would be permitted to live there. One of the persons to whom I was referring was involved with the welfare of the baby.

I wish to refer briefly to one or two other matters, the first of which is the problem of isolated education. Unfortunately the Budget that we have just considered has not addressed itself greatly to the needs and problems facing isolated communities. I listened with great interest to the reply that the Minister gave to a Dorothy Dix question from a member on his side earlier today during Question Time. If those are the arrangements that he is going to make in the electorate of Mawson, those of us who have many

school buses and problems with getting children to school will expect the same sort of consideration and assistance, because the school bus system in South Australia is a massive undertaking. I appreciate that it is a difficult area to administer and that it is difficult to provide for all the requests of the citizens of this State. I will study carefully what the Minister had to say.

It is appropriate to circulate the Minister's answer to school councils, because I think that he will have a lot of requests in the near future. A few weeks ago I received a letter on behalf of the North-East branch of the Isolated Parents Association. The letter, which is headed 'Lack of secondary school teacher and facilities at Cockburn', is addressed to the Director-General but should have been to the Minister, states:

For some time now parents have been very concerned about the total lack of access to secondary school facilities in the Cockburn area. Currently some children are taking correspondence lessons. However, this has not been entirely satisfactory as some lack the motivation and supervision to apply themselves to such a method, and others obviously miss the stimulation of the social, sporting and artistic interaction of an ordinary high school environment.

I want to say from the outset for the benefit of the member for Peake, who would not know, that the South Australian Correspondence School is recognised as being the best correspondence school in the world, and it would be the first to admit that you cannot replace the classroom. The letter continues:

In brief, parents feel that these children are being deprived of the opportunity to have access to a secondary school, and the fact that Cockburn is so remote from the metropolitan and regional education centres accentuates their feeling of neglect. Consequently, at a recent meeting of the North-East branch of the Isolated Children's Parents Association at Mannahill, the following motion was carried: 'that this branch supports the principle of a daily school bus run from Cockburn to Broken Hill, due to the lack of educational opportunities for secondary school children in the Cockburn area.'

I want to see how the Minister deals with this matter, in view of the answer he gave the member for Mawson. He is looking after the needs of the Labor electorate of Mawson; I want to see whether the same attention is given to the needs of my constituents in the Cockburn area, and I intend to send these people the answer. The letter continues:

It was felt that a school bus would be a reasonable and appropriate option as it offered the children access to top class educational facilities in Broken Hill, at a reasonable cost to the Education Department of a school bus. (Next year there will be approximately 12 secondary students at Cockburn.) During this year these children have been fortunate enough to enjoy a small measure of high school life at the Willyama High School in Broken Hill due to the endeavours of Tim Williams—a teacher based at the Yunta Host School. Tim is our visiting or itinerant teacher, and he has taken the Cockburn students to Willyama on frequent occasions on an excursion type basis, as well as fulfilling his already heavy schedule of attending to the needs of the many isolated children in our area.

During last year a meeting was held at the Correspondence School concerning the Cockburn problem. Present were J. Coker, J. Connell of the Education Department, V. Stone, N. Mayfield of the Correspondence School, and D. Jones and T. Williams of the Yunta Host School. The meeting was inconclusive, and it is disappointing to note that no further action appears to have taken place, other than Tim Williams' initiative of regular excursions. We of the North-East branch of the IPA sincerely request that you give this matter your most serious consideration so that the secondary school students of Cockburn may have the opportunity of a regular and adequate education reinforced by all the sporting and recreational facilities to be found at a high school.

Of course, there is also the problem in other parts of my district where a number of students from Coober Pedy attend the high school at Alice Springs. They are fortunate to be able to use the facilities of the Uniting Church St Philip's School, which is a boarding school. I understand that it is a good set up, and I believe it is the sort of exercise in which the State Education Department ought to be involved. I am not advocating for one minute that the State

Government should establish a hostel, but it ought to be encouraging one of the religious groups to become involved in establishing a hostel even if the Government had to pay virtually the full amount of its establishment. This system is working successfully in Alice Springs, and the parents who have sent their children there have nothing but praise for it. I believe that it is an area to which we should give close attention, and I hope that the Minister will pay attention to this in the near future. I also hope that the Minister will attend to the needs of the schoolchildren in the Olary and Cockburn areas.

I was rather disappointed to read in the August edition of the Labor Party rag, the *Herald*, an attack made by the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs on members of this side of the House. The article states:

A campaign of racism over land rights has been launched as a cheap electioneering trick by the conservative Parties.

That is a disgraceful attack to make. Those on this side of the House make no apology for attempting quite properly to amend the Maralinga land rights legislation. That is the right of all members of Parliament, and it is a right that should not be resiled from. What we attempted to do was make the legislation more effective and not unduly raise the expectations of the Aboriginal communities.

I believe one of the greatest confidence tricks that has ever been pulled to deprive people is being pulled now on the Aboriginal people of this nation where they are being led to believe that they can have all these rights that the rest of the community is not entitled to. If anyone thinks the legislation that currently operates in the Northern Territory or certain provisions of the Pitjantjatjara land rights legislation will stand the test of time, they are kicking reality in the face, because they will not stand the test of time. Unfortunately, the average person does not understand that an Aboriginal person who comes from the South-East is not even entitled to go to the Pitjantjatjara lands without a permit, and most people do not understand the full consequences of the legislation.

The whole problem is that a group of political activists have got in with the Aboriginal people and are endeavouring to exploit the situation, some of them for their own gain. Look at what has happened at Yalata, where unfortunately there has been a complete break-down in the administration and many of those activists who did everything they possibly could—

Ms Lenehan interjecting:

Mr GUNN: If the honourable member listens for a moment she might learn something. She cannot tell me anything about Yalata. I have been there many times, and I go there regularly. The whole problem at Yalata is that many of those activists who have caused the problem were keen to get rid of people such as Barry Lindner. They even took out injunctions to try to stop him from going back there, and when he did go back he was welcomed with open arms by the community. The people to whom I refer are the ones who set out to undermine the authority. They are the people who set out to get rid of anyone who has a genuine understanding there. Now there is the most unfortunate situation of a complete break-down, and the people to be pitied are the residents of that area, but the time has come for some firm guidelines to be laid down.

I do not know how many members have visited Yalata. If they have they will know that most of the windows on the buildings have double screens and grilles. They would also know what the school and the hospital look like. It is all very well to have a conference but what the Minister has to do is make sure that he puts in charge of those areas people who have an understanding of the areas and who are prepared to make a few tough decisions, because there ought to be strong guidelines given in those areas. Unfor-

tunately, people have been there who have not understood the situation and, to put it mildly, it has been most difficult. It is all very well for the Government to say that it has passed legislation that will prohibit alcohol at Yalata but that will only shift the problem to the nearest town. I am worried about it being shifted into Ceduna, and that will not solve anything.

Mr Hamilton: What's the answer then?

Mr GUNN: Just a minute. Some have been forced from time to time, on the floor of this House, to defend people such as Mr Lindner against the most scurrilous attacks which were made on him, people who have given the best part of their lives to the Aboriginal people and who have had a genuine concern for them. The answer to these problems is that there is no easy answer, and it will be a long-term solution. We will have to attempt to find something constructive for them to do.

Mr Hamilton: What would you suggest?

Mr GUNN: There is the old station at Colona which could be developed to its fullest potential. It could run a lot of sheep but there have been problems there. We have to endeavour to find programmes which will occupy the young people, and what I am really concerned about is having large numbers of young Aboriginal people with nothing to do.

Mr Hamilton: What sort of problems?

Mr GUNN: They will have to be taught to get involved in areas of work on which they are keen. It always amazes me that we have not made a serious attempt to get them to learn to shear and do work of that nature. We will also have to endeavour to point out the problems associated with drugs, alcohol and petrol sniffing.

If people think the problems will be overcome by passing laws in this Parliament, that will not happen. The people have been handed back the land at Maralinga, and the only way they will achieve economic independence is by allowing adequate exploration to occur there, and then there may be some jobs available for them. However, people are not allowed on those lands to explore. I am most concerned at what is taking place at Yalata and other parts of the State. Not a great deal will be achieved by the Minister continually attacking members on this side because they hold views contrary to his own—that is a very narrow point of view and quite irresponsible. If he wants to stir up this issue we are quite happy to accommodate him, but it will not do anything for the Aborigines or the people of this State.

I sincerely hope that the Government is prepared to address itself to the problems that it has caused with the tow truck regulations. This matter has gone on for too long. I would be interested to know from the Minister whether the South Australian Motor Garage is permitted to tow Government motor vehicles. It has been put to me that the regulations as currently drafted preclude the Government Motor Garage from using its tow truck to pick up Government vehicles that have broken down.

The Hon. Michael Wilson interjecting:

Mr GUNN: In the case of accidents, I understand that it is prevented from doing so and that people have been told, when they telephone the Government Motor Garage, that they have to telephone the police and get a rostered vehicle sent to pull the vehicle back to the Government Garage. They are these brilliant regulations currently in force! I know what has happened—the Government has itself locked in, because certain people in the department have got themselves so deeply involved that reason and common sense have gone out the window and the Minister himself is locked in with those people. It is time that he took some steps back and looked very closely at these regulations. There are a number of other problems. If anyone reads the evidence that has been tabled over this lengthy and unfor-

tunate debate, they will see that common sense certainly has not applied.

Another matter concerning transport is that I sincerely hope the Minister has dropped his absolutely stupid proposition which he put forward to reduce the speed limit from 110 to 100 km/h—an absolutely ludicrous proposition. I hope that the public rejection of this proposal will be enough to make the Minister forget about it once and for all. I believe the speed limit should be increased to at least 120 km/h on major highways in South Australia because that would be more in keeping with reality. All that will happen if the speed limit is reduced is that more law abiding citizens will be issued with tickets, because people will ignore it. The overwhelming majority of people living in my electorate totally opposed to a reduction in the speed limit.

To conclude, I sincerely hope that the Minister of Water Resources does something about the problems of the uneconomic water schemes which I have continually brought to his attention. I am most concerned that a start be made on some of these projects. Finally, I sincerely hope that the Minister of Community Welfare will have his officers go to Olympic Dam and investigate the conditions under which that baby is being brought up at the protest site.

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): The comment was made by the previous speaker that the Estimates Committee system is very good, and I agree: it is a very good system, and we should certainly keep it. Indeed, I do not think there are any plans to change it. However, the problem is how one gets on the Committee in the first place. I have been here five years and I have complained every time after the Committee has operated about the lack of access.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: When we were in Government we treated you well.

Mr PETERSON: You did not let me on the Committee, though. Perhaps I ought to ask the Opposition whether it will let me be one of its representatives—that is the only way that I will get on. However, the system is good. The interesting thing about the Appropriation Bill debate is the great diversity of matters covered. It is one of the more interesting sessions in our Parliament. I was a little hurt to hear the member for Albert Park criticised for asking questions—that is a pretty poor act and it is not to be supported in any way. That is the purpose of this place, to ask questions—not controversial ones but pointed questions and I have a couple for this afternoon.

The first matter I wish to cover is the container trade for South Australia. Over the years we have been made aware of the efforts of the Department of Marine and Harbors in this State to obtain the Japanese and Korean shipments through our port at No. 6 berth at Outer Harbor. In this week's edition of the *Daily Commercial News* an article states that Victoria clearly defined and stated that it would retain the container trade from South Australia. The article clearly shows the very ruthless and bloody-minded attitude of the people interstate who are determined to prevent the trade from coming to South Australia.

I first raised this matter on 15 September 1983, when I asked a question of the Minister about his awareness of a rebate system that was in place in Victoria, where there was a combination of the Victorian Port Authority, the Victorian Railways and the Australian National Railways to provide a \$90-odd rebate to ship owners using that port.

Mr Ashenden: Did you get an answer?

Mr PETERSON: I got an affirmative answer 'Yes,'—that was so. I have since been informed that the efforts of the Department of Marine and Harbors and people involved in the shipping industry in this State have been increased and that they were very hopeful of obtaining that trade.

However, this week's *Daily Commercial News* puts that to rest. Under the heading 'Melbourne maintained as premier box port,' it states:

Japanese and Korean shipping interests have recognised [I stress that] the port of Melbourne as South Eastern Australia's premier container port, the Minister of Transport, Mr Steve Crabb, announced yesterday. Mr Crabb said ship owners in the Australian Northbound Shipping Conference—Japan and Korea Section—have agreed to continue centralising all Victorian and South Australian containers through the port of Melbourne.

'Clearly the Conference recognises the port of Melbourne as the major container port for South-Eastern Australia', Mr Crabb said. Mr Crabb said a new transshipment rate has been struck between the container terminals, rail authorities and the conference, reflecting the significance of the conference as the port's largest transshipment customer.

I again stress that the rebate system applies in Victoria through co-operation between the Australian National Railways, the Victorian Port Authority and other bodies to provide that financial rebate. I still have not been convinced to this day that that is not in contravention of the Federal Act; in fact I still think it is. The article continues:

'More than 12 000 containers are handled through the port on this service,' Mr Crabb said.

The vast majority of those 12 000 containers come to the port of Adelaide, but money that could be earned due to this cargo coming across our wharves originally is being lost to Victoria. They are paying money to get that trade. They are offering a rebate. The article continues:

Mr Crabb's comments have come after Japanese and Korean shipping interests confirmed agreements which arose from meetings held in Japan earlier this year with Mr Crabb.

We have also had representatives in Japan on several occasions, of which I am aware, and each time they have come away with some idea that we might be getting somewhere, but that has not been the case. The article continues:

During Mr Crabb's visit issues discussed included the economic advantages of using the port of Melbourne, new State Government initiatives in transport—

that is referring to the Victorian State Government—in particular, seaports, and the State Government's push to make Melbourne the 'commercial centre of Australia'.

We are all aware of the parochialism that exists in Victoria and Melbourne, and again this point stresses how hard they will work to keep that trade. The article continues as follows:

Mr Crabb said importers and exporters realise that extending the service to ports other than the port of Melbourne would have meant additional charges.

That is true. There is no doubt that, by bringing a ship past Melbourne to Adelaide, it involves additional charges; for instance, there is steaming time and also the duplication of port charges. The article continues:

By using other ports, shipping lines would have incurred higher operational costs, increased port and tug charges and an increase in voyage port delays, all of which reduce the earning capacity of vessels.

'Another significant issue was that land haul employment would have been lost and replaced by predominantly non-Australian labour used on overseas shipping lines vessels,' Mr Crabb said.

That is not quite right, because some of the ships in the Japanese trade are Australian manned. The Eastern Searoad Services ships are manned by Australian seamen. Of course, the other side of the coin is that there are people working on the land-based side of things, for instance railway and train operators, involving shunting and this type of thing, but we must weigh that against the advantages that would accrue to South Australia of getting the trade here. The article continues as follows:

Mr Crabb said the container conference believes it provides the most cost-efficient service by using the port of Melbourne. Direct calls to other ports in the south-eastern region of Australia would also have represented a drop in service frequencies which, in the case of exporters, would have restricted opportunities to compete in Japanese and Korean markets.

A point that has been made over the years is that frequency would be interrupted, but I do not think that that is a viable argument, because importers would still have the option of shipping through Melbourne if required in the case of non-regular services to Adelaide. However, I think that a regular shipping service to Adelaide would provide a better service. This must put into question the installation of the new crane. One of the main purposes of that installation—

Mr Plunkett: It has been approved.

Mr PETERSON: I know that it has been approved. However, we must be careful that we have work for that crane. I realise that a two-crane operation will make the terminal more efficient, but part of the reason for the installation was to provide an attractive proposition to the Japanese. I am aware of efforts made over many years by the Department of Marine and Harbors, but unfortunately I still cannot see an answer to the question of providing a financial benefit, as is provided in Victoria.

The lack of anticipation of an increase in shipping has also affected our port works. There is a great deal of concern in the Port Adelaide Department of Marine and Harbors dockyards about the decreasing level of work. I know that the Minister is aware of it. A question was asked today about the deepening section—a problem exists there in having to remove a shift. I have spoken to the Minister on this matter and I hope that he can find some answer to the problem.

A while ago I heard an interjection about submarines. Whenever the matter of submarines is raised in this place. Opposition members always ask about nuclear or diesel submarines. Interjectors always ask about why there should not be nuclear submarines, and why they are diesel.

Mr Ferguson: What do you say about it?

Mr PETERSON: Only today I received a copy of the October 1984 edition of the *Johnny Green's Journal*, put out by the South Australian Chamber of Mines, in which there is an article on submarines.

Mr Plunkett interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: I like the magazine; I think it is a great journal. I want to use that article as a reference in bringing to a head the difference between nuclear and diesel submarines.

Mr Ferguson: Do we have nuclear?

Mr PETERSON: It is nice to have interest in this subject. There is room in the system for both, and that is the point that I want to make to the House today. I hope my comments will lay to rest the constant interjections made in this House about nuclear submarines. There is a place for them, absolutely, and I hope that my reference to this article in *Johnny Green's Journal* may help to clarify the situation for the doubters amongst us. The article is entitled, 'The Submarine Debate' and is by Commander E.A. Woodward, DSO^{xx}. The article contains a short profile on Commander Woodward. I shall read that to show that he is not just a Johnny-come-lately, or that he does not know what he is talking about.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: I have to establish the credibility of the person. The profile states:

Commander Edward Woodward D.S.O.^{xx}, F.I. Nuc.E., Royal Navy (Retd.), joined Submarines in 1931 and was in command of H.M. Submarines *H.28*, *Unbeaten* and *Tactician* in home waters, the Atlantic and the Mediterranean during World War II. He carried out 32 patrols and is credited with a number of sinkings for which he was awarded the Distinguished Service Order three times.

For the last year of the war he was the Commanding Officer of the commanding officers qualifying courses, training officers ashore and at sea and examining them before they were accepted to command a submarine.

After retiring from the Royal Navy he worked with a design team on nuclear submarines and was made a member of the

Institution of Nuclear Engineers. He is now a fellow of that Institution.

Therefore, one must accept that Commander Woodward knows a little bit about submarines. However, I now want to get to the nub of the debate and to set the scene a little in responding to the questions and queries that have arisen in relation to submarines. The article states (at page 17 of the journal):

Nuclear submarines are about four times as expensive as diesel submarines, something like \$400 million as opposed to \$100 million.

As things are at present it is unlikely that the Australian Navy will be called upon to operate thousands of miles away from our own shores. It is our country we must defend and our submarines would have to be deployed to intercept any expected approach by enemy forces. With the back-up of over-the-horizon radar and the RAAF, it is hoped that our submarines would be able to manoeuvre into defensive deterrent positions to intercept any forces approaching our coastline, huge as it is. This would be done with an up-to-date diesel-electric submarine fleet.

That is the first time that I have mentioned submarines in this place and made a point about diesel submarines when there has not been an interjection from the Opposition.

Mr Becker: Are they going to be built in South Australia?

Mr PETERSON: I will get to that in a moment and I will also refer to nuclear submarines later. The article continues:

Being smaller, cheaper, quicker and easier to build than a nuclear submarine, with a requirement of only about half the number of crew to man her, the diesel-electric submarine is, as things are today, a more practical vehicle for surveillance and reconnaissance, particularly close inshore and in shallow waters. She is also an easier and more economic training vessel, not only for initial training in handling and operating but, more importantly, as a practice target for anti-submarine vessels and aircraft.

The article then refers to other related aspects. However, to satisfy the pro-nuclear people I will read the following section again:

So at this moment we should go ahead and build, say, six diesel-electric submarines as soon as possible, planning to start on the production of nuclear powered submarines in the near future, and then continue with a progressive programme of nuclear submarines with a small contingent of diesel-electric boats to back them up.

That should lay to rest at last the debate about one or the other, because there is a man qualified and as experienced as anyone in this country in submarine saying we should have both types and we should start with diesel electrics, which we have done.

If I were to listen to interjections, I would hear somebody say, 'What about their construction?' We will not argue about that. Everyone in this place knows it should be built here. I heard someone say earlier today that it would be spread. Unfortunately, I believe that that is right. My feeling (and that of people to whom I have spoken around South Australia) is that we will not get the whole project. I hope that I am wrong. Unfortunately, I feel that we will not get it: I think it will be spread around the place. An article headed 'Wran in poll "defeat"' in today's *News*, states:

Labor would have been defeated in an election in New South Wales last month.

Unfortunately, that is the sort of factor that will control and dictate where submarines will be built. I tip now that the bulk of them will be built in Newcastle, New South Wales.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: With all the problems.

Mr PETERSON: I said Newcastle; people do not listen to what one says in this place. I did not say Garden Island or Cockatoo Dock—I said Newcastle. I hope that I am wrong. It is not often in this place that we say things about which we hope we are wrong, but I feel deeply about that. I hope that it is South Australia, because I believe that with all our advantages we should get it, and as a State we need it. I turn now to a local project with which I am involved,

to show the resilience of local industry if it is given a bit of a go.

An honourable member: Meals on Wheels?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PETERSON: No. This project has been brought about by an industry coming together—marine contractors. In May 1983 they formed themselves into an association after finding that they were losing out badly on State contracts. They wanted to be recognised as an industry in this State. Since then the members of that association have come together and formed a company to pool their expertise. They have called it Hi-Tech Marine Pty Ltd. Either by luck or judgment it is at Snowdens Beach on the Port River in the Semaphore District. They could not have picked a better district.

This firm has been expanded to involve the Marlestone Technical College. A senior lecturer there (Mr Ray Cauci) and a senior team of apprentices have developed a design for a 12 metre alloy work vessel. They designed, planned, lofted, drew it up, and Hi-Tech Marine has provided them free of charge with the facility and materials from which they have to construct this vessel. It is a hands on training project for those lads, many of whom would never have the experience of working in this material or constructing a vessel in this way.

As in most trades, apprentices tend to stay within a fairly clearly defined area of his trade and does not get the skill and ability to work in other areas. This project has given these lads an opportunity to work in alloy. That vessel is now framed up and they have started to plate it. I invite any member of this place to go there and look at that vessel and see those apprentices working. A combination of factors has come together to make a great project. This has given those lads experience that they would never have had and it will provide this State with a vessel that may be a very good marketing medium for the crayfish or fast vessel trade around Australia.

For too many years we have dragged behind other States in trying to get this work. We are now showing that we can do it. The material they are using is the same as that from which the *South Australia* is being built. We could have built that boat here. As I said, any member who would like to see this project and speak to those at Hi-Tech or the instructor (Mr Cauci) about it would certainly be welcome to do so. The project shows that industry in this State is resilient and moves if given a chance. Fortunately, they managed to get funding through private industry, which is prepared to take a risk on it. But, whatever they do, they will end up with a vessel, but it is still a risk, because the vessel must be acceptable to the market. It is a great vessel, and those people deserve all the support that they can get. On 11 September I was invited there to an open night for the apprentices working on the project. Parents, representatives from the trade and the Department of Marine and Harbors inspected the site and the vessel, which was well received.

I now wish to raise a couple of other small points relating to education. I say 'small' not in the sense that these matters are insignificant, but because they do not show up in budgets and are not likely to stop the State. However, I have received recently a number of letters from educational facilities. One that I received today came from people who are concerned about the closure of literacy classes. We do not think about that subject very much; we tend to forget about people who cannot read and write. However, there is a documented need for literacy classes. The well written letters were clearly and neatly expressed. It will be sad if we remove that facility which enables people to learn how to use the English language.

I received a letter about another education matter from the Le Fevre Peninsula Primary School. It states:

The staff of this school has been dismayed to find that services provided by the Education Section of the Art Gallery are under threat because of a reduction in the number of seconded teachers working there. Our school, which is a priority project school, has used the services of these teachers extensively in an effort to introduce the children to the Gallery and the variety and impact of the travelling art exhibition to widen the experiences of the children in the arts. We have found all the services to be of the highest quality and the co-operation received by us from the staff has been exemplary. All children, except the youngest, have been to visit the Gallery or seen the Outlook Exhibition at least twice in the last two years. These visits and trips have unanimous staff approval for their educational worth.

We feel that the children of our school will be deprived of a wonderful service and their educational development further disadvantaged if this resource is reduced purely as a cost cutting exercise. We would respectfully ask that you, in your position as member of Parliament, do all in your power to make inquiries to see that this service will not be lessened by reducing the staff of the Education Section of the Art Gallery. We trust that you may be able to help right what we see as an erosion of educational services to the children of this State.

Again, that is a small matter overall and people, generally, would not take much notice of it. However, it is important that students and young people have access to these things to enable them to broaden their appreciation and to be aware of what is going on.

I refer to another matter regarding education, and I am being very parochial, because it involves a school in my electorate. I refer to the Largs Bay school, where a new section was built which was outstanding and which was very well done except for one thing: the ventilation. I know that the ventilation in schools is a matter that is raised every summer by schools with problems. In this case it was raised during the construction of the new wing and involved the windows that were there. As I understand it, the matter was ignored at the time and members of the school since then have worked to have the matter corrected. They have done this in two ways.

First, they asked for a survey to be carried out, and I understand that it took a considerable time to complete (some 18 months). However, in my opinion, it really has not come up with an answer, and I hope that the Minister or someone in his Department will consider that matter again. Secondly, \$4 753 has been spent on blinds and other materials in an attempt to cool down the rooms. As has been put to me, that money would have been far better spent on some educational aid such as computers. Every day one hears about computers taking over and how it will affect our lives, but unfortunately all schools do not have them. The school having spent about \$5 000 to put blinds on the windows to keep the sun out and to try to keep the rooms practical for the children to work in, it seems to me that that could have been overcome in another way, but that is a problem still to be solved. I refer to the closing sentence of a letter received, as follows:

If the problem is not addressed before the onset of hot weather the school council will be forced to consider the prospect of withdrawing children and teachers from the area concerned.

They must consider the matter as serious. People do not write letters like that, get upset, take the trouble to see their member of Parliament or write to Ministers or anyone else unless they are seriously concerned. It seems to me that this problem may have a simple solution through ventilation of the ceiling, but that does not seem to have been broached in any of the reports or letters on the file. However, I hope that this problem is taken up by the people concerned and that they can see their way clear to reviewing it again. As I have said, this is a very interesting part of the processes of Parliament. It has been a pleasure to participate, and I appreciate the opportunity that Parliament gives members in this respect.

Mr Lewis: You're not leaving?

Mr PETERSON: No, I am not leaving. I appreciate the forum provided to air problems in my electorate, as well as gaining access to Ministers to tackle problems and try to correct them. It is still my belief that this should be an open forum; I try to bring matters fairly to the attention of the Ministers concerned and the House, and I must say that in general terms I have had good treatment. However, the only other problem is that once again I must complain about the Estimates Committees. As I said, I have been here for five years and so far I have not been on one Committee officially.

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

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Community Welfare): I move:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 5 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): It must be nearly two years since we have heard that election slogan 'We want South Australia to win.' Members opposite know exactly what I mean when I say that, although I wonder whether the people of South Australia knew what they would win when they voted in a Labor Government at the last election. We all know now what we have won, and I would like to remind the House of what has happened since the time this deceitful Government came to office. As the member for Price, who is leaving the Chamber, has quite properly anticipated, I will talk about the taxes and charges that have been increased and introduced—measures that we were promised we would never get in any circumstances during the first term of this Government, which will be the only term it will ever get; there will not be another one.

So often the Government made that promise; it gave that undertaking, and it leaves the Premier utterly discredited. Never has a Premier made more dishonourable and dishonest statements, knowing full well that when he got into office he would break his promises—that he would have to break them, as he did not have the power to do otherwise. His Ministers do not have control of their departments, and he does not have control of his Ministers. The kinds of spending programmes upon which the Government has embarked were not properly costed before they were undertaken, and consequently it has been necessary to try to balance the budget in a respectable fashion and at the same time con the people of South Australia into believing that the taxes and charges had to be introduced and increased because of some maladministration of the previous Government.

However, the Premier has never answered the Leader of the Opposition's questions about the amount of funds in the Treasury as at the time of the election two years ago, my Leader (and the next Premier of this State) clearly having placed on the record the real situation. The fact that the Premier knew how much money he had to raise by increasing taxes and charges to cover the alleged deficit has well and truly been raised since he came to office.

So, why on earth has it been necessary for those same taxes to remain, additional taxes to be introduced, and charges to continue rising? It would be almost believable if—and only if—the charges had been introduced in the first year to cover the so-called deficit that the Premier claimed he found in the Treasury. However, it lacks any credibility and plausibility whatsoever for the taxes and charges to go on increasing as they have consistently and continually done since the Labor Party won office.

So, when I go to people in my electorate asking them, as I usually do and as most Australians usually do, 'How's it going, mate?' I have learned now to be fairly cautious and

to stand back a little because of the tirade of abuse that I get, directed not at me but at the Government and Parliament for what has happened in the past two years with the tax burden they have to carry which has increased enormously in recent times. Initially, when a Labor Government was elected those people more or less expected it, but it has continued to escalate and there seems to be no relief in sight. What is more, it seems that, unlike Premier Bannon, the Federal Government's Senator Button is at least prepared to admit what Prime Minister Hawke is not prepared to admit about their intentions if they are re-elected. Hawke did not have the guts to state straight out that he intended to increase taxes and charges.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Chair does not want to continually pull up the member for Mallee, but this Bill deals with State finances and has nothing to do with what Bob Hawke or anyone else is likely to do or what anyone expects him to do. I ask the honourable member to come back to the State's finances. The honourable member for Mallee.

Mr LEWIS: I thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker, for your direction. I regret that the State Labor Party does not have the same measure of honesty that the Federal Labor Party seems prepared to illustrate—it is prepared to admit that it is going to increase taxes.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has already directed that the honourable member will come back to the State Budget and not comment on anything to do with the Federal situation.

Mr LEWIS: In keeping with your direction, Mr Deputy Speaker, I seek your leave and that of the House to incorporate in *Hansard* what I assure the House are purely statistical tables illustrating increased taxes, fees and charges that have occurred between 20 November 1982 and the present.

Leave granted.

Leave subsequently withdrawn.

(Table later inserted at pp. 1510-1 of *Hansard*, following Speaker's ruling at pp. 1509-10.)

Mr LEWIS: The first table is dated 20 November and shows that electricity tariffs increased by an average of 12 per cent from 1 December 1982. So they go on from there. The most recent increase, as a matter of interest, was on 11 October when licence fees under the Dairy Industry Act were increased by between 50 and 400 per cent. That increase will have a considerable impact on the kinds of fees that the people in my electorate will have to pay.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: When did they last go up?

Mr LEWIS: They last went up in August 1974. I do not understand why it is necessary to increase licence fees when no service whatever relating to the collection of these fees is provided to the people who pay them. The Minister of Community Welfare and the member for Florey may giggle, but I ask them to face the reality that they are literally harvesting revenue without any moral justification and slugging people just because they have money to pay. Members opposite think it is funny.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: What is the maximum fee you are talking about?

Mr LEWIS: What does it matter? The principle of the situation is what we are referring to. The Government has placed South Australia in the awful, invidious position of being the highest taxed State in the Commonwealth.

Mr Gregory: What is the basis of that statement?

Mr LEWIS: I point out to the member for Florey—who is sitting on the front bench in the Premier's position (and that, in mirror image form, is a real portent of the situation that will exist after the next election)—that he should address his attention to the tables that I have just had incorporated in *Hansard* in which he will see the increase in fees relating to premises. I remind him that the fees have gone up from

50 to 400 per cent with no increase in the service provided whatever, because there is no service.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: How much are they?

Mr LEWIS: An increase of 50 to 400 per cent has occurred since the fees were introduced. How tragic that the Minister does not know the business of the very Government of which he is a part! I now refer to the problems I experienced during the course of the discussions in the Estimates Committees as they relate to the people I represent. I was a member of the Estimates Committee on health and, like other members of this House, deplored the behaviour, bad manners and disrespect that the Minister of Health, the Hon. Dr Cornwall, displayed to the Committee in his usual arrogant fashion. He insulted members of the Committee and erroneously attempted to take points of order during the course of the proceedings of the Committee.

As a consequence, and in company with his unnecessarily extended answers, he wasted so much time that it was not possible for me to ask him a question that I now intend to place on the record for him to answer; namely, why will he not, as Minister of Health, permit the Health Commission to provide public ward accommodation beds for Medicare patients in the Keith Hospital? There is no hospital for miles around Keith. It is a hospital that was constructed by and at the expense of the residents of that community. They worked not just for hours or thousands of hours but for years as a community to get the funds together to build that hospital, and to make extensions to it over the years.

Some 10 or 12 years ago, when they were first tempted to join the ranks of other public hospitals during the Whitlam years, they chose not to do so. They stood out and decided to go on running the hospital as a commercial, efficient and self sufficient enterprise. I see no reason why they should not have done that. In fact, they are now a real thorn in the side of the Minister who is always blowing it—Dr Blewett. He does not want to see that hospital survive in its current form. Indeed, he wants it to become a deficit funded public hospital like all other community hospitals around South Australia, as does the Hon. John Cornwall, Minister of Health. Accordingly, they refuse to provide any public ward accommodation beds under contract to the Keith Hospital in a way that would enable that hospital to provide accommodation for residents of Keith who have already paid their compulsory 1 per cent levy on their income and should therefore be entitled to have access to a Medicare bed in their local hospital.

It is not as though the Keith community hospital ever distributes dividends to members of the community. It has always used its funds for the purpose of maintaining its premises and the standard of its service. Over the years some of those funds have been deliberately allocated to write off what accountants euphemistically call 'bad debts'. In a compassionate fashion, the Hospital Board has responsibly waived the bills of people who, by some misadventure, have become ill and who, by an equal misadventure, have been unable to afford private medical insurance and therefore have not had the funds to meet the cost of their hospitalisation. No questions are asked by the Board. As it knows the people involved, the matter is handled with dignity and respect. The Board waives the bill, which is written off as a bad debt. Nonetheless, its generosity to that extent—like no deficit-funded hospital can be generous—means that it has provided a service to the people who have been taken ill in that community over many years at no expense to the taxpayer because it has remained a private hospital for purposes of a legal definition. It belongs to the Keith community.

Why on earth the Minister cannot provide beds in that hospital for people who fall ill who are not members of a health fund, but who must pay the 1 per cent levy on their

income, is beyond me. It costs the Health Commission more to provide those beds days in hospitals in metropolitan Adelaide than it does to provide them in the Keith hospital. It costs more to provide bed days in hospitals in rural regional centres such as Mount Gambier or Murray Bridge than it does to provide those bed days in the Keith hospital. Their pigheaded bloody-minded Minister will not allow sufficient publicly funded beds to be provided in that hospital, if any beds at all. He is insisting that they come to heel, give up their status and become a public hospital—and deficit funded at that—under the terms of the Act. He is insisting in increasing the cost of providing health care in this State and in this nation by that action, and that is grossly irresponsible.

It is not only grossly irresponsible in a politically moral sense but it is also grossly irresponsible in the way in which it treats the people in the Keith community, because they find, if they become ill and do not now have private medical insurance, they cannot go to their community hospital. The family unit is broken up to the extent that, those families already of limited means (the working poor, I think, is the expression used by the Hon. Dr Cornwall during the course of the Estimates Committees to describe such people: they are his words not mine), cannot afford to visit their sick family member in a hospital located outside their community; so the person is left quite callously to languish in a publicly funded hospital bed somewhere else, out of reach of friends and relatives, away from the community in which he or she probably grew up and lived for several years and away from the hospital to which he or she has made a contribution (in all probability) as a member of that community to raise the funds necessary to establish it in the first place.

I want to turn to an entirely different matter, and that is the question of the Mypolonga Primary School. The Minister on the bench was the Minister in Estimates Committee A who answered a question put to him by my colleague, the member for Davenport, about that debacle. I want to introduce my remarks by referring to a letter which I received subsequent to the explanation given by the Minister. I want to warn the Minister, quite simply and forthrightly at the outset, before reading the letter, that he ought to go back to his Department and tell them that he wants the truth, not the concoction they have ostensibly given him and from which he quoted at length in the Estimates Committee. The relevant part of the letter states:

Thank you for your support of . . .

the teacher at the Mypolonga Primary School, who is a relative of the writer—

over the Mypolonga school episode. I was disgusted to read the report in the *Advertiser* that 'Minister denies etc....'. If a little more investigation was carried out in the PBD alone, enough money could be saved to employ quite a lot more people. Everyone to whom I have spoken has some tale of gross wastage in that area. Some time ago, two men came to install a new tank—

the community is Narrung, and I am willing to give the Minister details of this incident if he wants them—

they were lacking one small fitting. As you know, being in an irrigation area, our local storekeeper kept a good stock of pipe fittings, but they did not inquire there. They took the truck to Murray Bridge—not even Meningie—and spent the whole afternoon doing so. At Mypolonga, the fellow in charge threatened—

the person who is a relative of the writer and who works at the school as a teacher—

that he would call in the police if she did not keep fellows from 'snooping' around his workmen's area. The 'snooper' was the lecturer from a teachers college, in charge of two students at the school! He had merely asked to look at what was being done. I believe the Minister would best serve our State by listening to protests such as that, rather than dismissing it lightly and allowing the Department's men involved to think they can get away with such behaviour.

I know we are an apathetic lot in so many ways, but so many people are afraid to stand up for what they believe in, because they might be ridiculed or called liars. The fact that a Canadian exchange teacher is on the Mypolonga staff this year, made other members very conscious of the difficulties he was facing, not only was he teaching a composite class, but he was forever being asked to move his class to a verandah, shed or garden area while suffering a great degree of noise. When it went on to such ridiculous lengths, it was the last straw.

That person is the person who—

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: Why didn't you refer that letter straight across to me so that I could take some action?

Mr LEWIS: I do not want to reveal the identify of the person who wrote it. I do not criticise the Minister. I said at the outset of my remarks that he should go back to his Department and check out what they reported. It may just be possible to get statutory declarations which would lay the lie to what was reported to him. I wish to give a further illustration of that in another incident relating to the cost of travelling against boarding in Murray Bridge. At the bottom of page 394 of *Hansard* the report states:

The cost per week per man for mileage and travelling time is \$285.65 and the cost per week for one person at a hotel at Murray Bridge is marginally more expensive at \$300 approximately, and this is why we allowed our personnel to travel to the project by car.

I have made some fairly extensive inquiries around Murray Bridge and I have yet to find a publican or a manager of a pub who was approached by the Department to give that quote. In fact, I have been quoted anything from \$115 to \$160 a week, which is substantially less than \$285.65. It would be possible to obtain good boardinghouse accommodation at a figure even less than that. I dispute that the Department was being frank with the Minister when it provided him with that report.

Also now, in the context of that Estimates Committee, but leaving the subject matter entirely to one side, I wish to refer to another aspect of the conduct of the Estimates Committees which caused me concern. The Estimates Committees have now reached a point where they will simply break away from the House in the way in which business is conducted within them. There are too many anomalies and inconsistencies. A specific example is the instance in which the member for Davenport asked the Acting Chairman of that Committee at the time the honourable Minister gave that answer to it to table that part of the docket from which he was quoting. Reasons given at the time clearly indicate that whilst the practice in the House would have required the Minister to table that docket, and even though the Committee was an elected Committee of the House as a whole, he was able to avoid the embarrassment of doing so, if indeed that was the reason why he refused to do so.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Would the honourable member please resume his seat. I was in the Chair at that time in the Estimates Committee, and I point out that there is nothing under Standing Orders that allows the Minister to table a document. The honourable member is in fact reflecting on that decision of the Chair and Standing Orders, and he is completely out of order. If the honourable member wishes to take the matter further there are ways and means of doing that but certainly not in this climate nor at this time. I ask the honourable member to refrain from dealing with it at this time.

Mr LEWIS: I will take up that matter with you a bit later on, Mr Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEWIS: That was your invitation to me.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will not sit here and take that sort of reflection. The honourable member has had explained to him that it is not a question of taking up the matter with me at all.

Mr LEWIS: You invited me to.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I did not, and I will not sit here and take that as a reflection. The honourable member has ways and means of dealing with that matter and it is not at this time or in this climate, and that was my advice to the honourable member. The honourable member will come back to the debate.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I rise on a point of order. I think that you, Mr Deputy Speaker, probably misunderstood what the honourable member for Mallee was trying to say. At least, my understanding was that he was going to try to clarify the position with you after he had finished. That was the substance of the honourable member's remarks, and I think you probably misread what he had to say and took it as a reflection on yourself. I am sure that was not the intent.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I accept the explanation.

Mr Plunkett: It was a reflection on the Chair, and you blokes know it as well as everyone else does.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mallee.

Mr LEWIS: I wish to place on record my concern about a furphy that has been spread abroad. It is a pity that the Minister of Agriculture could not reassure the Estimates Committee at which he was attending that the Soil Conservation Boards, such as they are, would remain in existence and that the Soil Conservator in future would be an officer of the Department of Agriculture. He failed to give and refused to give that reassurance or any sort of assurance in that regard. That is unfortunate and clandestine when we see on the Notice Paper that there is a Bill before the Chamber to amend the Soil Conservation Act. That worries me.

There are many people who think that Mallee farmers and people who are farming elsewhere in similar climatic and soil circumstances are irresponsible and ought to be put off the land that they are upon, because these people claim that Mallee farmers and people in similar regions of the State and in the nation are engaged in an agriculture which is not sustainable in perpetuity; in fact, that is not true.

Over the past 15 years since the last rural reconstruction programmes of the late 1960s, a technical extension programme about the need to widen rotations has been very effective, in my opinion. It has reduced cropping levels, in terms of frequency, as well as reducing the heavier impact of livestock numbers (by reducing their numbers) on the smaller areas of pasture upon which they graze when the percentage and stocking rates have been reduced. That means that if one has more land under crop there is less land available for the animals to graze. There is no question that the enhanced soil organic matter levels on most farms as a result of these programmes have virtually eliminated their vulnerability (that is, the soils) to seasonal wind erosion. In addition to this, we have substantially controlled the rabbit problem with myxomatosis and, in addition to this, the use of desiccant and pre-emergent weedicides have reduced cultivation levels without poisoning the ground and thereby damaging the consequences to soil structure.

Mr ASHENDEN (Todd): I would like to address myself to a number of matters that have arisen because of the Budget which the Bannon Labor Government has forced on South Australians. I do not want to dwell too much on the points already made by the Leader of the Opposition and many speakers on this side which point out the absolute irresponsibility of the Budgets which the Bannon Government has brought down since it first came to office.

It is now well known that when this Government came to office it did so in a State which had the lowest level of

State taxation in Australia. We now have one of the highest levels of State taxation anywhere in this country. We have a Government now which came to office on completely false premises. It gave assurances such as 'We will not increase any taxes; we will not introduce any new taxes', and we now know that that promise has been broken in excess of 150 times.

Mr Mayes: Is it a reshuffled speech?

Mr ASHENDEN: I notice that members opposite find it amusing. The constituents in my electorate and many other electorates are far from amused by the increased taxation that has occurred under this Government. If any of the members opposite have bothered to get close to their electorate—and I cannot see one who would have—they would have had just as many phone calls to their offices as I have had. I except the member for Semaphore, who I know only too well is able to remain an Independent member of this Parliament because of the work he has done in his electorate. If members opposite were receiving the sorts of phone calls and letters that I am receiving they would realise only too well that the residents are extremely angry, particularly at the recent quite unjustified increases in electricity charges, brought about purely and simply by the activities of the Government. It has tried to foist the blame for the increased electricity charges in other directions, but we all know that they are the ones who have increased the taxation on the turnover of the Electricity Trust. They could, if they so wished, at one stroke of the pen remove \$26 million from the cost of electricity in South Australia just by removing the turnover tax which this Government is so happy to impose and to receive the funds from.

It is also of course quite happy to have the Electricity Trust increase its fees and charges: it will stand to gain—and this is on the Minister of Mines and Energy's own admission—probably \$4 million to \$5 million extra in taxation because of the turnover tax that the Government has imposed on the Electricity Trust. Let us have no crocodile tears from the Premier and his Ministers about the fact that they are sorry these charges have gone up. They gain a big windfall from those charges.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: As my colleague the member for Bragg has just pointed out, they have also forced interest rates up to two or three times the level of the interest that was charged on funds that ETSA borrowed. In other words, this Government has also, by its own action in forcing an increased rate of interest to be paid by the Electricity Trust on the funds which it has borrowed, directly contributed to increased electricity tariffs in South Australia.

These are points that are well understood by constituents in my electorate and, as I said, I am quite sure it is only too well known to residents right throughout the State. Another matter which is causing considerable concern to constituents in my electorate is the recently announced increases in water and sewerage rates. At the moment the quarterly bills are being received by those residents and again they are contacting me to express their anger at the actions of the Government.

As I move around my electorate at present I find, in door knocking, in attending sporting functions and other functions within my electorate, that the mood at the moment is very similar to that which existed a few weeks before the 1979 election. I have no doubt whatsoever that whenever this Government decides to go to the people, whether in the next few weeks or in April 1986, it will find that, fortunately, a Liberal Government will be returned to the Treasury benches in South Australia.

I would now like to direct comments about the Committees upon which I was able to serve during the consideration of the Budget Estimates. The first Committee in which I par-

ticipated was that dealing with the Deputy Premier's lines. I found that that tended to set the tone for most of the committees that were held during the remainder of the two weeks. The Deputy Premier was long-winded and evasive in his answers and, as my colleague the member for Morphett said, it was a filibuster. Government members went on and on, and the Minister took far too long to answer questions that could have been answered very briefly.

In a previous speech that I made in this House I said that I wished that Ministers of this Parliament would conduct themselves in the same way as the Ministers in the House of Commons in the United Kingdom, where the answers are precise and concise and are designed to provide information to the members who asked the questions. I think the Premier would probably be the world's best fudger when answering questions. I know of not one question asked of him by members on this side of the House that has received a direct answer. All the Premier does is come into the House each day at Question Time with a great sheaf of papers, and, when a question is asked, he thumbs through his index, finds the material that comes closest to the subject of the question asked, and then reads it out. He does not have the ability to answer a question. As I have said, he has never answered a question that has been put to him. The Ministers opposite have been well taught. Extremely rarely, if ever, do members on this side of the House get a specific answer to a question. This was the case, with very few exceptions (and the Deputy Premier was not one of them) during the Budget Estimates Committees.

The next committee in which I participated was that dealing with the examination of the Minister of Mines and Energy's lines. That Minister appeared to be extremely embarrassed by the constraints placed on him by his Party. I believe that deep down the Minister of Mines and Energy knows only too well that the Government is acting irresponsibly in South Australia in relation to its mining policies. I questioned the Minister on why it is considered that uranium from Roxby Downs is 'clean' and there are no problems about selling it overseas, whereas the uranium which would have been obtained from the Honeymoon and Beverley mines, is 'dirty' and under no circumstances can be sold overseas.

There must be a difference, although the Minister could not explain it to me. However, the Labor Party must believe that uranium from Roxby Downs is quite different from the uranium from Honeymoon and Beverley. The only difference I can see is that, if Roxby Downs were to be closed, as the present Government closed down Honeymoon and Beverley, it would lead to an even greater defeat of the Labor Government at the next election than will occur, anyway. The political cynicism of the Labor Government has to be seen to be believed. As I have said, Roxby Downs uranium is clean and it is quite all right to mine it and to sell it, but under no circumstances can we sell uranium from Honeymoon and Beverley overseas.

I asked the Minister of Mines and Energy whether he thought other companies would feel loath to explore for minerals in South Australia following the Government's closure of the uranium mines at Honeymoon and Beverley after \$12 million dollars had been invested by the companies involved, and not a cent reimbursed to the companies for the expenses that they had incurred; \$12 million of hard-earned money went 'down the gurgler', to use the colloquial. The Premier, the Minister of Mines and Energy and the Labor Government do not care two hoots that private companies have lost \$12 million because of a completely illogical decision made by the Government.

The Minister of Mines and Energy could not explain why the uranium from Honeymoon and Beverley could not be sold while the uranium from Roxby Downs could be sold.

He also indicated that the Government could not care less about the hundreds of jobs that had been lost because of the closure of the Honeymoon and Beverley mines. I know of two constituents of mine who have lost their jobs because of those closures: one is a young lady who was a secretary for one of the companies, and another was a labourer at one of the mines. Both were put off. When that occurred (it was well over a year ago) I asked the Minister of Mines and Energy whether the Government would do something about finding jobs for the people who would be put out of work because of the Government's decision. He said that the Government would do everything that it could to find some jobs. However, on the Minister's own admission in the Committee, the Government has placed only one of the hundreds of people who lost their positions at those two mines into work. What a disastrous record! Is it any wonder that the Minister of Mines and Energy was so embarrassed when these matters were raised with him during the Estimates Committee proceedings?

The present Government's policy is absolutely irresponsible. South Australia is blessed with an abundance of mineral riches—minerals which the Government will not allow to be sold. Because of its actions, the Government has caused reputable exploration companies to move away from South Australia. I refer to just one example of one of the biggest mining exploration companies in Australia that wanted to explore for petroleum in South Australia. Because of the deliberate policies of the Labor Government, the company withdrew the funds that it intended to devote to exploration in South Australia. It drilled wells in the Pacific and has now found oil. That company has now indicated that in no circumstances will it resume exploration work in South Australia while the present Government continues with its present policy.

Mining exploration companies know only too well that the most abundant mineral in South Australia (and a mineral that is wanted) is uranium, but that if and when it is found it will have to stay in the ground. It is absolutely pathetic that the Government in power at the moment is not prepared to allow the true wealth and riches of South Australia to be developed.

I have referred previously to the US State of Alaska, which is also very well endowed with mineral wealth. In Alaska, because of the money that the Government obtains from mineral wealth through royalties, not only do the residents of that State not pay any State taxation at all but each permanent resident receives in excess of \$3 000 per year back from the State Government, because it has so much money coming in from its mineral wealth. That is the sort of wealth that this State could have if it were not for the deliberate decision made by the present Government to wind down this State.

Various other matters concerning the Mines and Energy portfolio, such as nuclear power, were addressed. We pointed out to the Minister that nuclear power is the form of power that countries want. The United States, the United Kingdom, Europe, Pacific and Third World countries all desperately need nuclear power. One has only to consider the effects of other forms of power generation in Europe at the moment where fossil fuel burning stations are pouring out their waste, which is taken into the atmosphere and which comes back to earth as acid rain, almost completely destroying much vegetation in Europe. Members opposite close their eyes to that and carry on with outdated, unfounded fear tactics which are opposed to a nuclear industry of any form.

We also addressed questions to the Minister in relation to Roxby Downs. I bring in here one of the side effects that the demonstration at Roxby Downs has had on the electorate of Todd. We are all well aware that the Government opposite absolutely refused to do anything to control or remove

protesters from Roxby Downs. Because of those irresponsible protesters at that mine site, the South Australian Police Force was forced to send members up there to provide protection to the mine, workers and residents in that area. I think that speaks volumes for the irresponsibility of the protesters when it is necessary to have police protection against the shenanigans that they carried on with.

Be that as it may, because so many police were required at Roxby Downs, one school in my district has suffered severely. I will not name the school, to save embarrassment to the council, teachers and students, because it is one of the many outstanding State schools that I am fortunate to have in my district. It has a very professional staff and a hardworking school community of councillors and parents. The children are doing extremely well as a result of the programmes that are being offered at that school. It is one of the few schools where there is presently a growth in student numbers, and because of that growth there is insufficient classroom accommodation for the students.

The Education Department has agreed that six new transportable classrooms will be provided for that school and that these classrooms can be brought in from other schools. This was agreed to in the second term, and these classrooms were supposed to have been brought in during the second term school holidays so that they would be ready for use this term.

What happened? The Education Department put all plans in motion to have the classrooms brought to the school. Can honourable members imagine the amazement of the Principal and Chairman of the school council when they were advised that the classrooms could not be moved because there were inadequate police numbers to provide an escort, which is necessary when such classrooms are transported on public roads? In other words, my school still has not got six classrooms which were allocated to it and which were due to be transported and erected at the school during the last holidays. These classrooms are still not there because of only one fact: they were told by officers employed within the Public Service, under this Government, 'We are sorry. The classrooms are ready and the funds have been allocated to transport them, but you cannot have them because we cannot get a police escort.'

That is the sort of effect that these irresponsible idiots are having by continuing their blockade at Roxby Downs. I therefore have students in my district who will not be able to receive the education to which they are entitled. How do honourable members think they feel about this Government's support for those protesters and blockaders at Roxby Downs? The Government is to blame. Had it acted responsibly and controlled those protesters—removed them from the site—my school would have had those classrooms. So, let the blame rest fairly and squarely where it lies—with this Premier and his inactivity, his Government and its inactivity.

They talk about the rights of protesters. What about the rights of residents and miners at Roxby Downs? What about the rights of the students attending my school? Of course, they are insignificant, according to this Government. I do not see it that way; the parents of the children at the school to which I have referred do not see it that way; the school community does not see it that way; the council does not see it that way; and the teachers and the children do not see it that way. They are hearty in their condemnation of what this Government has not done to protect their rights.

The next Committee on which I served addressed questions to the Minister of Education. Once again, I was bitterly disappointed when I raised specific questions with the Minister and did not get specific replies. I will address myself to just one area on which I questioned the Minister—the Tea Tree Gully TAFE college. I have already spoken about

this college and the disastrous effect that this Government's reduction in staffing and funding is having in one of the biggest and most rapidly growing areas in the City of Adelaide metropolitan region.

The college has had its staffing reduced ever since this Government came to power, so that it is now down to a Principal and three lecturers. I guess, to be fair, I should say it has a Principal and four lecturers, but the fourth lecturer is only temporary. When I asked the Minister whether that fourth staff member would be retained at the college he said that he could not say; it was still to be decided. When I asked whether staff would be provided to allow courses presently being undertaken at the Tea Tree Gully TAFE to continue next year, he said, 'I cannot tell you that; we have not decided.' Every question that I asked him about funding or staffing was given the same answer: 'We will know in a few weeks; I cannot tell you yet.' I have forwarded all those questions and answers to the college council, which is amazed at the lack of concern that this Minister and his Government have for their college.

The point is that we have got there a situation where student after student is being told by the Principal that, because of the reduction in funding and staffing, they will have to go to another college. One student who started a course at Tea Tree Gully TAFE now has to travel to O'Halloran Hill to continue that programme. Others go to Kilkenny and Elizabeth. Yet the Minister had the gall to say that it was an advantage that other colleges could cater for the needs of people living in Tea Tree Gully. What utter rubbish! The people living in Tea Tree Gully expect, rightly, that they should be able to have TAFE education provided to them. We find that, of approximately 11 000 student courses at that college, over 9 000 students have to go to colleges outside the area because only just over 2 000 student courses can be undertaken at that college.

What a record! It illustrates a complete lack of interest by this Government in the form of education that should be provided to my constituents in an area where unemployment is higher than average, in an area where youth unemployment is higher than average, and in an area where the age of students leaving school is lower than the State average. This is an area in which people want to come back to get their education, and they just cannot get it. It is an absolute disgrace. I found most concerning and disconcerting the Minister's replies when I asked him questions that I had been asked by the college council to ask of him. I asked whether there would be increased funding and what the level of funding and staffing would be. At the moment, that college cannot even plan its 1985 courses because it has not been told whether it will be able to retain a quarter of its staff.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: None of the colleges know what their budgets will be.

Mr ASHENDEN: As the shadow Minister said, none of the colleges know, yet this Government expects those colleges to go out and plan. How can they plan when they are not given anything at all?

The Hon. Michael Wilson: The Budget was set in July.

Mr ASHENDEN: As my colleague said, the Budget was set in July. It is now October, and there are no answers. Yet, these college Principals and their staff will be forced in a few weeks to try to advise their students what they are able to offer. It is just not good enough. I assure honourable members that the Minister's replies to my questions were not well accepted by the college council.

The Hon. Michael Wilson interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: I assure the member for Torrens that my questions and those replies have well and truly been forwarded to the college council, which is amazed. I know

that the college council intends to take very strong public action over this matter in the next few weeks.

Let us look at some other aspects of this Government's performance that concern me greatly. Members would possibly recall that some months ago I raised in this place the matter of the Tilley Recreation Park at Golden Grove. I spoke in a grievance debate on this and addressed a question to the Minister for Environment and Planning about it.

Before either addressing it in the grievance debate or raising the question with the Minister, I wrote to the Minister a letter explaining that many people and organisations resident in the north-eastern suburbs were requesting the Government to provide additional land to that park from the Golden Grove development to enable the park to expand and offer greater facilities to the residents of the north-eastern suburbs. So, I did everything correctly. I wrote to the Minister a private letter; I raised it in Parliament twice; and the Minister did not reply either to my letter or directly to the question I asked in the House, except to say that he had not made up his mind but he would let me know as soon as a decision was made.

What do we find? He wrote to me on 10 October telling me that the Government had agreed to the representations I had placed before him to provide 3.3 hectares of additional land to the Tilley Recreation Park. However, the point is this: that letter from the Minister was dated 10 October. He wrote nine days earlier on 1 October to advise the council of his decision and he also forwarded a press release to the *North-East Leader*; many days before he bothered to let me know the answer to my representations; so, the *North-East Leader* had printed the fact that this Government would provide additional land to the Tilley Recreation Park even before he had the courtesy to write to me, as the local member who had raised the matter with him in the first place. That is politics at its lowest. In other words, I make the representations, but he does not answer my letter to him until nine days after he has let the *North-East Leader* and the Tea Tree Gully council know.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Who was this?

Mr ASHENDEN: This was the Minister for Environment and Planning. I find that absolutely appalling. I believe that I should have been advised either before or at least at the same time as the Tea Tree Gully council was, and at the same time he forwarded a press release to the *North-East Leader*. If that is the way that the Minister wants to do business, I just do not agree with it. I think that it is appalling. How can members of the Opposition represent their electorates if this Government works in that way? I believe that, when a member takes the trouble to raise with a Minister matters of great importance to the residents of his electorate, the least the Minister can do is have the courtesy to ensure that the member is advised of his decision at the same time or preferably before other announcements are made.

Let us face it: the Minister told me when I first asked him the question, after I had no response to my letter to him, that I would be informed of his decision as soon as it was made. Once again another Minister of this Government just does not stick to his word. There were many other matters that I intended to address, such as the disastrous unemployment levels in this State and other aspects of the budgetary decisions of this Government. Unfortunately time precludes that. However, I again say to the Government that my constituents are only too well aware of the way in which they are being slugged unmercifully by this Government and the lack of care that it has for them, and there is no doubt that this will be reflected in the ballot boxes.

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

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

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 6 p.m.

Motion carried.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: This debate has been a lengthy one. Obviously, at this stage of the afternoon I do not wish to go through piece by piece the various contributions that have been made by members. Certainly a lot has been said; there has not been very much said of substance. In saying that, I do not include everything that has been said or all members. Some points have been made that are well worth taking note of, and we will indeed do so. However, the Estimates Committee procedures indicate that, by and large, the Opposition has very little about which it can complain in terms of the Government's programme and the way in which it is carrying it out.

It is interesting that in the course of this debate we find demands beginning to flow again for greater expenditure. The contribution just made by the member for Todd was all about expenditure needs in his electorate. It is interesting that, overall, the Opposition has not had very much to cavil about in terms of our expenditure programme. We all concede that there are great needs in areas such as TAFE and other similar bodies, and we attempt to address those needs. However, the Opposition at the same time as demanding these expenditures is also demanding that we be denied or that we reduce the means to actually meet those expenditures. Much of the contribution of speakers in this debate has been about the Government destroying its revenue base and cutting back on its expenditure.

Indeed, the Leader of the Opposition in criticising the Budget spent most of the time talking about the receipts side of the Budget and was not able to find very much in the outgoings, but his colleagues have made up for that in a whole range of demands by going into every area of public sector services. In particular, I would like to deal with a number of things that the Leader of the Opposition has said and I particularly intend to concentrate on the matter raised by him in regard to the revenues that we have raised for our expenditure and expose the total hypocrisy, not only of him but of many of his colleagues, some of whom sat in the Cabinet with him in formulating the last Tonkin Budget—the disastrous financial situation that we inherited.

Before embarking on some of the decisions that were made by that Government and the hypocrisy of those members now in Opposition, pretending that things were otherwise or would have been otherwise, let us make an examination of the comparisons the Leader of the Opposition is constantly making about our revenue raising and our place in the table of taxation in Australia, because a lot of nonsense and deliberate untruths have been spoken and figures have been misrepresented, all aimed at frightening and worrying people or making them feel that somehow they are being disadvantaged. The facts are completely at odds with that. The Leader of the Opposition has failed to explain the basis of his comparisons and he has left out many important facts.

For instance, what he did not say is that overall in terms of estimated per capita taxation South Australia rates well behind Victoria, New South Wales and Western Australia, and Western Australia has the same population as we do and therefore would be expected to deliver services and facilities at least at the same level, but it has a higher per capita taxation. The two States below us—Queensland and Tasmania—are States that are recognised as benefiting enormously from the present Grants Commission formulas, and Tasmania also receives special assistance from the Federal Government.

It is interesting that that State, which boasted of State taxation reductions and subsequently found that it had to do something about its revenue, is also facing very high unemployment and major economic problems because its public sector has been allowed to languish. However, for the purposes of comparison at this stage both Tasmania and Queensland—the only two States that are below us—benefit very much from the Commonwealth outlays they get. In the case of Queensland, apart from its Commonwealth tax share and the windfall gains it has achieved under that over the past five years or so, it also has access to revenues that are not formally classified as taxation—revenues deriving from resource developments, the use of special penalty freight rates for the carriage of those resources which are not formally classified as taxation but which nonetheless are finding their way back into the system as an impost on the community, and are in turn passed on to ordinary taxpayers.

Those hidden imposts are quite clearly shown up from a study of the Budget papers of the six States. I would invite an objective assessment of that before we hear more nonsense talked about how South Australian taxation is well above the rate or level of other States. It is nonsense and it simply is not reasonable to try to make the case as it is being made. The Australian Bureau of Statistics releases a series of per capita tax collections which shows that, between 1980-81 and 1983-84 (the financial year in which our revenue package was introduced), South Australia in fact stood less than 1 per cent above the Queensland rate in terms of increased collections per capita. I am not talking about absolute numbers as I was a minute ago, but rather about the increase over that period.

The three States I mentioned—New South Wales, Victoria and Western Australia—were well above us and we were less than 1 per cent above Queensland in terms of collections per capita, with Tasmania below that again. That surely puts in perspective the ridiculous claims being made. The Leader of the Opposition does not explain another important thing in the phoney comparison he draws. He seeks to look at actual amounts collected year by year: in other words, he confuses constantly the tax base with the tax rate.

The fact is that many of our revenue collections are based on economic activity and, if one compares a year of deep recession (as one would do if one compares most of the years of the Tonkin Administration) with the last year in which there has been a considerable upsurge of economic activity, and with the projected year in which we hope that that surge of economic activity will continue, of course our revenues are going to increase: they must do so and must increase at a reasonable rate. That is an indication in itself of the fact that we are in a phase of economic recovery. Indeed, such an increase is consistent with a lowering of taxation rates. In other words, in certain situations if one lowered the taxation rate against the background of an upsurge of activity, one could still end up with a higher tax collection. In that situation it would be absolutely illogical to say that the taxpayer is being ripped off, fleeced or unfairly taxed. That is the factor that the Leader of the Opposition ignores when he tries to compare the increased level of taxation.

It is just as well the State's revenues are recovering because, if those revenues were not recovering the Budget we have just introduced, first, would not be in balance but in gross deficit and, secondly, would involve cuts in all services on which honourable members opposite are demanding we spend more. Why was it necessary to raise taxes? The fact is that the Government inherited a massive Budget deficit. Members opposite ask why we keep repeating that. The reason we keep repeating it is that that fact is obscured far too often in the slick formulas with which the Leader of

the Opposition persists. I will deal at length with matters that affect members opposite and with what they were faced with in 1982-83—situations which they covered up for the purposes of the election and which they left to the unsuspecting Government that took over after them.

I tabled that review of the Budget on 14 December 1982, a mere one month after we came to office. It had been completed by the Under Treasurer and made absolutely clear, that prior to the last election the former Government knew that the State's finances were in a hopeless position and that there was a grave financial crisis. I told the House on that occasion that the Tonkin Budget passed by this House immediately prior to the election was both incomplete and dishonest. It was a document designed for an election—not so much in what it handed out but in what it kept hidden. The origins of our financial problems and the necessity for the revenue packages all stem from that irresponsible final Budget of the Tonkin Government; framed knowing that the Government was going to the polls and having to keep hidden the financial crisis that was going to emerge.

The Leader of the Opposition kept talking about a document he had that had been presented by Treasury and which gave the lie to the statement I have just made and which was inconsistent. The document of 12 October 1982 was inconsistent with the one presented two years later. Eventually and reluctantly I was forced to present details of that document to the House—reluctant because I think there must be considerable care with the use of documents of a previous Government and discretion in the way matters of policy should be handled. But, in the face of untruths with which we have been constantly confronted, I had no alternative. That document presented to the Government on 12 October, far from what the Leader of the Opposition said, flagged quite clearly that we were in a state of financial crisis and that after the election, unless the Government addressed itself to that problem, drastically cut services and expenditures, raised revenue or did both, the State would be bankrupt. That was the finding of 12 December that I presented to this House. That was what was reported and flagged to the previous Government but it did not want to know about it in October.

The document made clear that the Government had been warned. I refer members to my earlier address on that document in which I gave chapter and verse the details of it. Still the Opposition continues with the nonsense about the fact that the finances were in good shape, that its expenditure programme could go on and that there would be no need to raise taxes if it regained office. Let us go back a stage before that. Even if it may be argued that, if advice on 12 October, after the presentation of the Budget, showed that we were going down the financial drain, we could not be blamed for that because the advice came late. That sort of advice had been presented to the Government's Budget Review Committee, had gone through the Cabinet process many months before that. It will be of interest to some members in marginal seats opposite to know what sort of fate awaited their constituents if the Government had been re-elected.

I will deal with a few examples. On 2 June 1982 the Under Treasurer forwarded a minute to the Chairman of the Budget Review Committee (that is, before the end of that financial year) and recommended that the Treasurer be advised of the likely outcome of the 1981-82 financial year and of the prospective position in 1982-83. In summary it showed that at best the 1982-83 operations on the Consolidated Account would show a deficit of \$18 million. That meant that there was a possibility that the deficit could be as high as \$30 million or \$35 million. That was the advice in June—well before the dishonest Budget was framed. The minute then suggested what ought to be done to improve

the position—advice that was totally unacceptable in a pre-election context. First, it was suggested that all the agencies allocations be held to the indicative level of April 1982. This, the Under Treasurer said, would be difficult. Indeed, it clearly was difficult because of the blow out that occurred in subsequent months.

The recommendation went on to state that flexibility to increase revenues should be maintained after the Premier's Conference: in other words, some sort of revenue package should be introduced to include the following—and these are specified with amounts given—to what would be raised under such measures, implementing an STA fare increase from September; increasing the tobacco tax quite substantially from October and considering a 1 per cent pay-roll tax surcharge for pay-rolls in excess of \$1 million as from 1 January 1983. They are examples of the sort of measures that the Under Treasurer was strongly recommending should be taken. He gave a strong warning about the dangers of trying to count on some recovery in future years unless the deterioration at that stage was arrested.

That minute is not setting out options. It is not suggesting that there may be problems that vaguely ought to be looked at. It is saying that the Government must look at increasing revenues as well as holding allocations. Let us look at the 1982-83 Budget formulation. We know that the Tonkin Government did not have the guts to face up to the realities of the revenue situation, as we have done. It did not even have the guts to institute the justified and necessary increase in bus fares, despite the appalling STA deficit which was rapidly increasing. So, in 1982 there was no such increase, leaving their successors (my Government) with a problem that two years had elapsed without any kind of adjustment to those fares while the STA deficit burgeoned out increasingly, million after million of dollars because, despite the firm advice that they had to do it, they took no action at all.

However, what about the expenditure side, and this is a very interesting aspect of the Budget process? Did that Government try to cut back on projects to which it had given commitments to make the Budget balance? The answer is twofold, and both indicate the deceit with which the document that was finally issued had been accompanied. In many areas of the Budget, it set out savings that it knew could not be achieved; in other words, claiming that savings would be achieved in the course of the year which quite clearly common sense and in many cases advice said were simply not possible.

Secondly, it deferred or held back projects while maintaining publicly that the opposite was the case. While saying that it was getting on with particular projects, that Government was reducing or cutting them back, and I will give a couple of details in a moment. In some very significant areas of expenditure an even more irresponsible course was adopted. That Government went ahead with projects in the full knowledge that no funds would be available to complete them, with the full knowledge that a commitment to those projects would mean a substantial shortfall in funds on Consolidated Account in years ahead. In other words, on a group of projects—all of them desirable—the Government, given the option 'which will you go ahead with?', answered, 'We will go ahead with all of them, even though we are not able to afford them. But, we will try to make some adjustments.' I will mention some of those adjustments now.

It is very important that we refresh the memories of some members opposite about some of these decisions, because that might stop the flow of hypocrisy and deceit that we have been getting over the past 12 months from the Leader of the Opposition and his cohorts. I notice that the former Minister of Recreation and Sport and Minister of Transport is on the bench sitting next to the current shadow Minister,

and he may well recall the recommendation that all work on the proposed aquatic centre be deferred for at least one year and that any further decision to proceed be based on further studies concerning cost, operating viability and the impact on Government funds. I do not remember that being announced or being put before the public.

However, I did have to listen yesterday, or whenever it was that the member made his contribution (it was on Tuesday), to that same Minister, against that background, trying to give the impression that he was about to immediately commence work on the Hindley Street aquatic centre and that my Government had unreasonably delayed the swimming pool project. He said that we delayed it while he was going to go ahead with it immediately.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: What nonsense.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That is the record. That was the decision that had been made.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: I was talking about the operating cost.

The Hon. J. C. BANNON: I am glad that the shadow Minister of Transport is sitting next to him. He also would have been fully conscious of the work of the Budget Review Committee. Let us deal with something in transport. It is a pity that the member for Todd is not here to listen to this one. Those former Ministers may recall the recommendations to defer the refurbishing of the 300/400 series rail car fleet and, more significantly, a recommendation that, given the pressure on State funds particularly in 1983-84 and 1984-85, planning of the North-East busway would proceed towards a completion date of not before December 1986. That recommendation was adopted by the Cabinet; it was part of the planning not before the end of 1986. In other words, it must be some time after that, well down the track after 1986. I do not remember that being announced.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: If the honourable member has the press release in which he announced that, I would be very happy to retract my accusation that he kept it hidden. But, he obviously has not indicated it to his colleague next to him who keeps saying that we have been delaying unduly the North-East transport corridor and that it is not running to time. The member for Todd and the Leader of the Opposition have both been on record as saying that the former Government would have had the O-Bahn running in 1986, yet the Cabinet in which they sat decided in no circumstances would it be operating before December 1986; it would be some time after that. So much for that!

Perhaps I might now refresh the memory of the former Minister of Tourism, who has been berating our Government about what she said was insufficient expenditure in some areas, despite the record totally to the contrary. I also remind the House that in that same area when we came to Government we were told that certain programmes had been committed, but we were also told no funds had been provided. How did that circumstance arise? Well, some time in the lead up to the election it was announced that these things would be done and an extra allocation would be made, but they had not actually got around to it; it was not in the Budget. So, we had to find the money, which we did with good grace. But, it was a commitment that had been announced without any funds, even though the Budget had just been presented. That makes sense because Cabinet accepted the following recommendation on tourism:

In the light of the substantial prospective recurrent Budget deficit, the growth in expenditure on tourism in the last three years, and the pressure for funds from other areas, the Government is unable to recommend additional funds at this stage and the Department should look to meet its highest priority requirements by re-allocation of resources.

I do not recall the Minister of Tourism then announcing that. What about the Minister of Water Resources? This will be of very great interest, particularly to those people living in the southern areas of this State, the large growing electorates with clear demands, ably represented, thankfully, mostly by members on this side of the House (members of the Government). Treasury advised that there were four major departmental projects: in the northern towns filtration scheme; the Happy Valley filtration scheme; the Mount Gambier Sewerage Treatment Plant (Finger Point), and we have heard a lot about that over the past two years; and the Berri-Cobdogla Rehabilitation Scheme. This is what they said about them:

When coupled with urgent and committed projects in other areas (particularly the transport area) this would lead to a very substantial shortfall in funds on the Consolidated Account overall in 1983-84—1984-85, and the immediate years beyond, even after allowing in those years for all fees and charges to increase in line with anticipated inflation, and a significant increase in royalty returns.

In other words, they said, 'There are four projects; you cannot afford them; the money will not be there.' The former Minister may also recall that, having pointed that out, the Budget Review Committee then recommended that, given the commitment to those projects, there was no alternative but to allow them to proceed. That Government could not face up to the fact of reviewing its capital works programme as we did as soon as we came to office, take some hard decisions, announce them to the people and explain the reasons—not a bit of it. Although the advice was that all four could not be done, they said, 'We cannot possibly announce that, and say it publicly; that would be terrible in an election year. Let's go on as if we can. Let us pretend that we can do them all. We will not say anything about it and hope that no-one will notice.' That is what they did—that was the recommendation: 'Allow them to proceed, even though we know that the funds are not there.'

This committee to which the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has often referred as being a key element of the former Government's cost control strategy made that recommendation—a splendid piece of cost control, I must say. In making that recommendation it stressed that there would be a substantial shortfall in funds, that is, of the order of tens of millions of dollars. If that was not bad enough, the former Minister and his colleagues who talk about this matter might like to remember the condition that was put on the continuation of the work on the Happy Valley water filtration plant, the southern areas filtration scheme. This will be of particular interest to those members representing the southern areas involved and those who, particularly after preselection battles and other things, seek to represent some of those areas.

The Budget Review Committee instructed that work on the Happy Valley water filtration plant be restricted to an on site programme which did not require more than \$2 million of funds for the financial years 1982-83, 1983-84 and 1984-85. Indeed, under the Budget of the former Liberal Government (which we inherited in 1982-83) the first installment of \$2 million was provided. The proposal was to allocate no more than \$2 million in each of those successive years. It would have been more efficient and more honest to have spent nothing than to waste that paltry sum. At that rate of expenditure it would have taken more than 25 years to finish the filtration plant—the former Government was planning a completion date of around 2010. I did not notice members of the former Government announcing that to the residents of the southern areas.

When the present Government came to office we grasped the nettle and re-ordered priorities. We decided which pro-

grammes the State could or could not afford. We accelerated work on the Happy Valley water filtration plant with the help of extra Commonwealth funding. In 1983-84 we spent not \$2 million but \$6.9 million. This year we plan to spend \$8.7 million, which will be the record for that project. On Tuesday the former Minister of Education, who is now the shadow spokesman on community welfare matters (we do not hear much from him these days, but apparently he does fill that function), got a bit stirred up and attacked the Government for not being able to meet the request of the South Australian Council of Social Services for an additional \$1 million for voluntary agencies. In the past two Budgets we have made a substantial increase in that allocation. This year we added \$355 000. The same voluntary agencies made the same requests to the former Government, but the response at that time was not an attempt to try to meet the needs or demands, as it is being suggested that we now do, but, on the contrary, at that time, while sympathy was expressed for the voluntary welfare agencies, it was pointed out that funding had been increased by 24 per cent in 1981-82.

The Committee recognised that community expectation for assistance will always exceed available funds—in other words, keep asking because we know that we are asking for more than can be given—and therefore priorities should be reviewed with a view to making further funds available to those agencies if necessary'. In other words, no commitments were given, no increases were provided and in fact the Department for Community Welfare was allowed an additional \$100 000 only to cover women's shelters, the cost of implementing amendments to the Act, welfare grants, emergency financial assistance, youth shelters, homes for unemployed youth, and a special vehicle for the Pitjantjatjara lands. That was what was in the Budget. One should compare that with the commitments made by my Government in this year's Budget, which include an increase for welfare agencies of \$355 000, plus a substantial increase in the youth accommodation programme, as well as maintenance in real terms of childrens, payments, and additional staff for district offices facing the greatest need. We are to continue concessions for water and sewerage rates, local government costs, public transport fares and for others in need.

We have introduced and are continuing to operate the most comprehensive and generous electricity concessions scheme in Australia. That illustrates the contrast in record and approach. We have also received a lot of carping criticism from members opposite about initiatives that the Government has taken in relation to road safety. However, what was the previous Government planning to do? It had recommended that expenditure be limited to levels which could be sustained in future years without recourse to the Consolidated Account for funds. The previous Government was not prepared to do anything other than the bare minimum to address the problem, which caused massive suffering and social and economic cost.

The former Minister of Health gets so distressed that the present Minister of Health took some time in the Estimates Committee to set out the achievements of this Government. She faced plenty of criticism previously concerning the control of the Health Commission budget and the Commission's overruns in 1981-82 and the impact that that was going to have. All those things were flagged and all those problems were known so it is about time that we heard an end to his hypocritical nonsense that there was no crisis or, even if there was the advice changed.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: What all this shows is that the Tonkin Government had come to the end of the road. Its ability to juggle the books to bring in greater and greater

amounts of capital works funds was rapidly diminishing. It knew that it faced an election and that many tough decisions had to be made, one of which was that it would have to increase revenue. Indeed, the former Premier told the other Premiers and the Prime Minister that that was exactly what he was going to do. He knew that even the holding down of Government expenditure and hoping for an increase in royalties would not be enough.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Leader of the Opposition likes to come into this House and strut around the community claiming that the Liberal Government was a low tax Government. The previous Government abolished some very inequitable taxes, but it is a gross distortion to claim that the burden on the South Australian taxpayer (both present and future) was lessened by what the previous Liberal Government did. If the record of the former Government is examined, it can be seen that it is none too pure. The Leader of the Opposition likes to wave around long lists of State charges, but he does not remind us that the former Liberal Government in its term of office was close to its double century in relation to increased charges by the time it had come to the end of its term of office.

He also does not invite us to look too closely at the list that he keeps producing now. For instance, analysis of the list shows that there are some quite odd things in it. For example, increased charge No. 5 in the Leader of the Opposition's list shows that the Government decided to pay higher fees to members of the Hairdressers Registration Board—I am not sure how that could be classified as a charge on the public. Charge No. 15 on the list shows that stewards at the trotting course should receive higher payments which, again, has nothing to do with an impost on the people of South Australia. The Leader has also included in his list some increases in penalties. I guess, having congratulated both himself and the Government for increasing penalties under the CFS Act, that will appear on his list of charges as a back door tax on people. That indicates the sort of list that the Leader has produced: it is the same as some of the petitions that have been presented by members opposite, like the one for which signatures were collected by the Liberal Party at the Adelaide Show, which had Mickey Mouse and me as signatories attacking the Government, among others. We will analyse—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The way things are going at the moment it does remind me of the Mickey Mouse show from years gone by!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The question that should be asked about taxes is not what taxes and revenue the former Government cut, but how it made up for the loss of revenue by not doing something in that area. They did it simply by borrowing. The Government had come to the end of the road, as I have demonstrated. In another year the Government would have had it on that, and so would have the State: we would have been bankrupt and would have had to go cap in hand to the Commonwealth Government. The former Government made up for the loss of revenue by borrowing—by adding to the public debt. The member for Mitcham and the member for Hanson are on record as having realised that that was occurring and as being critical of it. In fact, the member for Hanson said that the future of the State was being mortgaged.

Some illusory and temporary tax cuts were made to present-day taxpayers—to the electors of today. They were done and got away with on the basis that the children of those taxpayers would go on paying for many years to come—defer the debt; waive the debt. Mr Speaker, \$141 million was either transferred or budgeted to be transferred during their term of office. Who was going to pay the cost of that

(because it was being used to pay recurrent expenditure)? The people who followed; the children of the taxpayers of today, but so far down the track that that Government in office then—that dishonest Government—was never going to be called to account for that, it hoped. We had to address that problem, do something about it, and we did.

The other point is that I invite honourable members like the members for Bragg and Mitcham (who keeps talking about this issue) to sit down with their calculators and do some work on the interest that that sum involves, the cost of that borrowing to the South Australian taxpayers, and then compare it to the revenue cuts, and tax savings—and they will find that it simply does not compute.

When one adds two State revenues to those transfers which were in fact taxed, one sees that they rise very steeply indeed. The Leader of the Opposition's answer to all this is that a Government he would lead—heaven help us!—would be smaller, would have fewer people and would do fewer things. So far, his examples of the changes he would make are quite pathetic and misguided. They involve amounts of money which are totally insignificant. For example, members may recall that he said he would sell off the STA State Roadliner buses, which in fact run at a profit. I am not sure what savings that would make to the revenue. He then said he would sell off the lolly shop at the railway station and the newspaper stand there. They also make a profit. I am not sure what that impact will have on the State's revenue.

Then he said he would get rid of the Group Laundry which, under our Government, has experienced a turnaround and is doing the job more cheaply than it could be done elsewhere, to the extent that the Government's main problem with the private sector in this regard is the complaints we are getting that the Group Laundry's prices are too low. What sort of saving will that make to the State?

The net impact of all those so-called bold moves in the Budget is absolutely zero. It is about time the Leader of the Opposition came clean. The sort of financial leeway which this Government had to make up was caused by decision making which dealt with tens of millions of dollars irresponsibly. To pick that up the Leader could do nothing other than make inroads into the services the Government provides—major cuts in education, health, police, transport, community welfare, concessions and so on.

He had better spell out just where he will do that and where those millions of dollars will come from. He had better talk to some of his colleagues in the process. For instance, the member for Eyre needs a bit of disciplining in this area by his Leader. He had a motion on the paper calling for expenditure on what he agreed to be uneconomic water schemes. Where will that expenditure come from? It might be legitimate. I am not arguing with the honourable member.

Mr Gunn: You can find the money for the STA; you could find it for these people.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The honourable member should listen. I am actually supporting him, but I suggest that the honourable member will get into a lot of hot water with the Leader of the Opposition with his nonsensical claims. Those calls for more expenditure—and that is just one more example of them—are constantly coming in that way. We have even seen now, faced with the media at last beginning to call on the Leader to be actually concrete and specific, that he is airily talking about abolishing financial institutions duty—that measure which is one of the most broad based and equitable that the Government has at its disposal and which is expected to bring in \$28 million this year. If the Opposition abolishes that, not only does it lose \$28 million this year, but it loses \$28 million next year, the year after and the year after that. It has that compound effect, of course, that the Tonkin Government, in its great early tax

cutting zeal, neglected to look at.

It was told by Treasury, 'Yes there is a bit of money spare this year. You can cut those taxes and still come out in balance.' So, it did but it ignored the advice of Treasury which was, 'But remember that you will lose that much revenue every single year thereafter.' Faced with the reality of that, what did it do? It borrowed \$141 million to prop the Government up.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable Deputy Leader to come to order.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Before I am prepared to listen at all to any further statements about revenue cuts from any member opposite, I wish them to submit to me—and I invite each and every member opposite to do so—a full list of where they will make expenditure cuts. I want them to put in that list the schools in their electorate which they are prepared to see having higher classes.

I want them to tell me which hospitals in Adelaide they believe should have longer waiting lists—and there is at least one member who does not want them to have longer waiting lists because he asked me to spend more on that today in Question Time. I want them to tell me which bus services they think are unnecessary and unneeded. I want them to outline the DCW offices they would close.

I want the member for Todd and others to tell me which TAFE colleges they want to turn people away from and how many vocational courses they want to cut. I would like the member for Torrens and his colleagues to tell me what building projects we do not need to commence, because we are having to use capital funds to prop up recurrent expenditure. I want all those members, like the member for Mallee who has been talking about police services, to tell me how many fewer police he believes he could do with in his district and which police stations in his district he would like closed. If he says, 'none', then he had better tell me which of his other colleagues are going to volunteer some in order to keep his open.

I want to know what water and sewerage connections they think can be deferred. I want to know which roads can be left with potholes or which roads they would prefer we did not build in their districts at all. When we get these lists of savings and cuts from the electorates, when we can assess the very large savings that no doubt every member of the Opposition will be able to present in that course, then we have to look at major and substantial cuts in revenue.

However, I will not accept at all the strident and hypocritical cries from the Leader of the Opposition or any other member opposite until they present me with just such a list and show me how we are going to cope with the revenue foregone. To listen to what they said in the Estimates Committees, on the one hand to bray against taxes and charges and on the other hand to demand further expenditure, is a formula for total disaster.

It is about time they stopped carrying on on this two-sided track and got down to basics and told us just what they are going to do. The challenge has been issued. Let us hope it is responded to. If it is not, let us have no more of the nonsense spoken by members of the Opposition in the course of this debate.

Motion carried.

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

That the remainder of the Bill be agreed to.

Motion carried.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 6.28 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 23 October at 2 p.m.